# Strategic control for a Boltzmann like decision–making model

Luis Guillermo Venegas-Pineda<sup>\*1</sup>, Hildeberto Jardón-Kojakhmetov<sup>1</sup>, Maximilian Engel<sup>2, 3</sup>, Jobst Heitzig<sup>4</sup>, Muhittin Cenk Eser<sup>2</sup>, and Ming Cao<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bernoulli Institute for Mathematics, Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence, University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 9, 9700 AK, Groningen, The Netherlands.

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Mathematics, Freie Universität Berlin, Arnimallee 6, 14195 Berlin, Germany.

<sup>3</sup>Korteweg-de Vries Institute for Mathematics, University of Amsterdam, Science Park 105-107, 1098 XG Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

<sup>4</sup>FutureLab on Game Theory and Networks of Interacting Agents, Complexity Science Department,

Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, PO Box 60 12 03, 14412 Potsdam, Germany.

<sup>5</sup>Engineering and Technology Institute Groningen, University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 9, 9700 AE, Groningen, The Netherlands.

#### Abstract

We study a prototypical non-polynomial decision-making model for which agents in a population potentially alternate between two consumption strategies, one related to the exploitation of an unlimited but considerably expensive resource and the other a comparably cheaper but restricted and slowly renewable source. In particular, we study a model following a Boltzmann-like exploration policy, enhancing the accuracy at which the exchange rates are captured with respect to classical polynomial approaches by considering sigmoidal functions to represent the cost-profit relation in both exploit strategies. Additionally, given the intrinsic timescale separation between the decision-making process and recovery rates of the renewable resource, we use geometric singular perturbation theory to analyze the model. We further use numerical analysis to determine parameter ranges for which the model undergoes bifurcations. These bifurcations, being related to critical states of the system, are relevant to the fast transitions between strategies. Hence, we design controllers to regulate such rapid transitions by taking advantage of the system's criticality.

## 1 Introduction

A recurrent problem faced in a vast range of real-world phenomena is decision-making. In this sense, decision theory intends to formulate accurate hypotheses where the final outcome depends on the decisions that a rational agent makes for completing a certain task, trying to find optimal solutions that generate the maximum possible profit [30, 46]. Thus, decision-making is interpreted as the process of choosing an alternative, either following exact or heuristic procedures, and depending on the frequency of the action it can be classified as operational (short), strategic (long), or politic (very long) [39, 43]. Examples of decision-making studies are known in different areas, from biology [23, 6], all the way up to economics [38], and psychology [41]. Additionally, exponential weighting strategies represent fundamental elements in different areas, including machine learning, optimization, as well as decision-making theory [3]. In the context of Reinforcement Learning, an approach that aims to learn new behaviours through

<sup>\*</sup>l.g.venegas.pineda@rug.nl

experiencing and interacting with the environment [2, 31, 49, 55], these exponential schemes are also referred as softmax, Gibss or *Boltzmann* exploration policies and are commonly used for balancing the exploitation and exploration rates, where the probability of selecting a particular strategy is proportional to an exponential function of the empirical mean of the reward related to such strategy [10].

For our research, we study a resource's stock dynamics as being consumed by two distinguished groups following different exploitation strategies, one consuming an unlimited but highly costly common resource, such as wind energy, and the second employing a comparably cheaper but restricted and slowly renewable resource, for instance biomass. Let  $y \ge 0$  represent the limited resource stock and  $x \in [0, 1]$  the share of agents exploiting it, while 1 - x is the portion of agents consuming the unlimited resource instead.

We model the joint evolution of x and y as the fast-slow system

$$\dot{x} = \gamma_1 (1 - x) \left( \eta_1 + \frac{1 - \eta_1}{1 + e^{-\beta_1 (\alpha_1 + \delta(x, y))}} \right) - \gamma_2 x \left( \eta_2 + \frac{1 - \eta_2}{1 + e^{-\beta_2 (\alpha_2 - \delta(x, y))}} \right),$$
(1.1)

$$\dot{y} = \varepsilon y(1 - rx),\tag{1.2}$$

where  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  indicates the timescale separation, involving the *slow* recovery speed of the limited resource stock y and the comparatively fast change of x due to the agents' adaptation of their exploitation strategies. The *natural* and *metabolic* component of (1) is a simple equation for y governed by the growth rate  $\varepsilon$  and each agents' relative harvesting rate r, resulting in an effective total harvesting rate of  $\varepsilon rx$ . On the other hand, the *economic* element is a model of bounded rational behaviour governed by a set of parameters as follows. The terms  $\gamma_{1,2} > 0$  represent the rate at which agents from one strategy consider switching to the opposite strategy. If an agent considers switching, they either change strategy independently of the possible profits, which happens with probability  $\eta_{1,2} \in [0, 1]$  and can be called *unconditional exploration*, or they base their decision whether to switch strategies on the profit difference

$$\delta(x,y) = y + \frac{c}{d-x} - b, \tag{2}$$

which happens with probability  $1 - \eta_{1,2}$ , and where b > 1 represents the benefits of harvesting one unit of the unlimited resource, while c > 0 and d > 1 are parameters governing the costs of harvesting one unit of the unlimited resource. Note that the function  $\delta(x, y)$  is chosen such that these costs decrease from c/(d-1) to c/d as the share of agents exploiting it, i.e. 1-x, grows. Particularly, agents following the latter strategy employ a Boltzmann or softmax policy to decide their future strategy [2, 10]. Therefore, the logits, i.e. the logarithm of the odds of the probability of a certain event occurring, of the relative probabilities for both strategies are proportional to the corresponding profits, multiplied by an *inverse temperature* parameter  $\beta_{1,2} > 0$ , which is a common way to model bounded rational optimization [24, 37]. In addition to the payoff comparison, agents favour switching to a certain extent governed by an offset parameter  $\alpha_{1,2} > 0$ , which can be interpreted as a *conditional exploration*. Altogether, considering soft optimization and conditional exploration lead to the exponential terms  $1/(1+e^{-\beta(\alpha\pm\delta)})$  of (1). Therefore, the dynamics in (1) are governed by sigmoidal functions comprising the costs and benefits related to each consumption strategy, as well as the tendency of agents for switching from one strategy to another following a decision-making scheme comparable to the one presented by the Boltzmann policy. Similar approaches are found in economics, concerning the aggregate saving rate in a large population [4], as well as in ecology, where the cost-profit difference between distinct energy resources is expressed [58] or the rate of succession of grassland to forest as described in [25]. This particular representation allows for a closer interpretation to the cost-profit exchange rates of each exploit strategy compared to the usually employed polynomial descriptions.

Briefly speaking, the dynamics of (1) are characterized by two timescales, distinguished by the timescale separation parameter  $\varepsilon$ . For generic initial conditions, the flow generated by (1) quickly converges to an attracting equilibria of the fast dynamics (1.1). Once a trajectory is sufficiently close to such equilibria, it evolves according to the slow dynamics (1.2) until the equilibria of the fast dynamics undergo a bifurcation, repeating the aforementioned process to either produce sustained oscillations or stabilize in an equilibrium point of (1). For more details on fast-slow systems, see Section 2.1. In particular, our numerical results show that under parameter variations system (1) presents either zero, two or four fold bifurcations, see Appendix A. The previous fact provides our model with the capability to produce interesting dynamics, as the ones shown in Figure 1 for a case with two fold points. In the left panel, open-loop responses of system (1) are depicted, including the stabilization of trajectories (red, orange) to equilibrium points near the fold points  $F_{1,2}$ , and a relaxation oscillation (blue), response formed by alternating fast and slow segments [21]. On the other hand, the right panel exhibits actuated responses (blue, purple) of (1) for the stabilization of *canard orbits* (red, orange), particular solutions known for their lack of robustness towards perturbations as well as their capability to travel for considerable amounts of time along repelling regions of the critical manifold, geometric object associated to (1) which describes the boundary between the fast (1.1) and slow (1.2)dynamics when  $\varepsilon = 0$  [50, 34, 28]. For more details on fast-slow dynamics we refer the reader to Section 2.1. Finally, from an applied perspective, stabilizing an orbit near  $F_1$  corresponds to a scenario in which the controlling entity desires to preserve a high amount of limited resource yin stock by enforcing policies that limit the share of agents following each consumption strategy, while the stabilization of orbits in a vicinity of  $F_2$  describes an optimal consumption strategy, in which the maximum possible share of agents consume the limited resource y while reducing its stock to a minimum, representing an economic advantage for the controlling entity.

Therefore, our main contribution in this work is the development of control schemes capable of stabilizing planar canard orbits in a family of dynamical systems with (a possibly non-generic) fold bifurcation. We emphasize the importance of considering not necessarily generic folds, as better approximations to the associated critical manifold near a fold point can be obtained when considering higher order terms rather than the generic case, as shown in Figure 3, where the critical manifold  $S_0$  (black) is better approximated by the non-generic manifold  $S_4$  compared to the generic manifold  $S_2$ . The successful stabilization of the canard orbits is obtained through the implementation of compatible fast-slow controllers, that is, control schemes that achieve the desired outcome without dramatically altering the original dynamical structure, see Section 2.2. Specifically, we extend the theory developed for the design of these kind of controllers for the stabilization of generic planar canards [28] to more degenerate cases and apply it to model (1) in order to demonstrate the effectiveness of our control strategies, providing an efficient approach for the stabilization of these particular patterns in diverse real-world problems and allowing the controlling entity to produce drastic consumption changes at will with a minor effort by exploiting the system's criticality.

The rest of this work is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the mathematical principles sustaining our studies. Next, our main results are detailed in Section 3. First, we derive compatible fast-slow controllers for a generalized quadratic system, as synthesized in Theorem 3.1. Thereafter, we give arguments for applying our results in the decision-making system (1) and demonstrate its effectiveness to control canard cycles, even in the presence of modelling uncertainties. Finally, we discuss the reach of our controllers, as well as possible future study directions in Section 4.



Figure 1: Comparison between the open-loop (left) and controlled (right) responses of the decision-making model (1), where the stable and unstable regions of the critical manifold, which is an important geometric object denoting the equilibria of (1.1) and further detailed in Section 2.1, are depicted in solid and dashed black, respectively. For the open-loop scenario, a relaxation oscillation (blue) and two trajectories (red, orange) stabilizing at the closest fold point ( $F_1, F_2$  respectively) are shown. On the other hand, we present the stabilization of two trajectories (blue, purple) of (1) along the desired orbits (thick red, orange) through the implementation of the controlled schemes designed in this work. Observe that in the latter case the trajectories directly follow the target canard regardless of the position for the initial conditions. Parameters:  $\alpha = 2.0, \beta = 0.75, \gamma = 0.5, c = 2.5, d = 1.18, b = 30.0, \varepsilon = 0.001$ . For the open-loop scenario: relaxation oscillation (x(0), y(0)) = (0.9, 29.0) with r = 1.62, trajectory stabilizing at  $F_1$  (x(0), y(0)) = (0.2, 27.0) with r = 1.65, and trajectory stabilizing at  $F_2$  (x(0), y(0)) = (0.95, 27.5) with r = 1.08. Further details on the controlled case are given subsequently in Section 3. Double and single arrows indicate fast and slow movement, correspondingly.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section we present the theoretical principles that represent the basis of our results. We begin by briefly discussing the theory of fast–slow dynamics and geometric singular perturbation theory, specifically Fenichel's theorem [19, 34]. Thereafter, we describe planar folded canard trajectories, emphasizing their normal form [33, 28].

