



Osinga, H. M. (2006). Boundary crisis: mind the gaps!

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

## **University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research**

### **General rights**

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms.html>

# Boundary Crisis: Mind the Gaps!

Hinke M. Osinga\*

*Bristol Centre for Applied Nonlinear Mathematics,  
Department of Engineering Mathematics, University of Bristol,  
Queen's Building, University Walk, Bristol BS8 1TR, United Kingdom*

(Dated: April 8, 2006)

Boundary crisis is a mechanism for destroying a chaotic attractor when one parameter is varied. In a two-parameter setting the locus of boundary crisis is associated with curves of homoclinic or heteroclinic bifurcations of periodic saddle points. It is known that this locus has nondifferentiable points. We show here that the locus of boundary crisis is far more complicated than previously reported. It actually contains infinitely many gaps, corresponding to regions (of positive measure) where attractors exist.

PACS numbers: 05.45.-a, 02.30.Oz, 02.60.-x

The experimental study of nonlinear dynamical systems is necessarily limited to the observation of attractors and the transitions that they undergo as one or more parameters are varied. Therefore, it is important to study possible transitions also from a more theoretical point of view in order to predict what one expects to see in experiments. For this reason, transitions from steady-state or periodic attractors to a regime where attracting chaotic dynamics occurs are an active field of research; see, for example, [1].

It is well known that the existence of a chaotic attractor can end abruptly in a boundary crisis when a parameter is varied [2]. A boundary crisis occurs when the attractor collides with a periodic orbit on its basin boundary. This periodic orbit is called the crisis orbit. Boundary crisis is a common phenomenon that can be observed in experiments. For example, boundary crises were reported in a leaky faucet experiment [3], for Alfvén waves in cosmic plasmas [4], for cold trapped ions in a Paul trap [5], in power systems [6], in lasers [7], in tri-trophic food chain models [8], and in a model of a measles outbreak in New York [9].

Since boundary crisis is so common, one would expect that slight perturbations in the experimental setup, *i.e.* small variations of other parameters in the system, do not influence the occurrence of this phenomenon. Indeed, it should be possible to trace the boundary crisis in a plane of two parameters. Such a two-parameter study was done in [10, 11], where the authors reported the existence of a piecewise-smooth curve of boundary crises. They found that the curve is only piecewise smooth due to changes in the period of the crisis orbit associated with the boundary crisis. Along a smooth segment of the curve the boundary crisis is organised by, effectively, the same crisis orbit. At a so-called double-crisis vertex the curve is not differentiable, and the boundary crisis switches to a crisis orbit with a different period.

From a mathematical point of view, the boundary

crisis is a global change in the dynamics that is caused by a tangency between a stable and an unstable manifold. The chaotic attractor is contained in the closure of this unstable manifold, which is either associated with the crisis orbit or a periodic orbit on the attractor. The stable manifold is always associated with the crisis orbit and forms the basin boundary of the attractor. There are three global phenomena that can occur if two such manifolds become tangent. First, a boundary crisis occurs if the stable manifold is indeed the basin boundary and the closure of the unstable manifold is equal to the attractor at the moment of tangency. Second, if the latter holds, but the stable manifold is not the basin boundary, that is, the crisis orbit lies inside the basin of attraction, then an *interior crisis* occurs and the chaotic attractor suddenly grows in size [2]. Third, if the attractor is contained in, but smaller than the closure of the unstable manifold, then a *basin boundary metamorphosis* occurs, where the basin of attraction becomes fractal [12–15].

The locus of tangency between a stable and an unstable manifold is a smooth curve in a two-parameter plane. However, the global manifestation of this tangency changes type at points where another tangency curve intersects it. Indeed, at a double-crisis vertex two smooth arcs intersect: one arc changes type from a boundary crisis to an interior crisis, and the other from a boundary crisis to a basin boundary metamorphosis [10, 11].

It seems that everything is known about the boundary crisis, but this is actually not the case. By definition, a chaotic attractor implies the existence of infinitely many periodic orbits with stable and unstable manifolds. We report here that, in a two-parameter setting, there are actually infinitely many curves of tangencies between two manifolds, and there are infinitely many intersections between tangency curves. In effect, it is impossible to mark a curve segment that is associated with a boundary crisis. The locus of boundary crisis is interrupted by infinitely many gaps, so that it forms a fractal set.

In this Letter, we consider the Hénon map [16], the paradigm example of a two-dimensional dissipative map.

