

# On families of constrictions in model of overdamped Josephson junction and Painlevé 3 equation

Y.Bibilo<sup>\*†</sup>; A.A.Glutsyuk<sup>‡§¶</sup>

January 2, 2021

## Abstract

The tunneling effect predicted by B. Josephson (Nobel Prize, 1973) concerns the Josephson junction: two superconductors separated by a narrow dielectric. It states existence of a supercurrent through it and equations governing it. The *overdamped Josephson junction* is modeled by a family of differential equations on 2-torus depending on 3 parameters:  $B$  (abscissa),  $A$  (ordinate),  $\omega$  (frequency). We study its *rotation number*  $\rho(B, A; \omega)$  as a function of  $(B, A)$  with fixed  $\omega$ . The *phase-lock areas* are the level sets  $L_r := \{\rho = r\}$  with non-empty interiors; they exist for  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  (Buchstaber, Karpov, Tertychnyi). Each  $L_r$  is an infinite chain of domains going vertically to infinity and separated by points called *constrictions* (except for those with  $A = 0$ ). We show that: 1) *all the constrictions in  $L_r$  lie in its axis  $\{B = \omega r\}$*  (confirming a conjecture of Tertychnyi, Kleptsyn, Filimonov, Schurov); 2) *each constriction is positive*: some its punctured neighborhood in the vertical line lies in  $\text{Int}(L_r)$  (confirming another conjecture). We first prove deformability of each constriction to another one, with arbitrarily small  $\omega$ , of the same  $\rho$ ,  $\ell := \frac{B}{\omega}$  and type (positive or not), using equivalent description of model by linear systems of differential equations on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  (Buchstaber, Karpov, Tertychnyi) and studying their isomonodromic deformations described by Painlevé 3 equations<sup>1</sup>. Then non-existence of *ghost* constrictions (i.e., constrictions either with  $\rho \neq \ell$ , or of non-positive type) with a given  $\ell$  for small  $\omega$  is proved by slow-fast methods.

---

<sup>\*</sup>University of Toronto, Mississauga, Canada

<sup>†</sup>Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Moscow, Russia

<sup>‡</sup>CNRS, France (UMR 5669 (UMPA, ENS de Lyon) and UMI 2615 (ISC J.-V.Poncelet)). Email: aglutsyu@ens-lyon.fr

<sup>§</sup>HSE University, Moscow, Russia

<sup>¶</sup>Supported by RSF grant 18-41-05003.

<sup>1</sup>Analytic deformability of each constriction to constrictions of the same type,  $\rho$ ,  $\ell$  and arbitrarily small  $\omega$  is a joint result of the authors. Non-existence of ghost constrictions with a given  $\ell$  for every  $\omega$  small enough is a result of the second author (A.A.Glutsyuk).

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Model of Josephson junction: a brief survey and main results	3
1.2	Method of proof of Theorems 1.4, 1.7. Plan of the paper . . .	9
1.3	Historical remarks . . . . .	13
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries: irregular singularities, normal forms, Stokes matrices and monodromy–Stokes data of linear systems</b>	<b>15</b>
2.1	Normal forms, canonical solutions and Stokes matrices . . . .	15
2.2	Systems with two irregular singularities. Monodromy–Stokes data . . . . .	19
<b>3</b>	<b>Isomonodromic deformations and Painlevé 3 equation</b>	<b>22</b>
3.1	Isomonodromic deformations: definition and Frobenius integrability sufficient condition . . . . .	22
3.2	General Jimbo’s isomonodromic deformation . . . . .	23
3.3	Isomonodromic deformations of special Jimbo type systems .	25
3.4	Isomonodromic families of normalized $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo systems . .	27
3.5	Transversality property of Josephson type systems . . . . .	30
<b>4</b>	<b>Analytic families of constrictions. Proof of Theorem 1.11</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1	Systems with trivial monodromy. Proof of Theorem 4.3 . . .	32
4.2	The manifold of constrictions. Proof of Lemma 4.4 . . . . .	38
4.3	Asymptotics and unboundedness. Proof of Theorem 4.5 . . .	39
4.4	Constancy of rotation number and type. Proof of Theorem 1.11	44
<b>5</b>	<b>Slow-fast methods. Absence of ghost constrictions for small <math>\omega</math></b>	<b>45</b>
5.1	Absence of ghost constrictions with big ordinates . . . . .	46
5.2	Model of Josephson junction with small $\omega$ as slow-fast system	47
5.3	The Comparison Lemma . . . . .	53
5.4	The Monotonicity Lemma . . . . .	55
5.5	Absence of constrictions with small ordinates . . . . .	58
5.6	Proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.7 . . . . .	59
<b>6</b>	<b>Some applications and open problems</b>	<b>59</b>
6.1	Geometry of phase-lock areas . . . . .	59
6.2	The dynamical isomonodromic foliation . . . . .	62
<b>7</b>	<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>67</b>