#### 2.1 Fast–slow systems

Consider the family of systems

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon \dot{x} &= f(x, y, \varepsilon), \\ \dot{y} &= g(x, y, \varepsilon), \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

typically known as a fast-slow vector field, composed by a set of singularly perturbed ordinary differential equations, where the over-dot denotes the derivative with respect to the slow-time  $\tau$ , and with  $x = x(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $y = y(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n$  the fast and slow variables, respectively. Moreover, the parameter  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  describes the timescale separation and the functions  $f : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^m$ and  $g : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  are assumed to be sufficiently smooth. Additionally, by defining the fast time variable  $t := \tau/\varepsilon$ , it is possible to express the equivalent fast-time form of (3) as

$$\begin{aligned} x' &= f(x, y, \varepsilon), \\ y' &= \varepsilon g(x, y, \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

$$(4)$$

with the prime denoting the derivative with respect to t. Now, one important mathematical theory usually employed in the analysis of systems (3)–(4) is geometric singular perturbation theory (GSPT), with an overall idea of analyzing both problems separately and looking for invariant objects that can persist certain small perturbations [34]. Specifically, by considering the singular limit  $\varepsilon = 0$  in (3) and (4), two different problems arise

$$\begin{array}{ll}
0 = f(x, y, 0), & x' = f(x, y, 0), \\
\dot{y} = g(x, y, 0), & y' = 0,
\end{array} \tag{5}$$

known, correspondingly, as the reduced slow subsystem, being a constrained differential equation [51] or a differential algebraic equation [35], and the layer problem. Naturally, the aforementioned problems are no longer equivalent but they are intrinsically related through the geometric object known as the *critical manifold*.

Definition 2.1 (Critical manifold). The critical manifold of a fast-slow problem is

$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n : f(x, y, 0) = 0\}.$$
(6)

*Remark* 1. Observe that the critical manifold (6) corresponds both to the phase–space of the reduced problem and the set of equilibrium of the layer problem.

Moreover, one highly relevant property of fast–slow systems to analyze the different types of possible bifurcations is the *normal hyperbolicity*, defined as follows.

**Definition 2.2** (Normal hyperbolicity). A subset  $S_0 \subset C_0$  is normally hyperbolic if the matrix  $(D_x f)(p, 0)$  has only eigenvalues with non-zero real part for every point  $p \in S_0$ . Furthermore, given a normally hyperbolic subset  $S_0$ , it can be attracting (repelling) if every eigenvalue of the Jacobian  $(D_x f)(p, 0)$  has negative (positive) real part for every  $p \in S_0$ . Finally, if  $S_0$  is normally hyperbolic but neither attracting nor repelling, then it is of saddle type.

A useful consequence of normal hyperbolicity is that the dynamics of the constraint equation in (5) can be reduced to the dynamics of an ODE. Namely, due to normal hyperbolicity, the critical manifold  $C_0$  can be given locally near a regular point  $p \in C_0$  as the graph of a function f(h(y), y, 0) = 0, with  $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^m$ . Thus, it is possible to reduce the slow subsystem

$$0 = f(x, y, 0), 
\dot{y} = g(x, y, 0),$$
(7)

to the simpler form

$$\dot{y} = g(h(y), y, 0).$$
 (8)

Hence, a subset  $S_0$  is non-normally hyperbolic if the Jacobian  $(D_x f)(p, 0)$  has at least one eigenvalue with zero real part. According to the normally hyperbolic characteristic of the problem at hand, different analysis techniques can be used. For instance, non-normally hyperbolic points, which are related to dynamic features such as relaxation oscillations, that is, limit cycles of a singularly perturbed dynamical system [21], appearing in chemistry [47], geophysics [53], biology [13, 48, 59], or economics [22, 52], and canard trajectories [14], can be studied with the blow-up method [15, 60, 34, 27]. On the other hand, for normally hyperbolic cases a widely employed technique comes from the Fenichel's theorem, stated as follows.

**Theorem 2.1** (Fenichel's theorem). Suppose  $S = S_0$  is a compact normally hyperbolic submanifold of the critical manifold  $C_0$  of (3), and that  $f, g \in C^r, r < \infty$ . Then, for  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  sufficiently small, the following hold:

- 1. There exists a locally invariant manifold  $S_{\varepsilon}$  diffeomorphic to  $S_0$ . In this scope, local invariance means that trajectories can enter or escape  $S_{\varepsilon}$  only through its boundaries.
- 2. The Hausdorff distance between the submanifolds  $S_{\varepsilon}$  and  $S_0$  is of order  $\varepsilon$ .
- 3. The flow on  $S_{\varepsilon}$  converges to the flow generated by the reduced problem (3) in the singular limit  $\varepsilon = 0$ .
- 4.  $S_{\varepsilon}$  is  $C^r$  smooth, with  $r < \infty$ .
- 5.  $S_{\varepsilon}$  shares the same normally hyperbolic and stability properties as the critical manifold  $S_0$ .
- 6.  $S_{\varepsilon}$  is rarely unique, as all submanifolds satisfying properties 1-5, in a region with fixed distance from  $\partial S_{\varepsilon}$ , are exponentially close to each other with a Hausdorff distance of order  $O(\exp(-C/\varepsilon)), C > 0$ , and  $C \in O(1)$  as  $\varepsilon \to 0$ . Therefore, every submanifold  $S_{\varepsilon}$  satisfying conditions 1-5 is called a slow manifold.

Once we have revisited the main concepts of fast-slow systems, in what follows we focus our interest in the unexpected canard trajectories, solutions that follow unstable branches of the critical manifold  $C_0$  for considerable time, as the ones shown in the right panel of Figure 1, and which can arise from bifurcations of the fold type. Such trajectories have been observed in various applied sciences, for instance in neuroscience, allowing a detailed description of the very fast onset of large amplitude oscillations caused by small parameter variations in neural models [26, 17, 18, 32], as well as in chemistry [9, 40, 42], to mention a few.

## 2.2 Planar folded canards

Let us start by recalling the canonical form of a canard point [33], given as

$$\dot{x} = -yh_1(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha) + x^2h_2(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha) + \varepsilon h_3(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha), 
\dot{y} = \varepsilon \left(xh_4(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha) - \alpha h_5(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha) + yh_6(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha)\right),$$
(9)

with  $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , and  $\alpha$  is a parameter. Furthermore,

$$h_3(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha) = \mathcal{O}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha), h_i(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha) = 1 + \mathcal{O}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha), \quad i = 1, 2, 4, 5,$$
(10)

and  $h_6$  is smooth. Let us simplify (9) along (10) as

$$\dot{x} = -y + x^2 + f(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha), 
\dot{y} = \varepsilon(x - \alpha + \tilde{g}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha)),$$
(11)

where the functions  $\tilde{f}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  collect the higher order terms in (9). Thus, locally the critical manifold is denoted by

$$C_0 = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : -y + x^2 + \tilde{f}(x, y, 0, \alpha) = 0 \right\}.$$
 (12)

In particular, considering (11) in the absence of higher order terms yields

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{x} &= -y + x^2, \\ \dot{y} &= \varepsilon(x - \alpha). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

It is straightforward to check that the orbits of (13), for  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\alpha = 0$ , are given by the level sets of the Hamiltonian

$$H(x, y, \varepsilon) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-2y/\varepsilon} \left( \frac{y}{\varepsilon} - \frac{x^2}{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{2} \right).$$
(14)

Furthermore, some orbits of (14) are canard trajectories, as the ones shown in Figure 2, and in fact it is well-known that canard cycles exist for  $H \in (0, 1/4)$  [33]. Therefore, the representation of the normal form for a folded canard is of high importance for our study as the control schemes designed are based on such description. However, it is important to highlight that one should be careful while designing such controllers as the dynamical structure of (9) could be altered, rendering inaccurate behaviours. For this reason, we present the following definitions.

**Definition 2.3** (*k*-jet equivalence). Let  $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $G : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$  be smooth maps. We say that F and G are *k*-jet equivalent at  $p \in \mathbb{R}^n$  if F(p) = G(p) and  $F(x) - G(x) = \mathcal{O}(||x-p||^{k+1})$  as  $x \to p$ . Moreover, an equivalence class defined by this concept is called the *k*-jet of F at p, and is denoted as  $j^k F(p)$ .

Next, a formal definition of a *compatible controller* is introduced.

Definition 2.4 (Compatible controller). Given a control system

$$\hat{\zeta} = f(\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\lambda}, u)$$

where  $\hat{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  denotes the state variable,  $\hat{\lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  represents the set of parameters in the system, and  $u \in \mathbb{R}^m$  stands for the control entry. Suppose that in the open–loop system, i.e. (u = 0), the



Figure 2: Canard trajectories of system (13) obtained as level sets of the Hamiltonian (14), where the attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold  $C_0$  are depicted in solid and dashed black, respectively. Observe that the orange (H = -0.01) and purple (H = -0.1) solutions describe canard trajectories, while the blue (H = 0.01) and green  $(H = 1 \times 10^{-6})$  are canard orbits. Finally, the red orbit (H = 0) represents the maximal canard, which connects the attracting and repelling slow manifolds of (13).

origin  $\hat{\zeta} = 0$  is a nilpotent equilibrium point of  $\dot{\hat{\zeta}} = f(\hat{\zeta}, 0, 0)$  and that there exists a  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that k is the smallest number so that  $j^k f(0) \neq 0$ . Furthermore, the control variable is  $u(\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\lambda}, l)$ , where  $l \in \mathbb{R}^m$  represent all the controller parameters, and let  $\dot{\hat{\zeta}} = F(\hat{\zeta}, \hat{\lambda}, l)$  be the closed-loop system. Then, u is a *compatible controller* if the open and closed-loop vector fields are k-jet equivalent at the origin for  $\hat{\lambda} = 0$  [28].

Now, with the most important theoretical elements summarized, we are in the correct position to present our principal results for the design and implementation of compatible fast–slow controllers for a family of dynamical systems with similar characteristics as the decision–making model (1), in order to stabilize canard orbits near fold points and allowing the production of abrupt transitions at will by taking advantage of the system's criticality.