---

\*Electronic address: H.M.Osinga@bristol.ac.uk




FIG. 1: Manifolds of the Hénon map (1) for  $(\alpha, \beta) = (1.4269212, 0.3)$ . The unstable manifold  $W^u(p_0)$  of the fixed point  $p_0$  is tangent to the stable manifold  $W^s(p_1)$  of the fixed point  $p_1$ .

We use the definition, given in [17],

$$(x, y) \mapsto (\alpha + \beta y - x^2, y) \quad (1)$$

that is obtained by a parameter-dependent linear scaling of the variables from the standard definition [16]. The parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  remain unchanged in this coordinate transformation so that all crisis and tangency curves in the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -plane are identical for both definitions. The Hénon map has the property that the determinant of the associated Jacobian matrix is constant and equal to  $-\beta$ . Hence, the map is dissipative for  $|\beta| < 1$ . An attractor exists as soon as  $\alpha > -\frac{1}{4}(1 - \beta)^2$ , and it is believed that the upper bound for  $\alpha$  is a ( $\beta$ -dependent) boundary crisis.

Simó [18] has extensively studied the Hénon map for fixed  $\beta = 0.3$  and varying  $\alpha$ . As  $\alpha$  increases, a period-doubling route to chaos occurs and a strange attractor exists over a range of  $\alpha$ . However, this interval is interspersed with so-called periodic windows where the attractor is not chaotic. A boundary crisis occurs at  $\alpha \approx 1.4269212$  via a tangency between the manifolds of two fixed points [18]. Figure 1 shows the moment of tangency and illustrates how the strange attractor, which is formed by the closure of the unstable manifold  $W^u(p_0)$  of the fixed point  $p_0$  touches its own basin boundary, formed by the stable manifold  $W^s(p_1)$  of the other fixed point  $p_1$ . Hence,  $p_1$  is the crisis orbit.

We focus our attention on the locus of tangency between  $W^u(p_0)$  and  $W^s(p_1)$  in the two-parameter setting. As  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are varied continuously, the fixed points  $p_0$  and  $p_1$  vary continuously, and so do the manifolds  $W^u(p_0)$  and  $W^s(p_1)$ . The moment where these two manifolds are tangent forms a curve in the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -plane, which we denote by  $T_1$ . Reference [10] reports





FIG. 2: Bifurcations along the curve  $T_1$  of tangency between  $W^u(p_0)$  and  $W^s(p_1)$  from the double-crisis vertices  $V_1$  to  $V_0$ . The chaotic attractor that exists just to the left of  $T_1$  contains periodic windows (a), the start of which are initiated by saddle-node bifurcations that cross  $T_1$  transversely (b). The labels in panel (a) indicate the periods of the periodic windows and the corresponding bifurcating periodic orbits are indicated in panel (b).

that  $T_1$  corresponds to a boundary crisis on the segment between the double-crisis vertices  $V_0 = (2, 0)$  and  $V_1 \approx (0.973005, 0.55861)$ . This segment of  $T_1$ , shown in Fig. 2(b), is almost a straight line; see also [10, Fig. 3]. (The trained eye can observe ‘ripples’ along the curve in Fig. 3 of [10], which are clarified in this Letter.)

Figure 2(a) shows a projection onto the  $(\alpha, x)$ -plane of the attractor just to the left of  $T_1$ , that is, just before the boundary crisis, along the curve segment  $(\alpha_T - 0.01, \beta_T)$ , for  $(\alpha_T, \beta_T)$  on  $T_1$  in between  $V_0$  and  $V_1$ . The picture clearly shows periodic windows, where, for a range of  $\alpha$ ,

the attractor does not densely fill one large interval of  $x$ -values. Inside these periodic windows the attractor is, in fact, a  $k$ -periodic orbit  $p_k$  that undergoes a sequence of period-doubling bifurcations until a chaotic attractor emerges that consists of  $k$  pieces. The period  $k$ , *i.e.* the number of pieces, is labelled in Fig. 2(a).

The start of a  $k$ -periodic window is a saddle-node bifurcation. We computed curves of saddle-node bifurcations of  $k$ -periodic orbits in the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -plane using continuation with CONTENT [19]. Figure 2(b) shows how these curves (in grey for the periods labelled) intersect  $T_1$  transversely. The range of  $\alpha$  for the two figures is the same so that one can compare the start of the periodic windows in Fig. 2(a) with the intersections of the saddle-node bifurcation curves with  $T_1$  in Fig. 2(b). Since the attractor is a periodic orbit just to the right of each saddle-node bifurcation curve, each intersection point on  $T_1$  is an *end point* of the boundary crisis. The ‘ripples’ that one can observe in [10, Fig. 3] appear to lie exactly in the regions where the periodic windows exist.