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Model of Josephson junction: a brief survey and main results

The *Josephson effect* is a tunnelling effect in superconductivity predicted theoretically by B.Josephson in 1962 [41] (Nobel Prize in physics, 1973) and confirmed experimentally by P.W.Anderson and J.M.Rowell in 1963 [1]. It concerns the so-called *Josephson junction*: a system of two superconductors separated by a very narrow dielectric fiber. The Josephson effect is the existence of a supercurrent crossing the junction (provided that the dielectric fiber is narrow enough), described by equations discovered by Josephson.

The model of the so-called *overdamped Josephson junction*, see [41, 60, 50, 6, 46, 47, 55], is described by the family of nonlinear differential equations

$$\frac{d\phi}{dt} = -\sin \phi + B + A \cos \omega t, \quad \omega > 0, \quad B \geq 0. \quad (1.1)$$

Here  $\phi$  is the difference of phases (arguments) of the complex-valued wave functions describing the quantum mechanic states of the two superconductors. Its derivative is equal to the voltage up to known constant factor.

Equations (1.1) also arise in several models in physics, mechanics and geometry, e.g., in planimeters, see [26, 27]. Here  $\omega$  is a fixed constant, and  $(B, A)$  are the parameters. The variable and parameter changes

$$\tau := \omega t, \quad \theta := \phi + \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad \ell := \frac{B}{\omega}, \quad \mu := \frac{A}{2\omega},$$

transform (1.1) to a non-autonomous ordinary differential equation on the two-torus  $\mathbb{T}^2 = S^1 \times S^1$  with coordinates  $(\theta, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^2/2\pi\mathbb{Z}^2$ :

$$\frac{d\theta}{d\tau} = \frac{\cos \theta}{\omega} + \ell + 2\mu \cos \tau. \quad (1.2)$$

The graphs of its solutions are the orbits of the vector field

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\theta} = \frac{\cos \theta}{\omega} + \ell + 2\mu \cos \tau \\ \dot{\tau} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (1.3)$$

on  $\mathbb{T}^2$ . The *rotation number* of its flow, see [2, p. 104], is a function  $\rho(B, A)$  of parameters<sup>2</sup>:

$$\rho(B, A; \omega) = \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\theta(2\pi k)}{2\pi k}.$$

---

<sup>2</sup>There is a misprint, missing  $2\pi$  in the denominator, in analogous formulas in previous papers of the second author (A.A.Glutsyuk) with co-authors: [28, formula (2.2)], [13, the formula after (1.16)].

Here  $\theta(\tau)$  is a general  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued solution of the first equation in (1.3) whose parameter is the initial condition for  $\tau = 0$ . Recall that the rotation number is independent on the choice of the initial condition, see [2, p.104]. The parameter  $B$  is called *abscissa*, and  $A$  is called the *ordinate*. Recall the following well-known definition.

**Definition 1.1** (cf. [28, definition 1.1]) The  $r$ -th *phase-lock area* is the level set

$$L_r = L_r(\omega) = \{\rho(B, A) = r\} \subset \mathbb{R}^2,$$

provided that it has a non-empty interior.

**Remark 1.2 : phase-lock areas and Arnold tongues.** H.Poincaré introduced the rotation number of a circle diffeomorphism. The rotation number of the flow of the field (1.3) on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  equals (modulo  $\mathbb{Z}$ ) the rotation number of the circle diffeomorphism given by its time  $2\pi$  flow mapping restricted to the cross-section  $S^1 \times \{0\}$ . In Arnold family of circle diffeomorphisms  $x \mapsto x + b + a \sin x$ ,  $x \in S^1 = \mathbb{R}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$  the behavior of its phase-lock areas for small  $a$  demonstrates the tongues effect discovered by V.I. Arnold [2, p. 110]. That is why the phase-lock areas became “Arnold tongues”, see [28, definition 1.1].