## 3 Main results

In this section we detail the local analysis and the derivation of fast-slow controllers that stabilize canard orbits in a neighborhood of a fold point of the decision-making system (1). First, we study a general fast-slow system and design compatible controllers capable of stabilizing canards around a not necessarily generic fold point, results summarized in Theorem 3.1, and extending the application of our control methods to more degenerate cases. Moreover, depending on the dynamical features of the system at hand, we provide two different alternatives to accomplish the stabilization of canards, when having either a semi-actuated or a fully controlled system. Thereafter, we employ our general results to system (1) in order to stabilize canard orbits in two different fold points, entitling the controlling entity with the capability to stay near the bifurcation or produce abrupt transitions by exploiting the system's criticality. In particular, in our first example, detailed in Section 3.3, we stabilize orbits near a fold point that maximizes the stock of renewable resource y by restricting the share of agents exploiting it. On the other hand, our second example, explained in Section 3.4, denotes an *optimal exploitation strategy* in which the maximum number possible of agents x benefit from consuming the limited resource y while reducing its stock to the local minimum, producing a favorable scenario both for the population and the controlling entity.

#### 3.1 Generalization of the normal form controls

We begin by introducing a general fast-slow system in the form

$$\dot{x} = F(x, y, \varepsilon), 
\dot{y} = \varepsilon G(x, y, \varepsilon),$$
(15)

where  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$  is the timescale separation parameter, while  $F : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^m$  and  $G : \mathbb{R}^m \times \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^n$  are sufficiently smooth functions such that the associated critical manifold  $\mathcal{C}_0$  of the singularly perturbed vector field (15) has at least one point  $p = (x_p, y_p) \in \mathcal{C}_0$  as a not necessarily generic fold bifurcation, i.e., it satisfies the following conditions: **i**) the first 2k - 1 derivatives with respect to the fast variable x are equal to zero, with  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , that is  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x}(x_p, y_p, 0) = \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial x^2}(x_p, y_p, 0) = \cdots = \frac{\partial^{2k-1}F}{\partial x^{2k-1}}(x_p, y_p, 0) = 0$ , **ii**)  $\frac{\partial^{2k}F}{\partial x^{2k}}(x_p, y_p, 0) \neq 0$ , **iii**)  $\frac{\partial F}{\partial x^{2k}}(x_p, y_p, 0) \neq 0$ , and **iv**)  $F(x_p, y_p, 0) = 0$ ,  $G(x_p, y_p, 0) \neq 0$  [34, 33]. The parameter k determines the contact order of the parabola–like shape in the critical manifold of (15) near the bifurcation point p, which for a generic fold point is k = 1. It is precisely the parameter k the one that enables the use of our control techniques in applications for which the associated critical manifold  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is better locally approximated by a higher order quadratic–like system (k > 1) around a not necessarily generic fold point  $p \in \mathcal{C}_0$ . For instance, in Figure 3 the critical manifold  $\mathcal{S}_0 \coloneqq \{(w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0.1w^5 + 0.25w^4 + 0.1w^2 = z\}$  (black) is better approximated at larger scales by  $\mathcal{S}_4 \coloneqq \{(w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0.25w^4 = z\}$  (blue), than by  $\mathcal{S}_2 \coloneqq \{(w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0.1w^2 = z\}$  (red), although the latter represents the first derivative different from zero in the expansion of (15) around the fold point located at the origin.

Remark 2. The importance of the previous fact in the decision-making model (1) is clear as the parameters vary and the critical manifold  $C_0$  presents more degenerate forms, specially when there are four fold points. This can be observed in the different examples shown in Appendix A. Therefore, depending on each particular case, the critical manifold may be better locally approximated by a higher order term than by the first derivative different from zero when expanding the fast-slow vector field around the fold point of interest, evidencing the relevance of the contact order parameter k for our results.

Hence, as long as conditions i-iv are fulfilled, the dynamics in a region of (15) sufficiently close to the fold point p are approximated by a system in the form

$$\dot{x} = a_c x^{2k} + b_c y + \tilde{F}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda)), \qquad (16.1)$$

$$\dot{y} = -\varepsilon \left( \sigma k a_c x^{2k-1} - \alpha(x, y; \lambda) + \tilde{G} \left( x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda) \right) \right), \tag{16.2}$$

with the parabola-like shape and its stability conditions determined by the non-zero constants  $a_c = \frac{1}{2k!} \frac{\partial^{2k} F}{\partial x^{2k}} (x_p, y_p, 0)$ , and  $b_c = \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} (x_p, y_p, 0)$ , obtained through the expansion of (15) around the fold point  $p \in C_0$ , and where we reuse the same variables for the coordinate system as in (15) for simplicity, with the parameter  $\sigma = \text{sign}(a_c b_c)$ . Additionally, the functions  $\tilde{F}$  and  $\tilde{G}$  collect any higher order terms, while the term  $\alpha(x, y; \lambda)$  sets the equilibrium point of the slow problem



Figure 3: Graphical comparison between two possible approximations to the critical manifold  $S_0 := \{(w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0.1w^5 + 0.25w^4 + 0.1w^2 = z\}$  (black) by the manifolds  $S_2 := \{(w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0.1w^2 = z\}$  (red) and  $S_4 := \{(w, z) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : 0.25w^4 = z\}$  (blue). As it can be seen, despite that in a small neighborhood of the fold the best approximation is given by  $S_2$ , as it is the first non-zero derivative, the manifold  $S_4$  is indeed a better approximation as the size of the desired canard orbit increases.

of (16). Furthermore, if we consider that for a neighborhood sufficiently close to the fold point p the higher order terms  $\tilde{F}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$  and  $\tilde{G}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$  in (16) are zero, then for  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $\alpha(x, y; \lambda) = 0$  orbits of (16) are given by level sets of

$$H(x, y, \varepsilon) = \frac{\sigma}{2} e^{2y/\sigma\varepsilon} \left( \frac{b_c y}{\varepsilon} + \frac{a_c x^{2k}}{\varepsilon} - \frac{\sigma b_c}{2} \right), \tag{17}$$

and it is known that canards cycles exists for  $H(x, y, \varepsilon) = h, h \in (-1/4, 1/4)$  [33, 28]. Thus, a region of the critical manifold of (15) sufficiently close to the fold point p can be approximated by a manifold as

$$S_0 = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : a_c x^{2k} + b_c y + \tilde{F}(x, y, 0, \alpha(x, y; \lambda)) = 0 \right\}.$$
 (18)

Now, let us introduce the fast-slow control entries into (16), as

$$\dot{x} = a_c x^{2k} + b_c y + \tilde{F}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda)) + u(x, y; \xi),$$
  

$$\dot{y} = -\varepsilon \left( \sigma k a_c x^{2k-1} - \alpha(x, y; \lambda) + \tilde{G}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda)) + v(x, y; \xi) \right),$$
(19)

where  $\xi$  collects all possible controller parameters. Moreover, observe that without control restrictions both  $u(x, y; \xi)$  and  $v(x, y; \xi)$  are able to compensate the higher order terms  $\tilde{F}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$  and  $\tilde{G}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$ , respectively, when enough knowledge on these higher order terms is at hand. Hence, assuming that the higher order terms are compensated by the control entries  $u(x, y; \xi)$  and  $v(x, y; \xi)$ , two possible alternatives arise in order to bring the slow dynamics of (19) to the necessary form depending on the  $\alpha(x, y; \lambda)$  term, that is, setting the equilibrium of the slow dynamics in the origin so that a canard point is obtained. First, if  $\alpha(x, y; \lambda) = \alpha$  is a constant value, then a coordinate transformation  $\hat{x} = x - \alpha$  is enough to set the equilibrium of the slow dynamics of (19) at the origin. On the other hand, if  $\alpha(x, y; \lambda)$ presents a different variable or parameter dependence, then the slow control  $v(x, y; \xi)$  is able to compensate its effect. Hence, the fast controller  $u(x, y; \xi)$  acts as the main control, while the slow input  $v(x, y; \xi)$  becomes a support control when the slow dynamics require it. Thus, after compensating the effect of the higher order terms  $\tilde{F}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$ , and  $\tilde{G}(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$ , as well as  $\alpha(x, y; \lambda)$ , the control problem reduces to

$$\dot{x} = a_c x^{2k} + b_c y + u(x, y; \xi),$$
  

$$\dot{y} = -\varepsilon \sigma k a_c x^{2k-1}.$$
(20)

Then, the critical manifold of (20) is  $C_0 := \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : y = -(a_c/b_c)x^{2k}\}$ , with stability conditions given by the sign of  $a_c$  and  $u(x, y; \xi)$  being a compatible controller. Moreover, notice that (20) defines a conservative system with the Hamiltonian (17).

Now, the aim of the control strategy is to stabilize one orbit of (20), namely  $\gamma_h = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H = h\}$ , related to the canard trajectory of interest. Hence, the control objective is to reduce the error existing between a level set of (17) and the desired trajectory  $\gamma_h$ , determined by the constant h. Therefore, we want to stabilize the error dynamics  $\tilde{H} \coloneqq H - h$  to zero. Specifically, we select  $h = -(1/4)\operatorname{sign}(b_c)e^{-c_c/\varepsilon}$ ,  $h \in (-1/4, 1/4)$ , with  $c_c \in (0, \infty)$ . Note that this selection of h is done in order to improve the precision by using exponential variations. Thus, it is clear that

$$\dot{\tilde{H}} = \frac{e^{2y/\sigma\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon^2} \left( \dot{y} \left( a_c x^{2k} + b_c y \right) + \varepsilon \sigma k a_c x^{2k-1} \dot{x} \right).$$
(21)

Then, by substituting (20) in (21) yields

$$\dot{\tilde{H}} = \frac{e^{2y/\sigma\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} \left(\sigma k a_c x^{2k-1} u\right).$$
(22)

Subsequently, an alternative to guarantee the local asymptotic stability of the desired level set  $\gamma_h$  is to define the error dynamics as  $\dot{\tilde{H}} = -A_c \tilde{H} = -A_c (H - h)$ , for some  $A_c > 0$ . Thus, the fast control entry is given by

$$u(x,y;\xi) = -\frac{\varepsilon B_c x}{\sigma k a_c} (H-h) e^{-2y/\sigma\varepsilon},$$
(23)

where we have desingularized the origin by setting  $A_c = B_c x^{2k}$ , positive for every  $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ , and  $B_c > 0$  is the controllers' gain.