The end of each  $k$ -periodic window, by which we mean the moment where the attractor becomes one large attractor again, is an interior crisis. The interior crisis is caused by a tangency of the manifolds of the  $k$ -periodic saddle orbit that appeared in the saddle-node bifurcation at the start of a  $k$ -periodic window. Each of these  $k$ -periodic tangencies lies on a curve  $T_k$  of  $k$ -periodic tangencies in the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -plane. The tangency curves  $T_k$  lie almost parallel to the  $k$ -periodic saddle-node bifurcation curves, and also intersect  $T_1$  transversely. All such intersections points are double-crisis vertices, that is, to the left of  $T_1$  each curve  $T_k$  is an interior crisis, but to the right of  $T_1$  it is a boundary crisis with a crisis orbit of period  $k$ . The segment of  $T_1$  in between a  $k$ -periodic saddle-node bifurcation curve and the associated tangency curve  $T_k$  does *not* correspond to a boundary crisis. Namely, the attractor is relatively small here and far away from its basin boundary. Indeed, close to the saddle-node bifurcation curve, the attractor is not even chaotic. Hence, instead of a boundary crisis, these segments of  $T_1$  instead cause a basin boundary metamorphosis.

In order to illustrate what happens along  $T_1$ , we checked the dynamics in a neighbourhood of the double-crisis vertex at the end of the first 5-periodic window in Fig. 2(a), approximately at  $(\alpha_5, \beta_5) = (1.49017, 0.26553)$ . Figure 3 shows from top to bottom the attractors and their basins for parameter values just below, to the left, and above  $(\alpha_5, \beta_5)$ , respectively. Panel (a) shows the situation for  $(\alpha_5, \beta_5 - 0.005)$ , which is as expected for parameter values close to a boundary crisis: the attractor and its basin boundary are similar to the manifolds  $W^u(p_0)$  and  $W^s(p_1)$  in Fig. 1. For a slightly larger value of  $\alpha$  the curve  $T_1$  is reached, the manifolds  $W^u(p_0)$  and  $W^s(p_1)$  become tangent and a boundary crisis takes place.

Figure 3(b) is for  $(\alpha_5 - 0.01, \beta_5)$ , which is inside the first 5-periodic window in Fig. 2(a). While the basin of attraction is virtually the same as in Fig. 3(a), the




FIG. 3: Basins of attraction with the attractors of the Hénon map (1) for  $(\alpha, \beta)$  near  $(\alpha_5, \beta_5) = (1.49017, 0.26553)$ . The phase portraits are for  $(\alpha_5, \beta_5 - 0.005)$  (a),  $(\alpha_5 - 0.01, \beta_5)$  (b), and  $(\alpha_5, \beta_5 + 0.005)$  (c).

attractor is a periodic orbit of period 5. Indeed, moving from  $(\alpha_5, \beta_5 - 0.005)$  to  $(\alpha_5 - 0.005, \beta_5)$  is very similar to entering the 5-periodic window from the right in Fig. 2(a): a (reversed) interior crisis occurs followed by a (reversed) period-doubling sequence to a 5-periodic attracting orbit.

The transition from  $(\alpha_5 - 0.01, \beta_5)$  to the situation in Fig. 3(c) involves a crossing of  $T_1$ . However, no boundary crisis takes place. Figure 3(c) shows that the attractor persists — it is a 10-periodic orbit here, — but the basin of attraction has changed dramatically. As predicted, a basin boundary metamorphosis takes place.

The description of the 5-periodic window is typical for all other periodic windows along  $T_1$ . Even though we only labelled eight of them in Fig. 2(a), one must expect infinitely many periodic windows that cannot be observed at the scale of the figure. For example, there are two saddle-node bifurcation curves of period 9 and also two of period 7 in Fig. 2(b), but there is only one periodic window each in Fig. 2(a). A zoom of the bifurcation diagram does reveal the other two periodic windows in the parameter region indicated by the intersection points. For each of these possibly infinitely many periodic windows the associated curve segment on  $T_1$  in between the double-crisis vertices  $V_0$  and  $V_1$  causes a basin boundary metamorphosis, rather than a boundary crisis. Hence, each of these segments is a gap on  $T_1$ , where this curve is not associated with a boundary crisis. The recursive structure of the periodic windows suggest that the gaps are created in a Cantor like process, so that the locus of

boundary crisis along  $T_1$  is a fractal set.