Recall that the rotation number has physical meaning of the mean voltage over a long time interval up to known constant factor. The phase-lock areas of the family (1.3) were studied by V.M.Buchstaber, O.V.Karpov, S.I.Tertychnyi et al, see [12]–[22], [44], [28] and references therein. The following statements are known results:

- 1) Phase-lock areas exist only for integer rotation number values (*quantization effect* observed and proved in [17], later also proved in [36, 34]).
- 2) The boundary of the  $r$ -th phase-lock area consists of two analytic curves, which are the graphs of two functions  $B = g_{r,\eta}(A)$ ,  $\eta = 0, \pi$ , (see [18]; this fact was later explained by A.V.Klimenko via symmetry, see [44]).
- 3) The latter functions have Bessel asymptotics

$$\begin{cases} g_{r,0}(s) = r\omega - J_r(-\frac{s}{\omega}) + O(\frac{\ln|s|}{s}) \\ g_{r,\pi}(s) = r\omega + J_r(-\frac{s}{\omega}) + O(\frac{\ln|s|}{s}) \end{cases}, \text{ as } s \rightarrow \infty \quad (1.4)$$

(observed and proved on physical level in [56], see also [47, chapter 5], [6, section 11.1], [16]; proved mathematically in [44]).

- 4) Each phase-lock area is a garland of infinitely many bounded domains going to infinity in the vertical direction. In this chain each two subsequent

domains are separated by one point. This was proved in [44] using the above statement 3). Those of the latter separation points that lie in the horizontal  $B$ -axis were calculated explicitly, and we call them the *growth points*, see [18, corollary 3]. The other separation points, which lie outside the horizontal  $B$ -axis, are called the *constrictions*.

5) For every  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  the  $r$ -th phase-lock area is symmetric to the  $-r$ -th one with respect to the vertical  $A$ -axis.

6) Every phase-lock area is symmetric with respect to the horizontal  $B$ -axis. See Figures 1–5 below.




Figure 1: Phase-lock areas and their constrictions for  $\omega = 2$ . The abscissa is  $B$ , the ordinate is  $A$ . Figure taken from [13, fig. 1a)]

**Definition 1.3** For every  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\omega > 0$  we consider the vertical line

$$\Lambda_r = \{B = \omega r\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{(B,A)}^2$$




Figure 2: Phase-lock areas and their constrictions for  $\omega = 1$ . The abscissa is  $B$ , the ordinate is  $A$ . Figure taken from [13, fig. 1b)]

and we will call it the *axis* of the phase-lock area  $L_r$ .

The main results of the paper are the two following theorems.

**Theorem 1.4** *For every  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  and every  $\omega > 0$  all the constrictions of the phase-lock area  $L_r$  lie in its axis  $\Lambda_r$ .*

**Remark 1.5** Theorem 1.4 was numerically observed by S.I.Tertychnyi, V.A.Kleptsyn, D.A.Filimonov, I.V.Schurov. It was stated as an experimental fact and conjecture [28, experimental fact A]. It was proved in [28, theorem 1.2] that for every  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  the constrictions in  $L_r$  have abscissas  $B = \ell\omega$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\ell \equiv r \pmod{2}$ ,  $\ell \in [0, r]$ . For further results and discussion of this conjecture see [13, section 5] and [28, 29, 30].




Figure 3: Phase-lock areas and their constrictions for  $\omega = 0.7$ . Figure taken from [13, fig. 1c)], see also [20, p. 331].

**Definition 1.6** [29, p.329] A constriction  $(B_0, A_0)$  is said to be *positive*, if the corresponding germ of interior of phase-lock area contains the germ of punctured vertical line interval: that is, if there exists a punctured neighborhood  $U = U(A_0) \subset \mathbb{R}$  such that the punctured interval  $B_0 \times (U \setminus \{A_0\}) \subset B_0 \times \mathbb{R}$  lies entirely in the interior of the corresponding phase-lock area. A constriction is called *negative*, if the above punctured interval can be chosen to lie in the complement to the union of the phase-lock areas. Otherwise it is called *neutral*. See Fig.6.

**Theorem 1.7**<sup>3</sup> *All the constrictions are positive.*

---

<sup>3</sup>The main results of the paper (Theorems 1.4 and 1.7) with a sketch of proof were announced in [7].




Figure 4: Phase-lock areas and their constrictions for  $\omega = 0.5$ . Figure taken from [13, fig. 1d)]

**Remark 1.8** It was shown in [29, theorem 1.8] that each constriction is either positive, or negative: there are no neutral constrictions. Positivity of constrictions was stated there as [29, conjecture 1.13]. It was also shown in [29] that Theorem 1.7 would imply Theorem 1.4.