To show stability, we define a candidate Lyapunov function as

$$L(x,y) = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{H}^2.$$
 (24)

Observe that (24) is positive for every  $\tilde{H} \neq 0$ , and that L = 0 if and only if  $\tilde{H} = 0$ , if and only if  $(x, y) \in \gamma_h$ , which we recall is the control target defined earlier. Then, it is easy to check that

$$\dot{L} = \tilde{H}\dot{\tilde{H}} = -B_c x^{2k} \tilde{H}^2.$$
<sup>(25)</sup>

Finally, to demonstrate the asymptotic stability of  $\gamma_h$  as (25) is only negative semidefinite, by LaSalle's invariance principle [36], trajectories of the fast-slow vector field (20) under the control action  $u(x, y; \xi)$  as (23) reach, in finite time, the largest invariant set contained in

$$\mathcal{I} = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \dot{L} = 0 \right\} = \left\{ x = 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ \tilde{H} = 0 \right\}.$$
 (26)

It is important to mention that, as long as  $y \neq 0$ , the vector field (20) does not vanish when it reaches (26), allowing the usage of the fast control (23) in the quadratic–like system (20). Notice, however, that x = 0 is generically not invariant for the closed–loop dynamics (20). Actually, setting x = 0 in (20) reduces to  $(\dot{x}, \dot{y}) = (b_c y, 0)$ , inducing an increment or decrement in the share of agents x depending of the values of  $b_c$ . Hence, trajectories of (20) eventually reach  $\mathcal{I} = \{(x, y) = (0, 0)\} \cup \{\tilde{H} = 0\}$ , and since the origin is an unstable equilibrium point of (20) with the controller as (23), we have that every trajectory with initial condition different from zero eventually reaches the set  $\{\tilde{H} = 0\}$  as  $t \to \infty$ . In Figure 4 we present an example of the effect that the fast control entry (23) has in system (20). The target level set  $\gamma_h$  and the resulting trajectory are shown in solid red and blue, respectively. As it can be appreciated, the fast control scheme makes the system to behave in the desired manner, causing the orbit to follow unstable branches of the critical manifold  $C_0$  for time of order  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . Hence, canard orbits originating from a fold point in system (20) are stable when implementing an adequate fast control law as (23). We summarize these results in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1** (Generalized quadratic system control). Let a general fast-slow quadratic-like system (15) be given locally as (16), with an associated critical manifold  $C_0$ , and let the Hamiltonian  $H(x, y, \varepsilon)$  be defined by (17). Then, if the higher order terms in the expansion (16) are sufficiently small, the compatible controller  $u(x, y; \xi) = -\frac{\varepsilon B_c x}{\sigma k a_c} (H - h) \exp(-2y/\sigma \varepsilon)$  renders the target orbit  $\gamma_h = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H = h\}$  locally asymptotically stable, stabilizing canard orbits in a vicinity of the origin of (16), with  $a_c = \frac{1}{2k!} \frac{\partial^{2k} F}{\partial x^{2k}} (x_p, y_p, 0)$ , and  $b_c = \frac{\partial F}{\partial y} (x_p, y_p, 0)$ , for  $h \in (-1/4, 1/4)$ ,  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $B_c > 0$ ,  $0 < \varepsilon \ll 1$ , and  $\sigma = \text{sign}(a_c b_c)$ . Moreover, under the appropriate translations  $x \mapsto x + x_p$ ,  $y \mapsto y + y_p$  this controller stabilizes an equivalent canard near  $(x_p, y_p)$  of (15).

The proof of Theorem 3.1 directly follows the previously presented analysis and, as long as the higher order terms  $F(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$  and  $G(x, y, \varepsilon, \alpha(x, y; \lambda))$  of (16) are sufficiently small, the control scheme synthesized in Theorem 3.1 produces canard cycles in a neighbourhood of the fold point  $p = (x_p, y_p) \in \mathcal{C}_0$  of (15). This fact shows the true strength of our control technique since, regardless of the complexity of system (15), as long as its critical manifold satisfies the previously stated conditions, it is possible to stabilize canard orbits in a neighborhood of the fold point p, even if (15) is not explicitly given in normal form. Finally, it is noteworthy to mention that as the amplitude of the target level set  $\gamma_h = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H = h\}$  increases, the approximation error between the associated critical manifold  $\mathcal{C}_0$  and the target level set  $\gamma_h$ will accordingly increase, producing an undesired response in (15) caused by the disparity of both trajectories due to the effect of the higher order terms. To improve the aforementioned behaviour, a possible alternative is the use of complementary control schemes acting sufficiently far away from the bifurcation such that when the trajectory travels in a vicinity that is correctly approximated by our expansion the system is under the effect of our control scheme, but once the expansion error increases beyond a tolerance threshold, an additional controller redirect the solution in order to follow the flow along the critical manifold  $C_0$ .

Next, we discuss on the effectiveness of the fast–slow control technique developed in this section for the control of canard orbits near a fold point in the presence of parametric uncertainties.



Figure 4: x - y plane (top), control output (center), and y-time series (bottom) for a trajectory of the generalized quadratic system (20) in solid blue, with the fast controller (23), for initial conditions (x(0), y(0)) = (-0.1, -0.3), and (x(0), y(0)) = (1.25, -0.3), inside (left) and outside (right) of the target level curve, respectively. For the x - y plane, the attracting and repelling branches of the critical manifold  $C_0$  are depicted in solid and dashed black, respectively, while the target level set  $\gamma_h$  is presented in solid red. Parameters:  $a_c = 2.0$ ,  $b_c = 3.0$ ,  $c_c = 7.0$ ,  $B_c = 10.0$ ,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , and k = 2. Notice on the right how the orbit is attracted to the desired level curve even when initialized near the repelling branch of the open-loop system.

### 3.2 Control of canards in the perturbed normal form

Consider the control problem (20) under the effect of parametric perturbations in the form

$$\dot{x} = (a_c + \delta_a) x^{2k} + (b_c + \delta_b) y + u(x, y; \xi),$$
  

$$\dot{y} = -\varepsilon \sigma k (a_c + \delta_a) x^{2k-1},$$
(27)

where  $\delta_a$  and  $\delta_b$  represent sufficiently small modelling uncertainties in (20), with the same parameter interpretation as before. Hence, orbits of (27) are given by level sets of

$$H_p(x, y, \varepsilon) = \frac{\sigma}{2} e^{2y/\sigma\varepsilon} \left( \frac{(b_c + \delta_b)}{\varepsilon} y + \frac{(a_c + \delta_a)}{\varepsilon} x^{2k} - \frac{\sigma (b_c + \delta_b)}{2} \right), \tag{28}$$

with the subscript p standing for *perturbation* in  $H_p(x, y, \varepsilon)$ . Therefore, our control objective is to stabilize canard orbits given by level sets of (28) in a vicinity of the fold point at the origin of (27), by implementing the compatible fast-slow controller (23), designed in the unperturbed normal form (20) and without explicit information regarding the perturbations  $\delta_a$  and  $\delta_b$ . We begin by defining the error  $\tilde{H}_p = H_p - h$ , with the associated perturbed error dynamics given by

$$\dot{\tilde{H}}_{p} = \frac{e^{2y/\sigma\varepsilon}}{\varepsilon} \sigma k \left(a_{c} + \delta_{a}\right) x^{2k-1} u, \qquad (29)$$

where we follow the same procedure as for the unperturbed case, aiming to stabilize the error dynamics  $\dot{\tilde{H}}_p$  to zero. By substituting the fast-slow controller (23) in (29) yields

$$\dot{\tilde{H}}_{p} = -\frac{a_{c} + \delta_{a}}{a_{c}} B_{c} x^{2k} (H - h),$$
(30)

with  $B_c > 0$  the controller gain, while  $H(x, y, \varepsilon)$  is (17). Moreover, since the perturbations  $\delta_a$  and  $\delta_b$  are assumed to be sufficiently small, we rewrite (30) as

$$\dot{\tilde{H}}_p = -\tilde{B}_c x^{2k} \left( \tilde{H}_p - H_\delta \right), \tag{31}$$

where  $\tilde{B}_c > 0$  is the new controller gain, and

$$H_{\delta}(x, y, \varepsilon) = \frac{\sigma}{2} e^{2y/\sigma\varepsilon} \left( \frac{\delta_b}{\varepsilon} y + \frac{\delta_a}{\varepsilon} x^{2k} - \frac{\sigma \delta_b}{2} \right), \tag{32}$$

since the unperturbed Hamiltonian (17) is equal to the difference between the perturbed Hamiltonian (28) and (32), i.e.  $H(x, y, \varepsilon) = H_p(x, y, \varepsilon) - H_\delta(x, y, \varepsilon)$ . Observe from (31) that the error dynamics  $\hat{H}_p = -\tilde{B}_c x^{2k} \tilde{H}_p + \tilde{B}_c x^{2k} H_\delta$  are bounded from above by  $-\tilde{B}_c x^{2k} \tilde{H}_p$ . Therefore, in order for the perturbed error to converge to zero in finite time, it is sufficient to show that (32) is negative, and restricted to the perturbed critical manifold  $y = -\sigma |(a_c + \delta_a)/(b_c + \delta_b)|x^{2k}$ , the aforementioned condition is satisfied as long as

$$\sigma \delta_a < \delta_b \left| \frac{a_c}{b_c} \right|,\tag{33}$$

for  $\delta_b > 0$ . In Figure 5, we show examples for the stabilization of canard cycles in the perturbed normal form (27) by implementing the fast-slow controller (23) obtained from the unperturbed normal form (20). Considering  $\delta_b$  positive, in the left and right columns we present the cases for which  $\delta_a$  is negative and positive, respectively, such that condition (33) is satisfied. In the upper row the phase portraits are depicted, where the critical manifold and response associated to the unperturbed problem (20) are represented in dotted black and blue, while the critical manifold and solution associated to the perturbed case (27) are shown in solid purple and green, correspondingly. Moreover, the target level set  $\gamma_h = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H = h\}$  is again presented in solid red, and observe that the stabilization of the canard trajectory is achieved for both cases. Notice that, under condition (33), the perturbations  $\delta_a$  and  $\delta_b$  cause a phase shift between the responses of (20) and (27), effect that can be appreciated in the comparison of the slow dynamics for both systems presented in the lower row of Figure 5. However, such difference does not modify the stabilization of the desired periodic pattern in the perturbed normal form (27).

In what follows, we employ the results summarized in Theorem 3.1 to stabilize canard cycles in a neighborhood of a fold point of the main model (1), even in the presence of modelling uncertainties when condition (33) is satisfied.