In summary, the overall structure of the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -plane is drastically different from what is reported in [10, 11], where it is suggested that an attractor exists up to a piecewise-smooth curve that ranges, roughly, over  $\alpha \in [0.56, 4.2]$ ; see also [10, Fig. 3]. We have shown that there are likely infinitely many gaps along the curve segment in between the double-crisis vertices  $V_0 = (2, 0)$  and  $V_1 \approx (0.973005, 0.55861)$ , where the boundary crisis is reportedly caused by a tangency  $T_1$  between the manifolds of fixed points [10]. In fact, the Hénon map has infinitely many of such tangency curves that criss-cross the  $(\alpha, \beta)$ -plane. Gaps in the locus of boundary crisis occur where tangency curves intersect. Hence, it is not correct to think that the locus of boundary crisis forms a single piecewise-smooth curve with a finite number of nondifferentiable points (the double-crisis vertices). The recursive process of removing gaps along tangency curves likely leads to a fractal set as the locus of boundary crisis.

In an experiment, including a numerical one, it is difficult to avoid jumping over smaller gaps when attempting to trace a locus of boundary crisis. As a result a misleading bifurcation diagram may be obtained. We point out that the gaps do not necessarily correspond to attractors with a small basin, although there does seem to be a relationship between the size of the basin and the width of the gap. In [20] a large gap was reported in a three-dimensional dynamical system that appears to be bounded in exactly the same way as discussed in this Letter.

- 
- [1] J. M. T. Thompson, H. B. Stewart, and Y. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. E* **49**, 1019 (1994).
- [2] C. Grebogi, E. Ott, and J. A. Yorke, *Physica D* **7**, 181 (1983).
- [3] J. C. Sartorelli, W. M. Gonçalves, and R. D. Pinto, *Phys. Rev. E* **49**, 3963 (1994).
- [4] A. C.-L. Chian, F. A. Borotto, and E. L. Rempel, *Int. J. Bif. Chaos* **12**, 1653 (2002).
- [5] J. Hoffnagle and R. G. Brewer, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 4157 (1994).
- [6] H. O. Wang, E. H. Abed, and A. M. A. Hamdan, *IEEE Tr. Circ. Sys. I: Fund. Th. Appl.* **41**, 294 (1994).
- [7] S. Wicczorek, B. Krauskopf, and D. Lenstra, *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 056204 (2001).
- [8] M. P. Boer, B. W. Kooi, and S. A. L. M. Kooijman, *Mathematical Biosciences* **169**, 109 (2001).
- [9] F. R. Drepper, R. Engbert, and N. Stollenwerk, *Ecological Modelling* **75-76**, 171 (1994).
- [10] J. A. Gallas, C. Grebogi, and J. A. Yorke, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **71**, 1359 (1993).
- [11] H. B. Stewart, Y. Ueda, C. Grebogi, and J. A. Yorke, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **75**, 2478 (1995).
- [12] K. T. Alligood, L. Tedeschini-Lalli, and J. A. Yorke, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **141**, 1 (1991).
- [13] C. Grebogi, E. Ott, and J. A. Yorke, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **56**, 1011 (1986).
- [14] C. Grebogi, E. Ott, and J. A. Yorke, *Physica D* **24**, 243 (1987).
- [15] H. E. Nusse and J. A. Yorke, *Erg. Th. & Dyn. Sys.* **17**, 463 (1997).
- [16] M. Hénon, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **50**, 69 (1976).
- [17] K. T. Alligood, T. D. Sauer, and J. A. Yorke, *Chaos — An Introduction to Dynamical Systems* (Springer, New York, 1996).
- [18] C. Simó, *J. Stat. Phys.* **21**, 465 (1979).
- [19] W. Govaerts, Y. Kuznetsov, and B. Sijnave, in *Computer Algebra in Scientific Computing — CASC'99*, edited by V. G. Ganzha, E. W. Mayr, and E. V. Vorozhtsov (Springer, New York, 1999), pp. 191–206.
- [20] H. M. Osinga and U. Feudel, *Physica D* **141**, 54 (2000).