Proofs of Theorems 1.7 and 1.4 are sketched in the next subsection, where the plan of the paper is presented. They are based on the following characterization of constrictions.

**Proposition 1.9** [28, proposition 2.2] Consider the period  $2\pi$  flow map  $h^{2\pi}$  of system (1.3) acting on the transversal coordinate  $\theta$ -circle  $\{\tau = 0\}$ . A point  $(B, A; \omega)$  is a constriction, if and only if  $\omega, A \neq 0$  and  $h^{2\pi} = Id$ .

Some applications of Theorems 1.7 and 1.4 and open problems will be






Figure 5: Phase-lock areas and their constrictions for  $\omega = 0.3$ . Figure taken from [13, fig. 1e)]

discussed in Section 6.

## 1.2 Method of proof of Theorems 1.4, 1.7. Plan of the paper

**Definition 1.10** A *ghost constriction* is a constriction  $(B, A; \omega)$  in model of Josephson junction for which either  $\ell := \frac{B}{\omega}$  is different from the corresponding rotation number  $\rho(B, A; \omega)$ , or the constriction is not of positive type. (Note that  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  for each constriction, see Remark 1.5.)

Theorems 1.4 and 1.7 state that there are *no ghost constrictions*. We prove this statement in two steps given by the two following theorems. To state them, let us introduce the following notation. We set  $\eta := \omega^{-1}$ . For every fixed  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  we consider the set

$$\text{Constr}_\ell = \{(\mu, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \mid (B, A; \omega) = (\ell\eta^{-1}, 2\mu\eta^{-1}; \eta^{-1}) \text{ is a constriction}\}.$$




Figure 6: Positive, negative and neutral constrictions (figure made by S.I.Tertychnyi). It is proved that negative and neutral constrictions do not exist.

**Theorem 1.11** *For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  the subset  $\text{Constr}_\ell \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2$  is a regular one-dimensional analytic submanifold in  $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ . The restriction of the coordinate  $\eta$  to each its connected component is unbounded from above (i.e.,  $\omega$  is unbounded from below). The rotation number and the type of constriction (positive or negative, see Remark 1.8) are constant on each component.*

**Theorem 1.12** *For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  there are no ghost constrictions in the axis  $\Lambda_\ell := \{B = \omega\ell\}$  whenever  $\omega > 0$  is small enough (dependently on  $\ell$ ).*

Theorem 1.12 will be proved in Section 5 by methods of the theory of slow-fast families of dynamical systems. Theorems 1.4 and 1.7 immediately follow from Theorems 1.11 and 1.12, see the Subsection 5.6.

The proof of Theorem 1.11 is sketched below. It is based on the following equivalent description of model of Josephson junction by a family of two-dimensional linear systems of differential equations on the Riemann sphere, see [15, 17, 20, 26, 34, 36], [12, subsection 3.2]. The variable change

$$z = e^{i\tau} = e^{i\omega t}, \quad \Phi = e^{i\theta} = ie^{i\phi}, \quad \ell = \frac{B}{\omega}, \quad \mu = \frac{A}{2\omega}$$

transforms equation (1.2) on the function  $\theta(\tau)$  to the Riccati equation

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dz} = z^{-2}((\ell z + \mu(z^2 + 1))\Phi + \frac{z}{2\omega}(\Phi^2 + 1)). \quad (1.5)$$

Equation (1.5) is the projectivization of the two-dimensional linear system

$$Y' = \left( \frac{\text{diag}(-\mu, 0)}{z^2} + \frac{\mathcal{B}}{z} + \text{diag}(-\mu, 0) \right) Y, \quad \mathcal{B} = \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & -\frac{1}{2\omega} \\ \frac{1}{2\omega} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.6)$$

in the following sense: a function  $\Phi(z)$  is a solution of (1.5), if and only if  $\Phi(z) = \frac{v}{u}(z)$ , where the vector function  $Y(z) = (u(z), v(z))$  is a solution of

system (1.6). For  $\mu > 0$  system (1.6) has two irregular nonresonant singular points at 0 and at  $\infty$ . Its *monodromy operator* acts on the space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  of germs of its solutions at a given point  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^*$  by analytic extension along a counterclockwise circuit around zero.