#### 3.3 Control of canards in the decision–making system

For simplicity, the dynamics of (1) are here reduced to the more homogeneous form with fewer parameters,

$$\dot{x} = \gamma(1-x) \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta(\alpha+\delta(x,y))}}\right) - x \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta(\alpha-\delta(x,y))}}\right),\tag{34.1}$$

$$\dot{y} = \varepsilon y(1 - rx),\tag{34.2}$$

where we set  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha$  as a common conditional exploration rate,  $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta$  being the shared inverse temperature,  $\gamma = \gamma_1/\gamma_2$  the ratio between the rates at which agents consider switching strategies,  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$  the common unconditional exploration rate,  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon/\gamma_2$  a timescale rescaling, and  $\delta(x, y)$  remains as in (2). In particular, the choice  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$  allows for the interesting dynamics of (1) to occur in the whole domain  $x \in [0, 1]$ . Nevertheless, we emphasize that every pattern observed for  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$  is also produced for any  $\eta_1, \eta_2 \in (0, 1)$ but in a reduced region of the domain of x. By performing an asymptotic analysis of system (1), we find the location of the left and right asymptotes of the associated critical manifold  $\mathcal{C}_0$ , being  $x_L = (\gamma_1 \eta_1)/(\gamma_1 \eta_1 + \gamma_2)$ , and  $x_R = \gamma_1/(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 \eta_2)$ , when  $y \to -\infty$  and  $y \to \infty$ , respectively. Hence, when  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 1$ , the dynamics of (1) occur along a vertical line centered at  $x = \gamma_1/(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$ , dramatically reducing the possible behaviours to be observed. In Figure 6 we show the effect of varying the unconditional exploration rates  $\eta_{1,2}$  when fixing the rest of the parameters in system (1). On the left panel, we consider  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$ , which represents a scenario where, once the agents have decided to switch from one strategy to another with rates  $\gamma_{1,2} > 0$ , they change in a completely interested manner with respect to the cost-benefit determined by (2). Oppositely, in the right panel we show the case when the agents modify their strategy following a more informed conviction, i.e.  $\eta_{1,2} \in (0,1)$ . Notice that, by increasing the unconditional exploration rates, the presence of abrupt changes in the share of agents following an exploitation policy is considerably reduced without the need of an external controller. However, although desirable, this scenario is rather unreliable as it completely depends on the agents' goodwill, motivating further the need of an outer controlling entity. Lastly, when every agent switch in an entirely informed way a complete balance between the two groups of agents exploiting each strategy is reached, allowing for the renewable resource only to increase, which would be the case when  $\eta_{1,2} = 1$ , and the share of agents exploiting the limited resource y would be constant with value  $x = \gamma_1/(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)$ .

To continue our analysis, we identify the associated critical manifold of the decision-making



Figure 5: Stabilization of canard cycles in the perturbed normal form (27) through the implementation of the fast-slow controller (23) obtained from the unperturbed normal form (20). Results for  $\delta_b = 0.5$ , with  $\delta_a = -0.5$  and  $\delta_a = 0.1$  are shown in the left and right columns, respectively. Note that for the aforementioned perturbations, condition (33) is satisfied. In the phase portraits depicted in the upper row, the critical manifold and response of the unperturbed normal form (20) are presented in dotted black and blue, while the the critical manifold and response of the perturbed normal form (27) are shown in solid purple and green, correspondingly. Additionally, the target level set  $\gamma_h = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H = h\}$  of the unperturbed Hamiltonian (17) is presented in solid red. Observe that, even though the fast-slow controller (23) is designed only with information of the unperturbed normal form (20), it is capable of stabilizing the desired canard cycle even for the perturbed case (27). Finally, a consequence of the perturbations  $\delta_a$ , and  $\delta_b$  in (27) is a phase-shift in the response with respect to the unperturbed case (20), effect that can be appreciated in the lower row for the variable y(t), however, such outcome only represents a speed modification and it does not alter the effective stabilization of the targeted canard cycle. Parameters:  $a = 2.0, b = 3.0, \delta_b = 0.5, c = 7.0, B = 50.0, h = -2.46492 \times 10^{-305}, k = 2, k = 2$  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , and  $\delta_a = -0.5$  (left), and  $\delta_a = 0.1$  (right).



Figure 6: Effect of the unconditional exploration values  $\eta_{1,2} = 0$  (left), and  $\eta_{1,2} \in (0,1)$  (right) on the decision-making model (1). Upper row: x - y planes, where stable and unstable regions of the critical manifold are depicted in solid and dashed black, respectively, while the asymptotes and response of (1) are shown in red and blue, correspondingly. Lower row: Variations on the slowly renewable resource y. Parameters:  $\alpha_1 = 0.9$ ,  $\alpha_2 = 2.5$ ,  $\beta_1 = 4.0$ ,  $\beta_2 = 2.0$ ,  $\gamma_1 = 3.0$ ,  $\gamma_2 = 2.0$ , b = 30, c = 1.5, d = 1.1,  $\varepsilon = 0.001$ , and r = 1.4, with  $\eta_1 = \eta_2 = 0$  (left), and  $\eta_1 = 0.1$ ,  $\eta_2 = 0.13$  (right).

system (34), given by

$$\mathcal{C}_0 = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : (1 - x) = \frac{x \left( 1 + e^{-\beta(\alpha + \delta(x, y))} \right)}{\gamma \left( 1 + e^{-\beta(\alpha - \delta(x, y))} \right)} \right\},\tag{35}$$

from which we observe numerically the behaviour of (35) under parameter changes and determine that it presents either zero, two or four non-normally hyperbolic points for different parameter combinations, rendering feasible the production of canard orbits in (34). Following this idea, in Figure 7 we identify the regions for which these patterns are observed by varying  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$  while keeping  $\beta$ , c, and d fixed in (34), generating an  $\alpha - \gamma$  bifurcation diagram in which regions such that (35) is completely normally hyperbolic are depicted in light blue, while areas producing non-normally hyperbolic critical manifolds with two and four fold points are shown in blue and dark blue, respectively. Similarly, we repeat this experiment for all possible parameter combinations and the different outcomes are presented in Appendix A, for readability purposes. Additionally, as the bifurcation points are of fold type, again numerically confirmed, it is possible to employ the control approach of Theorem 3.1.

Therefore, by introducing control inputs in system (34) yields

$$\dot{x} = \gamma(1-x) \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta(\alpha+\delta(x,y))}}\right) - x \left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-\beta(\alpha-\delta(x,y))}}\right) + u(x,y;\xi),$$
  
$$\dot{y} = \varepsilon \left(y(1-rx) + v(x,y;\xi)\right),$$
(36)

where  $u(x, y; \xi)$  and  $v(x, y; \xi)$  (with  $v(x, 0; \xi) = 0$ , see Remark 3 below) represent the fast and slow control components, respectively, while  $\xi$  collects the possible control parameters involved.

Remark 3. Let us justify the reason for selecting the slow control as mentioned above. Notice that the y-dynamics for the open-loop of (34) is in the form  $\dot{y} = \varepsilon y(1 - rx)$ . This is not, at first sight, compatible with the normal form (16). However, the reduction to the critical manifold yields slow reduced systems of the form

$$y' = g(y)$$
 and  $y' = y(g(y)),$  (37)

related to (16.2), and (34.2) respectively. These systems are  $C^{\infty}$ -equivalent for y > 0. To ensure this equivalence, we make sure that the parameters are chosen so that the point  $F_2$  (see Figure 1) is uniformly bounded away from  $\{y = 0\}$ .

Note that the selection of the controllers  $u(x, y; \xi)$  and  $v(x, y; \xi)$  in (36) is inspired from different physical applications [16, 26, 18, 29]. Particularly, for our decision-making model (36), the fast control  $u(x, y; \xi)$  represents a direct action modifying the rate at which agents change their strategy in order to adjust the stock of renewable resource y in a desired manner, for instance some regulation aimed to increase or decrease such concentration by limiting the number of agents that are allowed to exploit either resource, forcing some to rapidly switch to the other consumption strategy. By contrast, the slow control  $v(x, y; \xi)$  corresponds to actions directly favouring the recovery of the resource's stock, for instance, in the form of infrastructure expansions both for the storage and production of the resource, as such tasks usually require extended time intervals in order to be effectively introduced or executed.

Therefore, now we present the consequent purely fast and combined fast-slow controllers for system (36), following the results stated in Theorem 3.1. First, we consider the fast control scheme, i.e.  $v(x, y; \xi) = 0$ , and



Figure 7: (a)  $\alpha - \gamma$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\alpha \in [0.0, 3.0]$ ,  $\gamma \in [0.0, 6.0]$ , with  $\beta = 1.0$ , c = 3.0, d = 1.3,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , b = 30.0, and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(\alpha, \gamma) = (2.5, 4.25)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(\alpha, \gamma) = (0.5, 4.25)$  (green square), and (d)  $(\alpha, \gamma) = (1.25, 4.25)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.

$$u(x,y;\xi) = -\frac{\varepsilon B_c}{\sigma k a_c} \left(x - x^*\right) (H - h) e^{-2(y - y^*)/\sigma\varepsilon},\tag{38}$$

with

$$H(x, y, \varepsilon) = \frac{\sigma}{2} e^{2(y-y^*)/\sigma\varepsilon} \left( \frac{b_c}{\varepsilon} \left( y - y^* \right) + \frac{a_c}{\varepsilon} \left( x - x^* \right)^{2k} - \frac{\sigma b_c}{2} \right),$$
(39)

where, as explained at the beginning of this section,  $a_c$  and  $b_c$  are constant values obtained through the expansion of (36) near the fold point  $p = (x_p, y_p) \in C_0$  of interest and are responsible of setting the parabola–like shape as well as its stability properties, while  $\sigma = \operatorname{sign}(a_c b_c), k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $B_c > 0$  is the controller gain, and  $(x_p, y_p) = (x^*, y^*)$ , numerically obtained in our studies, are the coordinates of the fold point  $p \in C_0$  of interest in the original coordinated system of (36), required to displace the point  $p = (x_p, y_p)$  to the origin in the coordinated system of the normal form (16). Moreover, notice that since the slow dynamics are not actuated, we are going to stabilize canards centered at  $(x, y) = (1/r - x^*, 0)$ . Hence, it is convenient to define the coordinate transformation  $\hat{x} = x - (1/r - x^*)$ , which brings (38) and (39) to

$$u(x,y;\xi) = -a_c \left(x - x^*\right)^{2k} + a_c \left(x - 1/r\right)^{2k} - \frac{\varepsilon B_c}{\sigma k a_c} \left(x - 1/r\right) (H - h) e^{-2(y - y^*)/\sigma\varepsilon}, \qquad (40)$$

and

$$H(x, y, \varepsilon) = \frac{\sigma}{2} e^{2(y-y^*)/\sigma\varepsilon} \left(\frac{b_c}{\varepsilon} \left(y-y^*\right) + \frac{a_c}{\varepsilon} \left(x-1/r\right)^{2k} - \frac{\sigma b_c}{2}\right).$$
(41)

As a comparison to the resulting purely fast controller (40) and Hamiltonian (41), now we consider a fully actuated scenario and obtain a joint fast–slow controller for the decision–making system (34), in the form

$$u(x, y; \xi) = -\frac{\varepsilon B_c}{\sigma k a_c} (x - x^*) (H - h) e^{2(y - y^*)/\sigma\varepsilon},$$
  

$$v(x, y; \xi) = -(1 - rx^*),$$
(42)

with  $H(x, y, \varepsilon)$  as (39) and the same variable interpretations as before. Notice that in the joint fast-slow scenario (42), the slow component  $v(x, y; \xi)$  effectively sets the fold point  $p \in C_0$  of (36) at the origin in the coordinated system of the normal form (16), and therefore the additional translation  $\hat{x} = x - (1/r - x^*)$  necessary for the purely fast controller (40) is no longer needed.