**Remark 1.13** The variable change  $E(z) := e^{\mu z}v(z)$  transforms the family of systems (1.6) to the following family of *special double confluent Heun equations*, see [62], [19]–[23]:

$$z^2 E'' + ((\ell + 1)z + \mu(1 - z^2))E' + (\lambda - \mu(\ell + 1)z)E = 0, \quad \lambda := \frac{1}{4\omega^2} - \mu^2. \quad (1.7)$$

We will also deal with the so-called *conjugate* Heun equation obtained from (1.7) by change of sign at  $\ell$ :

$$z^2 E'' + ((-\ell + 1)z + \mu(1 - z^2))E' + (\lambda + \mu(\ell - 1)z)E = 0. \quad (1.8)$$

Using this relation to well-known class of Heun equations a series of results on phase-lock area portrait of model of Josephson junction were obtained in [62], [19]–[23], [12, 13]. See also a brief survey in the next subsection.

Recall that an *isomonodromic family* of linear systems is a family in which the collection of residue matrices of formal normal forms at singular points, Stokes matrices and transition matrices between canonical solution bases at different singular points remain constant (up to appropriate conjugacies).

It is known that  $(B, A; \omega)$  is a constriction, if and only if  $A, \omega \neq 0$  and system (1.6) has trivial monodromy; then  $\ell = \frac{B}{\omega} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . See [28, proposition 3.2, lemma 3.3]

We denote by *Jos* the three-dimensional family of systems (1.6), which will be referred to, as *systems of Josephson type*. For the proof of Theorem 1.11 we study their isomonodromic deformations in the four-dimensional space  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  of linear systems of the so-called *normalized  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type*

$$Y' = \left( -\tau \frac{K}{z^2} + \frac{R}{z} + \tau N \right) Y, \quad \tau \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad K, R, N \text{ are real } 2 \times 2\text{-matrices}, \quad (1.9)$$

$$N = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & -R_{21} \\ R_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad K = -GNG^{-1}, \quad R_{21} > 0, \quad \ell \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (1.10)$$

where  $G \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{R})$  is a matrix such that

$$G^{-1}RG = \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & * \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad (1.11)$$

here the matrix elements  $*$  may be arbitrary.

Step 1. We study the real one-dimensional analytic foliation of the space  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  by isomonodromic families of linear systems. These isomonodromic families are obtained (by gauge transformations and rescaling of the variable  $z$ ) from well-known Jimbo isomonodromic deformations [38], which are given by real solutions of Painlevé 3 equation (P3). Namely, the function  $w(\tau) = -\frac{R_{12}(\tau)}{\tau K_{12}(\tau)}$  should satisfy the P3 equation

$$w'' = \frac{(w')^2}{w} - \frac{w'}{\tau} + w^3 - 2\ell \frac{w^2}{\tau} - \frac{1}{w} + (2\ell - 2) \frac{1}{\tau} \quad (1.12)$$

along the isomonodromic leaves. We show that the hypersurface  $Jos \subset \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  corresponds to poles of order 1 with residue 1 of solutions of (1.12). This implies that  $Jos$  is *transversal* to the isomonodromic foliation. This is the key lemma in the proof.

Step 2. We consider the subset  $\Sigma \subset \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  of systems (1.9) with trivial monodromy. We show that  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  for these systems, and their germs at 0 and at  $\infty$  are analytically equivalent to their diagonal formal normal forms. Using this fact, we show that  $\Sigma$  is a real two-dimensional analytic submanifold in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  with the following properties:

2.1)  $\Sigma$  is a union of leaves of the isomonodromic foliation;

2.2) (the key theorem in the proof) there exists a *submersive* projection  $\mathcal{R} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_x$  given by an analytic invariant  $\mathcal{R}$  of linear systems, the so-called *transition cross-ratio*, that is constant along the leaves.

Statement 2.1) follows from definition. Statement 2.2) is proved by showing that  $(x, \tau)$ ,  $x = \mathcal{R}$ , form local analytic coordinates on  $\Sigma$ . Fix an  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and let  $\Sigma_\ell \subset \Sigma$  denote the subset of systems with the given value of  $\ell$ . For every pair  $(x_0, \tau_0)$  corresponding to a system from  $\Sigma_\ell$  realization of any pair  $(x, \tau)$  close to  $(x_0, \tau_0)$  by a system from  $\Sigma_\ell$  can be viewed as a solution of the Riemann–Hilbert type problem. It is proved via holomorphic vector bundle argument, as in famous works by A.A.Bolibrukh on the Riemann–Hilbert Problem and related topics: see [9]–[11] and references therein. We glue a holomorphic vector bundle with connection on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  from the two trivial bundles: one over the disk  $D_2 \subset \mathbb{C}$ , and the other one on the complement of the closed disk  $\overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}} \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}$ . The connections on the latter trivial bundles are given by the diagonal normal forms prescribed by  $\ell$  and  $\tau$ . The gluing matrix, which is holomorphic on the annulus  $D_2 \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , depends analytically on  $(x, \tau)$ . The bundle thus obtained is trivial for  $(x_0, \tau_0)$  (by definition). It remains trivial for all  $(x, \tau)$  close enough to  $(x_0, \tau_0)$ . This follows from the classical theorem stating that *a holomorphic vector bundle close to a*

*trivial one is also trivial* [11, appendix 3, lemma 1, theorem 2], [53, theorem 2.3], [31]. The connection on the trivial bundle thus obtained is given by a meromorphic system with order two poles at 0 and at  $\infty$  and the same normal forms. Its gauge equivalence to a Jimbo type system (1.9), (1.10) is proved by a symmetry argument.

The submanifold  $Jos$  is transversal to  $\Sigma$ , by the result of Step 1 and Statement 2.1). Therefore, the intersection  $Jos \cap \Sigma_\ell$  is a real one-dimensional submanifold in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . It is transversal to the isomonodromic foliation of  $\Sigma_\ell$  (Step 1), and hence, is locally diffeomorphically projected to an open subset in  $\mathbb{R}$  by the mapping  $\mathcal{R}$ . The above intersection is identified with  $Constr_\ell$ . This implies that  $Constr_\ell$  is a one-dimensional submanifold; each its connected component is analytically parametrized by an interval  $I = (a, b)$  of values of the parameter  $x = \mathcal{R}$  and hence, is non-compact.

Step 3. We show that the coordinate  $\eta = \omega^{-1}$  is unbounded from above on each component  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $Constr_\ell$ . Assuming the contrary, i.e., that  $\eta$  is bounded on  $\mathcal{C}$ , we have that for every  $c \in \{a, b\}$  at least one of the functions  $\mu^{\pm 1}$ ,  $\eta^{-1}$  (depending on the choice of  $c$ ) should be unbounded, as  $x \rightarrow c$ . Boundedness of  $\mu$  is proved by using Klimenko–Romaskevich Bessel asymptotics of boundaries of the phase-lock areas [44]. For  $c \neq 0$  we prove boundedness of the functions  $\mu^{-1}$ ,  $\eta^{-1}$ , as  $x \rightarrow c$ , by studying accumulation points of the set  $Constr_\ell$  in the union of coordinate axes  $\{\eta = 0\} \cup \{\mu = 0\}$ .

Afterwards, to finish the proof of Theorem 1.11, it remains to show that the rotation number and type of constriction are constant on each connected component in  $Constr_\ell$ . We deduce constance of type from the fact that no constriction can be a limit of the so-called *generalized simple intersections*: those points of intersections  $\Lambda_\ell \cap \partial L_r$ ,  $r \equiv \ell \pmod{2}$ , that are not constrictions and do not lie in the abscissa axis. This, in its turn, is implied by the two following facts:

- the generalized simple intersections correspond to Heun equations (1.8) having a polynomial solution [13, theorem 1.15]; this remains valid for their limits with  $A \neq 0$ ;
- no constriction can correspond to a Heun equation (1.8) with polynomial solution [12, theorems 3.3, 3.10].

### 1.3 Historical remarks

Model (1.1) of overdamped Josephson junction was studied by V.M.Buchstaber, O.V.Karpov, S.I.Tertychnyi and other mathematicians and physicists, see [12]–[23], [46], [28]–[30], [34, 36, 43, 44, 61, 62] and references therein. Hereby we present a brief survey of results that were not mentioned in

the introduction. Recall that the rotation number quantization effect for a family of dynamical systems on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  containing (1.3) was discovered in [17]. I.A.Bizyaev, A.V.Borisov, and I.S.Mamaev noticed that a big family of dynamical systems on torus in which the rotation number quantization effect realizes was introduced by W.Hess (1890). It appears that in classical mechanics such systems were studied in problems on rigid body movement with fixed point in works by W.Hess, P.A.Nekrassov, A.M.Lyapunov, B.K.Mlodzejewski, N.E.Zhukovsky and others. See [8, 51, 52, 45, 63] and references therein. P.A.Nekrasov observed in [52] that the above-mentioned big family of systems considered by Hess can be equivalently described by a Riccati equation (or by a linear second order differential equation).