In Figure 8, we compare the results obtained by implementing the fast control (38) (left), and the fast-slow scheme (42) (right) in system (34) for the stabilization of canards in a vicinity of the leftmost fold point  $F_1$  (see Figure 1). This particular scenario represents a situation in which the controlling entity aims to increase the slowly renewable resource y stock by limiting the share of agents consuming it. Observe that both controllers effectively cause trajectories traveling near a neighborhood of the fold point to follow the targeted level set, namely  $\gamma_h$ , in red, thus moving sufficiently close to unstable branches of the critical manifold and producing sustained canard orbits even when the initial conditions are set near the unstable branch of the critical manifold (35), showing the effectiveness of our control schemes. Particularly, notice the presence of a shift between the targeted orbit and the actual response in the purely fast controller due to the translation  $\hat{x} = x - (1/r - x^*)$ . Moreover, observe that in both cases the controllers are active only during the direction change in the limited resource stock y(t), demonstrating a remarkable energetic efficiency. Now, it is clear why stabilizing the consumption ratio in the fold point  $F_1$ is desirable, however, in order to precisely stabilize the point  $F_1$ , the controlling entity would need to accurately know the value of each parameter of the system, something that is rarely, if not never seen, in real-world applications. Hence, the controlling authority, for instance a

government, aims to robustly stabilize a neighboring trajectory that stays near the fold point  $F_1$ , hindering any abrupt transition possible even in the presence of parametric uncertainties. To achieve the aforementioned, we extend our analysis for the stabilization of canard cycles in the perturbed normal form (27), detailed in Section 3.2, and the results are depicted in Figure 9, where a canard cycle in a vicinity of the leftmost fold point  $F_1$  is stabilized even in the presence of modelling perturbations by implementing the fast-slow control (42) in (36). In particular, for this example we consider perturbations  $\delta_{\beta} = 0.05$  and  $\delta_{\gamma} = -0.001$ , related to parameters  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , respectively. In the phase portraits shown in the upper row, we represent the critical manifold and response for the unperturbed system (36) in dotted black and blue, while the critical manifold and response for the same system considering the perturbations  $\delta_{\beta}$  and  $\delta_{\gamma}$  are presented in solid purple and green, correspondingly. Additionally, the target level set  $\gamma = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H = h\}$  is presented in red, where  $H(x, y, \varepsilon)$  is the Hamiltonian (39) of the unperturbed model (36). Observe that the canard orbit is effectively stabilized for both the unperturbed and perturbed scenarios. Specifically, the parameters of the parabola-like shape obtained through the expansion of (36) around the leftmost fold point  $F_1$  for the unperturbed case are  $a_c = 1.6423$  and  $b_c = 0.100927$ , while for the perturbed scenario are  $a_c = 1.75871$  and  $b_c = 0.108357$ , with the fold point  $F_1$  of the perturbed case centered at  $(x^*, y^*) = (0.6025, 28.596378)$ , once again numerically identified. Therefore, the resultant perturbations, given by the parameter difference, are  $\delta_a = 0.116412$  and  $\delta_b = 0.00743007$ , satisfying condition (33). Additionally, in the lower row the same phase-shift observed for the perturbed normal form (27) is appreciated in the decision-making system (36) under perturbations. Nevertheless, the qualitative behaviour of (36) with and without perturbations are similar. Finally, observe that the origin of the target level set  $\gamma_h$  is centered at the leftmost fold point  $F_1$  of the unperturbed scenario as the controller is designed only with information of the unperturbed case, granting the controlling entity with the capability to stabilize orbits in a vicinity of the desired fold point even with a bounded level of parametric uncertainty.

In the following section, we explore further the capabilities of our fast-slow controllers (40) and (42) to stabilize canard cycles in a vicinity of the rightmost fold point  $F_2$  of the decision-making model (34) and discuss on its utility in our system.

### 3.4 Control of the optimal consumption strategy

Lastly, we extend the implementation of our control schemes in the decision-making model (34) to the stabilization of a canard trajectory in the vicinity of the rightmost fold bifurcation point, namely  $F_2$  (see Figure 1). The selection of  $F_2$  is related to an optimal exploitation strategy as this point represents the limit at which the largest group of agents benefit from consuming the slowly renewable resource y, while also being the point at which the minimum stock of resource yis reserved, advantageous from an economic perspective since it considerably reduces the storage costs for the controlling entity. On top of that, the controlling authority is entitled once more with the capability to produce abrupt transitions by exploiting the system's criticality, for instance in a scenario in which now a greater concentration of resource in needed. As an example of the implementation of our fast-slow controllers, in Figure 10 the effective stabilization of canard cycles in a vicinity of the rightmost fold point  $F_2$  is shown along with the resulting resource, agents and control responses when using the fast-slow control scheme (42). Observe that the variation of agents consuming the renewable resource is rather small, while the element y also presents periodic oscillations with small amplitude. In addition, notice that the controller only activates periodically and remains bounded between two considerably small values, which translates in minor actions done by the controlling entity in order to stay around the desired trajectory and



Figure 8: Comparison between the implementation of the purely fast (38) (left) and the combined fast–slow (42) (right) control schemes in system (34). The phase portraits are shown in the upper row, where the stable and unstable regions of the critical manifold (35) are depicted in solid and dashed black, respectively, while the target level set  $\gamma_h$  and the resulting trajectory are shown in red and blue, correspondingly. Similarly, the limited resource stock y(t), and the fast controller outputs are presented in the middle and lower row. For the fast–slow scheme, the slow controllers signal is a constant value  $v(x, y; \xi) = -(1 - rx^*)$ , depicted in red. Parameters:  $\alpha = 2.0$ ,  $\beta = 0.75$ ,  $\gamma = 0.5$ , c = 2.5, d = 1.18, b = 30.0, r = 1.65,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ ,  $a_c = 1.64218$ ,  $b_c = 0.100924$ ,  $c_c = 3.0$ , k = 1, t = 1000, (x(0), y(0)) = (0.8, 28.0),  $(x^*, y^*) = (0.6152, 28.665)$  and the gain  $B_c = 1500.0$  (left),  $B_c = 1000.0$  (right). Observe that trajectories tend to follow the desired level set through the implementation of both fast–slow controllers (38) and (42) even when the initial conditions are set closer to the unstable branch of the critical manifold (35).



Figure 9: Stabilization of canard cycles in the decision-making system (36) by implementing the compatible fast-slow control (42), with and without considering parametric uncertainties. In the upper row, the critical manifold and response associated to the upperturbed scenario are depicted in dotted black and blue, while the critical manifold and response for the perturbed case are shown in solid purple and green, respectively. Additionally, the target level set  $\gamma_h = \{(x,y) \in \mathbb{R}^2 : H = h\}$  is presented in red, where  $H(x,y,\varepsilon)$  is (39). The parameters of the parabola–like shape obtained through the expansion of (36) around the leftmost fold point  $F_1$ for the unperturbed case are  $a_c = 1.6423$  and  $b_c = 0.100927$ , while for the perturbed scenario are  $a_p = 1.75871$  and  $b_p = 0.108357$ , with the fold point  $F_1$  of the perturbed case centered at  $(x^*, y^*) = (0.6025, 28.596378)$ , numerically identified once again. Hence, the total perturbations are  $\delta_a = a_p - a_c = 0.116412$  and  $\delta_b = b_p - b_c = 0.00743007$ , which satisfy condition (33), determined for the stabilization of canard orbits in the perturbed normal form in Section 3.2. Naturally, the canard orbit stabilized in the perturbed scenario is centered at the fold point  $F_1$  of the unperturbed case since the compatible fast-slow control (42) has only access to information of the unperturbed scenario. Nevertheless, such control, derived in the unperturbed normal form, grants the controlling entity with the capability of stabilizing canard orbits in a vicinity of the target level set even in the presence of bounded modelling uncertainties. Finally, in the lower row a comparison for the time series of the share of agents x(t) and renewable resource stock y(t) in the unperturbed and perturbed scenarios are depicted in dotted blue and solid green, respectively. Despite the presence of a phase-shift, the qualitative behaviour of both responses is similar.

optimally consume the renewable resource y. Finally, in Figure 11 we show a scenario in which the controlling authority effectively regulates at will the dynamical behaviour of (34) by activating our fast-slow control scheme (42). On the upper row of Figure 11, we show the stabilization of an orbit near the leftmost fold  $F_1$ , which corresponds to the scenario when the share of agents following each consumption strategy is mostly balanced, leading to the largest amount of renewable resource y in stock, without considering the right asymptote. From an authority perspective, stabilizing a canard cycle in a vicinity of  $F_1$  represents an advantageous position in order to increase the amount of limited resource, to then allow its consumption by a larger share of agents after a specific desired time, corresponding to the free dynamics of (34). On the other hand, in the middle row of Figure 11 we present the effect of activating our controller after a given time for the stabilization of a canard cycle in a vicinity of the fold point  $F_2$ , which corresponds to the aforementioned optimal consumption strategy. Similarly, in the lower row of Figure 11 we show a sequential activation of our fast-slow controllers in order to generate a pattern that oscillates in a vicinity of the leftmost fold  $F_1$ , then deactivate the controller and let the system travel freely near the critical manifold, to later activate the controller once more when the response is in a vicinity of the rightmost fold  $F_2$  to stabilize the canard orbit around a neighboring target level set, deactivate again the controller and finally activate it again in a vicinity of the leftmost fold point  $F_1$ , showing the capability of the controlling entity to exploit the systems' criticality to reach the desired state by sequentially activating and deactivating the controller (42). Notice that the sharp transition in the stock of renewable resource y, occurring while changing the target orbit from  $F_2$  to  $F_1$ , is due to the own flow of the open-loop problem (34). Finally, observe that the oscillation frequency for the canard orbits stabilized near the fold point  $F_1$  is comparably larger with respect to the one of the canard orbits stabilized in a neighborhood of the fold point  $F_2$ . This fact is due to the form of the critical manifold  $C_0$ , as the resulting trajectory mainly travels along the slow direction near the fold point  $F_2$ , while in the case for a canard cycle close the fold  $F_1$  the systems' response constantly alternates between the fast and slow directions.