Transversal regularity of the fibration by level sets  $\rho(B, A) = \text{const} \notin \mathbb{Z}$  with fixed  $\omega$  on the complement to the union of the phase-lock areas was proved in [13, proposition 5.3]. Conjectures on alignment and positivity of constrictions (now Theorems 1.4 and 1.7 respectively) were stated respectively in [28] and [29] and studied respectively in [28, 29] and [29], where some partial results were obtained. Theorem 1.4 for  $\omega \geq 1$  was proved in [28]. For further survey on these conjectures see [28, 13, 29] and references therein. A conjecture saying that the semiaxis  $\Lambda_\ell^+ := \Lambda_\ell \cap \{A > 0\}$  intersects the corresponding phase-lock area  $L_\ell$  by a ray explicitly constructed in [29] was stated in [29, conjecture 1.14]. It was shown in [29, theorem 1.12] that the ray in question indeed lies in  $L_\ell$ . An equivalent description of model (1.1) in terms of a family of special double confluent Heun equations (1.7) was found by S.I.Tertychnyi in [62] and further studied in a series of joint papers by V.M.Buchstaber and S.I.Tertychnyi [19]–[23]. They have shown that the constrictions are exactly those parameter values  $(B, A; \omega)$  for which the corresponding double confluent Heun equation (1.7) has an entire solution: holomorphic on  $\mathbb{C}$  [20]. Using this observation they stated a conjecture describing ordinates of the constrictions lying in a given axis  $\Lambda_\ell$  as zeros of a known analytic function constructed via an infinite matrix product [20]. This conjecture was studied in [20, 21] and reduced to the conjecture stating that if the Heun equation (1.7) has an entire solution, then the conjugate Heun equation (1.8) cannot have polynomial solution. Both conjectures were proved in [12]. New automorphisms of solution space of Heun equations (1.7) were discovered and studied in [22, 23].

In [19] V.M.Buchstaber and S.I.Tertychnyi described those  $(B, A; \omega)$ , for which conjugate Heun equation (1.8) has a polynomial solution. Namely, for a given  $\ell = \frac{B}{\omega} \in \mathbb{N}$  their set is a remarkable algebraic curve, the so-called spectral curve (studied in [19, 30]): zero locus of determinant of appropriate three-diagonal matrix with entries being linear non-homogeneous functions

in the coefficients of equation (1.8). The fact that those points  $(B, A; \omega)$  for which (1.8) has a polynomial solution are exactly the generalized simple intersections is a result of papers [19, 13], stated and proved in [13].

There exists an antquantization procedure that associates Painlevé equations to Heun equations; double confluent Heun equations correspond to Painlevé 3 equations. See [58, 59, 54] and references therein.

V.M.Buchstaber, O.V.Karpov, S.I.Tertychnyi, D.A.Filimonov, V.A.Kleptsyn, I.V.Schurov made numerical experiences that have shown that as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , the "upper" part of the phase-lock area portrait converges to a kind of parquet in the renormalized coordinates  $(\ell, \mu)$ : the renormalized phase-lock areas tend to unions of pieces of parquet, and gaps between the phase-lock areas tend to zero. See Fig. 5 and the paper [43]. This is an open problem. In [43] V.A.Kleptsyn, O.L.Romaskevich, and I.V.Schurov proved some results on smallest of gaps and their rate of convergence to zero, as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , using methods of slow-fast systems.

A subfamily of family (1.2) of dynamical systems on 2-torus was studied by J.Guckenheimer and Yu.S.Ilyashenko in [35] from the slow-fast system point of view. They obtained results on its limit cycles, as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ .

An analogue of the rotation number integer quantization effect in braid groups was discovered by A.V.Malyutin [49].

## 2 Preliminaries: irregular singularities, normal forms, Stokes matrices and monodromy–Stokes data of linear systems

### 2.1 Normal forms, canonical solutions and Stokes matrices

All the results presented in this subsection are particular cases of classical results contained in [3, 37, 4, 5, 42, 57].

Recall that two germs of meromorphic linear systems of differential equations on a  $n$ -dimensional vector function  $Y = Y(z)$  at a singular point (pole), say, 0 are *analytically equivalent*, if there exists a holomorphic  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ -valued function  $H(z)$  on a neighborhood of 0 such that the  $Y$ -variable change  $Y = H(z)\tilde{Y}$  sends one system to the other one. Two systems are *formally equivalent*, if the above is true for a formal power series  $\hat{H}(z)$  with matrix coefficients that has an invertible free term.