## 4 Discussion and conclusions

Decision-making represents a fundamental component in several real world phenomena as it describes a common problem in which agents need to find the maximum benefit according to different external and internal factors. In this work, we have studied a fast-slow dynamical system describing the decision-making process that two groups of clearly identified agents undergo when selecting between two harvesting strategies, one representing the exploit of an unlimited but highly costly common source, and the other describing the consumption of a comparably cheaper but limited and slowly renewable resource. With this in mind and by an extensive numerical study, we determine parameter combinations such that the associated critical manifold of the fast-slow dynamical system analyzed presents either zero, two or four fold points, allowing for the generation of canard cycles due to the system's properties. Such special trajectories are well-known for following unstable regions of the slow-flow for considerable amounts of time, convenient in our context for the controlling entity to exploit the systems' criticality in order to manipulate the renewable resource dynamics according to a desired outcome and enabling the possibility to produce abrupt strategic transitions in the consumption schemes that the agents follow. Therefore, we have been able to stabilize canard orbits in our system by implementing fast-slow controllers developed through the analysis of a canonical form of a not necessarily generic fold point, and shown the effectiveness of our approach for two particular scenarios when considering a parameter combination with two fold points. The first one being a situation in



Figure 10: Stabilization of canard trajectories around the optimal consumption fold point  $F_2$ . **a)** x - y plane, with the stable and unstable branches of the critical manifold (35) in solid and dashed black, respectively, while the target level set  $\gamma_h$  and the resulting trajectory are shown in red and blue, correspondingly. **b)** Variations in the slowly renewable resource's stock y(t), **c)** agents consuming the limited resource, and **d)** fast-slow controller response for the stabilization of the rightmost fold  $F_2$ .



Figure 11: Demonstration of the activation of the fast-slow control (42) on the decision-making model (34) for the stabilization of a canard orbit in a vicinity of the  $F_1$  (upper),  $F_2$  (middle), and sequentially both fold points (lower). Left column: x - y planes, where stable and unstable regions of the critical manifold are depicted in solid and dashed black, respectively, while the target level sets  $\gamma_h$  and response of (34) are shown in red and blue, correspondingly. Right column: Variations on the slowly renewable resource y. Parameters:  $\alpha = 2.0$ ,  $\beta = 0.75$ ,  $\gamma = 0.5$ , b = 30, c = 2.5, d = 1.18,  $\varepsilon = 0.001$ . For the stabilization of the leftmost fold  $F_1$  (upper): r = 1.62, with (x(0), y(0)) = (0.8, 28.5),  $(x^*, y^*) = (0.6152, 28.665)$ , and control activation time  $t_{on} = 2300$ . For the stabilization of the rightmost fold  $F_2$  (middle): r = 1.08, with (x(0), y(0)) = (0.2, 26.0),  $(x^*, y^*) = (0.977, 25.5928)$ , and control activation time  $t_{on} = 5300$ . For the stabilization of both folds  $F_{1,2}$  (lower): Same parameters as for each individual case and control switch times  $t_{off_{F_1}} = 2300$ ,  $t_{on_{F_2}} = 2570$ ,  $t_{off_{F_2}} = 8590$ ,  $t_{on_{F_1}} = 9000$ .

which the controlling authority needs to guarantee a high concentration of renewable resource for a specific period, task achieved by implementing policies that restrict the number of agents consuming such source and enabling the controlling entity to cause an abrupt transition to a scenario in which most of the population consume the limited resource with a minor control effort. On the other hand, the second implementation describes a circumstance in which, lead by the controlling entity, the population follows an optimal consumption strategy that allows the vast majority of the entire community to consume the renewable resource while reserving a local minimum of it, which represents an economic saving considering the stock's storage. Moreover, we demonstrate that our fast–slow controllers present a certain degree of robustness to parametric perturbations, which grants the controlling entity with the capability to stabilize canard orbits even in the presence of modelling uncertainties.

However, we want to emphasize that our results are able to stabilize canard orbits in any fast-slow system that presents planar folded canard orbits, regardless on the degeneracy degree such bifurcation points may present, allowing for a wide variety of real-world processes to benefit from our controllers. For instance, consider competition, which represents a key element in the study of diverse phenomena, ranging from biological systems [5, 12, 1], epidemics [54, 7, 57], ecology [25, 44, 58, 11], economics [20, 4, 56], and social models [45, 8], describing the interaction between populations of a broad nature, behaviour that considerably resembles the decision-making process that we have studied.

Finally, although the controllers designed here effectively stabilize the target orbits, even for non-generic fold points, they rely on the fact that the higher order terms in the approximation of the critical manifold in a neighborhood of the fold point of interest are sufficiently small, that is, the error existing between the approximating parabola–like curve and the actual shape of the critical manifold is locally small. As such terms increase, the difference between the approximated curve and the critical manifold will tend to increase, causing an incorrect response. Thus, we propose one possible solution by developing switching control strategies in such a manner that, when the trajectory is travelling near the region that is correctly approximated by our expansion the system operates under our control schemes, but once the approximation error increases beyond a threshold an additional control scheme redirect the solution in order to follow the critical manifold. Nevertheless, this alternative presents certain difficulties beyond the scope of our work and is left as a future work idea for now.

## A Bifurcation diagrams

## References

- P. A. Abrams. Competition Theory in Ecology. Oxford University Press, 2022. DOI: 10. 1093/oso/9780192895523.001.0001.
- [2] Y. Achbany et al. "Tuning continual exploration in reinforcement learning: An optimality property of the Boltzmann strategy". In: *Neurocomputing* 71.13 (2008). Artificial Neural Networks (ICANN 2006) / Engineering of Intelligent Systems (ICEIS 2006), pp. 2507–2520. ISSN: 0925-2312. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2007.11.040.
- [3] S. Arora, E. Hazan, and S. Kale. "The Multiplicative Weights Update Method: A Meta-Algorithm and Applications". In: *Theory of Computing* 8 (2012), pp. 121–164. DOI: 10.4086/toc.2012.v008a006.



Figure 12: (a)  $\alpha - \beta$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\alpha \in [0.0, 3.0]$ ,  $\beta \in [0.0, 3.0]$ , with  $\gamma = 3.5$ , c = 2.8, d = 1.3,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , b = 30.0, and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(\alpha, \beta) = (1.5, 0.5)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(\alpha, \beta) = (1.5, 1.0)$  (green square), and (d)  $(\alpha, \beta) = (1.5, 1.5)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 13: (a)  $\alpha - c$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\alpha \in [0.0, 3.0]$ ,  $c \in [0.0, 5.0]$ , with  $\beta = 1.0$ ,  $\gamma = 3.5$ , d = 1.3,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , b = 30.0, and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b) ( $\alpha, c$ ) = (2.0, 2.0) (black triangle), (c) ( $\alpha, c$ ) = (2.0, 3.0) (green square), and (d) ( $\alpha, c$ ) = (2.0, 4.0) (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 14: (a)  $\alpha - d$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\alpha \in [0.0, 3.0]$ ,  $d \in [1.0, 2.0]$ , with  $\beta = 1.0, \gamma = 3.5, c = 4.0, \varepsilon = 0.01, b = 30.0$ , and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Finally, the white region represents parameter combinations for which the resource stock y(t) is negative, thus lacking physical interpretation for our research. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(\alpha, d) = (1.5, 1.5)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(\alpha, d) = (1.5, 1.2)$  (green square), and (d)  $(\alpha, d) = (1.5, 1.3)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 15: (a)  $\beta - d$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\beta \in [0.0, 3.0]$ ,  $d \in [1.0, 2.0]$ , with  $\alpha = 2.0, \gamma = 3.5, c = 3.0, \varepsilon = 0.01, b = 30.0$ , and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Finally, the white region represents parameter combinations for which the resource stock y(t) is negative, thus lacking physical interpretation for our research. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(\beta, d) = (2.5, 1.8)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(\beta, d) = (2.5, 1.55)$  (green square), and (d)  $(\beta, d) = (2.5, 1.4)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 16: (a)  $\gamma - \beta$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\gamma \in [0.0, 8.0]$ ,  $\beta \in [0.0, 3.0]$ , with  $\alpha = 2.0, c = 3.0, d = 1.3, \varepsilon = 0.01, b = 30.0$ , and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(\gamma, \beta) = (3.0, 0.5)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(\gamma, \beta) = (3.0, 1.0)$  (green square), and (d)  $(\gamma, \beta) = (3.0, 2.0)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 17: (a)  $\gamma - c$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\gamma \in [0.0, 8.0]$ ,  $c \in [0.0, 5.0]$ , with  $\alpha = 2.0$ ,  $\beta = 1.0$ , d = 1.3,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , b = 30.0, and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(\gamma, c) = (6.0, 1.0)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(\gamma, c) = (6.0, 3.0)$  (green square), and (d)  $(\gamma, c) = (6.0, 4.0)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 18: (a)  $\gamma - d$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $\gamma \in [0.0, 8.0]$ ,  $d \in [1.0, 2.0]$ , with  $\alpha = 2.0$ ,  $\beta = 1.0$ , c = 3.0,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , b = 30.0, and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Finally, the white region represents parameter combinations for which the resource stock y(t) is negative, thus lacking physical interpretation for our research. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(\gamma, d) = (7.0, 1.6)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(\gamma, d) = (7.0, 1.3)$  (green square), and (d)  $(\gamma, d) = (7.0, 1.2)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 19: (a)  $c - \beta$  bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $c \in [0.0, 3.0]$ ,  $\beta \in [0.0, 3.0]$ , with  $\alpha = 2.0$ ,  $\gamma = 3.5$ , d = 1.3,  $\varepsilon = 0.01$ , b = 30.0, and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b)  $(c, \beta) = (2.0, 1.0)$  (black triangle), (c)  $(c, \beta) = (2.0, 1.5)$  (green square), and (d)  $(c, \beta) = (2.0, 2.0)$  (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.



Figure 20: (a) c - d bifurcation diagram of (34) for  $c \in [0.0, 3.0]$ ,  $d \in [1.0, 2.0]$ , with  $\alpha = 2.0, \beta = 1.0, \gamma = 3.5, \varepsilon = 0.01, b = 30.0$ , and r = 1.6156. The light blue section describes completely normally hyperbolic scenarios, while the blue and dark blue regions present combinations exhibiting two and four non-normally hyperbolic points, respectively. Finally, the white region represents parameter combinations for which the resource stock y(t) is negative, thus lacking physical interpretation for our research. Examples of the associated critical manifold for (b) (c, d) = (2.5, 1.4) (black triangle), (c) (c, d) = (2.5, 1.23) (green square), and (d) (c, d) = (2.5, 1.16) (yellow circle). The solid and dashed black lines represent attracting and repelling regions of the critical manifold (35), correspondingly.

- [4] Y. M. Asano et al. "Emergent inequality and business cycles in a simple behavioral macroeconomic model". In: Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 118.27 (2021), e2025721118. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.2025721118.
- N. Bacaër. "Lotka, Volterra and the predator-prey system (1920–1926)". In: A Short History of Mathematical Population Dynamics. London, UK: Springer London, 2011, pp. 71–76. DOI: 10.1007/978-0-85729-115-8\_13.
- [6] G. Balazsi, A. van Oudenaarden, and J. J. Collins. "Cellular decision making and biological noise: from microbes to mammals". In: *Cell* 144 (6 2011), pp. 910–25. DOI: 10.1016/j. cell.2011.01.030.
- S. Biswas et al. "Optimal harvesting and complex dynamics in a delayed eco-epidemiological model with weak Allee effects". In: *Nonlinear Dynamics* 87.3 (2017), pp. 1553–1573. DOI: 10.1007/s11071-016-3133-2.
- [8] A. Bravetti and P. Padilla. "An optimal strategy to solve the Prisoner's Dilemma". In: Scientific Reports 8.1 (2018), p. 1948. DOI: 10.1038/s41598-018-20426-w.
- [9] M. Broens and K. Bar-Eli. "Canard explosion and excitation in a model of the Belousov-Zhabotinskii reaction". In: *The Journal of Physical Chemistry* 95.22 (1991), pp. 8706-8713. DOI: 10.1021/j100175a053.
- [10] N. Cesa-Bianchi et al. "Boltzmann exploration done right". In: Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems. NIPS'17. Red Hook, NY, USA: Curran Associates Inc., 2017, 6287–6296.
- X. Chen, W. Jiang, and S. Ruan. "Global dynamics and complex patterns in Lotka–Volterra systems: The effects of both local and nonlocal intraspecific and interspecific competitions". In: Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications 499.1 (2021), p. 125015. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmaa.2021.125015.
- [12] J. M. Craine and R. Dybzinski. "Mechanisms of plant competition for nutrients, water and light". In: Functional Ecology 27.4 (2013), pp. 833–840. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/ 1365-2435.12081.
- [13] B. Deng. "Food chain chaos with canard explosion". In: Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 14.4 (Nov. 2004), pp. 1083–1092. DOI: 10.1063/1.1814191.
- [14] M. Desroches et al. "Canards, Folded Nodes, and Mixed-Mode Oscillations in Piecewise-Linear Slow-Fast Systems". In: SIAM Review 58.4 (2016), pp. 653–691.
- F. Dumortier. "Local Study of Planar Vector Fields: Singularities and Their Unfoldings". In: Structures in Dynamics. Ed. by H. W. Broer et al. Vol. 2. Studies in Mathematical Physics. North-Holland, 1991, pp. 161-241. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-444-89257-7.50011-5.
- [16] J. Durham and J. Moehlis. "Feedback control of canards". In: Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science 18.1 (2008), p. 015110.
- [17] B. Ermentrout and M. Wechselberger. "Canards, Clusters, and Synchronization in a Weakly Coupled Interneuron Model". In: SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems 8.1 (2009), pp. 253–278. DOI: 10.1137/080724010.
- [18] G. B. Ermentrout and D. H. Terman. Mathematical foundations of neuroscience. Vol. 35. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [19] N. Fenichel. "Geometric singular perturbation theory for ordinary differential equations". In: Journal of Differential Equations 31.1 (1979), pp. 53–98. ISSN: 0022-0396. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-0396(79)90152-9.

- [20] P. Gatabazi et al. "Grey Lotka—Volterra models with application to cryptocurrencies adoption". In: Chaos, Solitons & Fractals 122 (2019), pp. 47–57. DOI: https://doi.org/ 10.1016/j.chaos.2019.03.006.
- [21] J. Grasman. "Relaxation Oscillations". In: Mathematics of Complexity and Dynamical Systems. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2011, pp. 1475–1488. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4614-1806-1\_93.
- [22] L. Hamburger. "Note on Economic Cycles and Relaxation Oscillations". In: *Econometrica* 2.1 (1934), p. 112. DOI: 10.2307/1907954.
- T. Helikar et al. "Emergent decision-making in biological signal transduction networks". In: Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 105.6 (2008), pp. 1913–1918. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.0705088105.
- [24] S. A. Herbert. Models of Bounded Rationality: Empirically Grounded Economic Reason. The MIT Press, July 1997. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/4711.001.0001.
- [25] C. Innes, M. Anand, and C. T. Bauch. "The impact of human-environment interactions on the stability of forest-grassland mosaic ecosystems". In: *Scientific Reports* 3 (2013), p. 2689. DOI: 10.1038/srep02689.
- [26] E. M. Izhikevich. Dynamical Systems in Neuroscience: The Geometry of Excitability and Bursting. The MIT Press, 2006.
- [27] H. Jardón-Kojakhmetov and C. Kuehn. A survey on the blow-up method for fast-slow systems. 2021.
- [28] H. Jardón-Kojakhmetov and C. Kuehn. "Controlling Canard Cycles". In: Journal of Dynamical and Control Systems 28 (2022), 517—544.
- [29] H. Jardón-Kojakhmetov, J. M. A. Scherpen, and D. del Puerto-Flores. "Stabilization of a class of slow-fast control systems at non-hyperbolic points". In: *Automatica* 99 (2019), pp. 13-21. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.automatica.2018.10.008.
- [30] A. Kelly. Decision Making Using Game Theory: An Introduction for Managers. Cambridge, University Press, 2003. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511609992.
- [31] A. Kianercy and A. Galstyan. "Dynamics of Boltzmann Q learning in two-player two-action games". In: Phys. Rev. E 85 (4 2012), p. 041145. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.85.041145.
- [32] E. Köskal-Ersöz and F. Wendling. "Canard solutions in neural mass models: consequences on critical regimes". In: *The Journal of Mathematical Neuroscience* 11.1 (2021), p. 11. DOI: 10.1186/s13408-021-00109-z.
- [33] M. Krupa and P. Szmolyan. "Extending geometric singular perturbation theory to nonhyperbolic points – Fold and canard points in two dimensions". In: SIAM Journal on mathematical analysis 33 (2001), pp. 286–314.
- [34] C. Kuehn. *Multiple Time Scale Dynamics*. Springer, 2015.
- [35] P. Kunkel and V. Mehrmann. "Differential-algebraic equations: analysis and numerical solution". In: *European Mathematical Society* 2 (2006).
- [36] J. LaSalle. "Some extensions of Liapunov's second method". In: IRE Transactions on circuit theory 7 (1960), pp. 520–527.
- [37] J. Lorkowski and V. Kreinovich. Bounded Rationality in Decision Making Under Uncertainty: Towards Optimal Granularity. Springer Cham, July 2017. DOI: https:// doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-62214-9.

- [38] S. K. Lynn et al. "Decision making from economic and signal detection perspectives: development of an integrated framework". In: *Front. Psychol.* 6 (2008), p. 952. DOI: doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00952.
- [39] A. P. Marugán and F. P. G. Márquez. "Decision Making Approach for Optimal Business Investments". In: Advanced Business Analytics. Ed. by F. P. G. Márquez and B. Lev. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2015, pp. 1–20. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-11415-6\_1.
- [40] A. Milik and P. Szmolyan. "Multiple Time Scales and Canards in a Chemical Oscillator". In: *Multiple-Time-Scale Dynamical Systems*. Ed. by C. K. R. T. Jones and A. I. Khibnik. New York, NY: Springer New York, 2001, pp. 117–140.
- [41] S. Mishra. "Decision-Making Under Risk: Integrating Perspectives From Biology, Economics, and Psychology". In: *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 18.3 (2014), pp. 280–307. DOI: 10.1177/1088868314530517.
- [42] J. Moehlis. "Canards in a Surface Oxidation Reaction". In: Journal of Nonlinear Science 12.4 (2002), pp. 319–345. DOI: 10.1007/s00332-002-0467-3.
- [43] F. P. G. Márquez. Advances in Decision Making. Rijeka: IntechOpen, 2022. ISBN: 978-1-83969-497-4. DOI: 10.5772/intechopen.95217.
- [44] J. Nitzbon, J. Heitzig, and U. Parlitz. "Sustainability, collapse and oscillations in a simple World–Earth model". In: *Environ. Res. Lett.* 12 (2017), p. 074020. DOI: 10.1088/1748– 9326/aa7581.
- [45] G. Owen. *Game Theory*. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, 2013.
- [46] M. Peterson. An Introduction to Decision Theory. Cambridge, University Press, 2009. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511800917.
- [47] O. Rossler and K. Wegmann. "Chaos in the Zhabotinskii reaction". In: Nature 271 (1978), pp. 89–90.
- [48] J. Shen. "Canard limit cycles and global dynamics in a singularly perturbed predator-prey system with non-monotonic functional response". In: Nonlinear Analysis: Real World Applications 31 (2016), pp. 146-165. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nonrwa.2016. 01.013.
- [49] R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. The MIT Press, 2018.
- [50] P. Szmolyan and M. Wechselberger. "Canards in R3". In: Journal of Differential Equations 177.2 (2001), pp. 419–453. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1006/jdeq.2001.4001.
- [51] F. Takens. "Constrained equations; a study of implicit differential equations and their discontinuous solutions". In: *Structural Stability, the Theory of Catastrophes, and Applications in the Sciences.* Ed. by Peter Hilton. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1976, pp. 143–234. ISBN: 978-3-540-38254-6.
- [52] H. R. Varian. "Catastrophe theory and the business cycle". In: *Economic Inquiry* 17.1 (1979), pp. 14–28. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.1979.tb00293.x.
- [53] G. L. Vasconcelos. "First-Order Phase Transition in a Model for Earthquakes". In: Phys. Rev. Lett. 76 (25 1996), pp. 4865-4868. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.76.4865.
- [54] E. Venturino. "The influence of diseases on Lotka-Volterra Systems". In: The Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics 24.1 (1994), pp. 381–402.

- [55] S. Wang et al. "Boltzmann Exploration for Deterministic Policy Optimization". In: Neural Information Processing. Ed. by H. Yang et al. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 214–222.
- [56] C. Z. Yao, Y. N. Mo, and Z. K. Zhang. "A study on interplatform competition based on a Lotka-Volterra competition model focusing on network externality". In: *Electronic Commerce Research and Applications* 56 (2022), p. 101201. DOI: https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.elerap.2022.101201.
- [57] M. Ye et al. "Applications of the Poincaré–Hopf Theorem: Epidemic Models and Lotka—Volterra Systems". In: *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 67.4 (2022), pp. 1609–1624. DOI: 10.1109/TAC.2021.3064519.
- [58] P. Zeppini and J. C. J. M. van den Bergh. "Global competition dynamics of fossil fuels and renewable energy under climate policies and peak oil: A behavioural model". In: *Energy Policy* 136 (2020), p. 110907. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2019.110907.
- [59] L. Zhao and J. Shen. "Relaxation oscillations in a slow-fast predator-prey model with weak Allee effect and Holling-IV functional response". In: *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation* 112 (2022), p. 106517. DOI: https://doi.org/10. 1016/j.cnsns.2022.106517.
- [60] M. J. Álvarez, A. Ferragut, and X. Jarque. "A survey in the blow up technique". In: International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos 21 (11 2011), pp. 3103–3118. DOI: 10. 1142/S0218127411030416.