Consider a two-dimensional linear system

$$Y' = \left( \frac{K}{z^2} + \frac{R}{z} + O(1) \right) Y, \quad Y = \begin{pmatrix} u \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

on a neighborhood of 0; here the matrix  $K$  has distinct eigenvalues  $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ , and  $O(1)$  is a holomorphic matrix-valued function on a neighborhood of 0. Then we say that the singular point 0 of system (2.1) is *irregular non-resonant of Poincaré rank 1*. Then  $K$  is conjugate to  $\tilde{K} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ ,  $\tilde{K} = \mathbf{H}^{-1}K\mathbf{H}$ ,  $\mathbf{H} \in GL_2(\mathbb{C})$ , and one can achieve that  $K = \tilde{K}$  by applying the constant linear change (gauge transformation)  $Y = \mathbf{H}\tilde{Y}$ . System (2.1) is formally equivalent to a unique *formal normal form*

$$\tilde{Y}' = \left( \frac{\tilde{K}}{z^2} + \frac{\tilde{R}}{z} \right) \tilde{Y}, \quad \tilde{K} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2), \quad \tilde{R} = \text{diag}(b_1, b_2), \quad (2.2)$$

$$\tilde{R} \text{ is the diagonal part of the matrix } \mathbf{H}^{-1}R\mathbf{H}. \quad (2.3)$$

The matrix coefficient  $K$  in system (2.1) and the corresponding matrix  $\tilde{K}$  in (2.2) are called the *main term matrices*, and  $R, \tilde{R}$  the *residue matrices*.

Generically, the normalizing series  $\hat{H}(z)$  bringing (2.1) to (2.2) diverges. At the same time, there exists a covering of a punctured neighborhood of zero by two sectors  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  with vertex at 0 in which there exist holomorphic matrix functions  $H_j(z)$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ , that are  $C^\infty$  smooth on  $\bar{S}_j \cap D_r$  for some  $r > 0$ , and such that the variable changes  $Y = H_j(z)\tilde{Y}$  transform (2.1) to (2.2). This Sectorial Normalization Theorem holds for the so-called *good sectors* (or *Stokes sectors*.) Namely, consider the rays issued from 0 and forming the set  $\{\text{Re} \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{z} = 0\}$ . They are called *imaginary dividing rays* (or *Stokes rays*). A sector  $S_j$  is *good*, if it contains one imaginary dividing ray and its closure does not contain the other one.

Let  $W(z) = \text{diag}(\tilde{Y}_1(z), \tilde{Y}_2(z))$  denote the canonical diagonal fundamental solution matrix of the formal normal form (2.2); here  $\tilde{Y}_\ell(z)$  are solutions of its one-dimensional equations. The matrices  $X^j(z) := H_j(z)W(z)$  are fundamental solution matrices of the initial equation (2.1) defining solution bases in  $S_j$  called the *canonical sectorial solution bases*. In their definition we choose the branches  $W(z) = W^j(z)$  of the (a priori multivalued) matrix function  $W(z)$  in  $S_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ , so that  $W^1(z)$  is obtained from  $W^0(z)$  by counterclockwise analytic extension from  $S_0$  to  $S_1$ . And in the same way we define yet another branch  $W^2(z)$  of  $W(z)$  in  $S_2 := S_0$  that is obtained from  $W^1(z)$  by counterclockwise analytic extension from  $S_1$  to  $S_0$ . This yields another canonical solution matrix  $X^2 := H_0(z)W^2(z)$  in  $S_0$ , which is obtained from  $X^0(z)$  by multiplication from the right by the monodromy matrix  $\exp(2\pi i\tilde{R})$  of the formal normal form (2.2). Let  $S_{j,j+1}$  denote the connected component of intersection  $S_{j+1} \cap S_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ , that is crossed when one moves from  $S_j$  to  $S_{j+1}$  counterclockwise, see Fig. 7. The transition ma-



trices  $C_0, C_1$  between thus defined canonical solution bases  $X^j$ ,

$$X^1(z) = X^0(z)C_0 \text{ on } S_{0,1}; \quad X^2(z) = X^1(z)C_1 \text{ on } S_{1,2} \quad (2.4)$$

are called the *Stokes matrices*.

**Example 2.1** Let  $A = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ , and let  $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then the imaginary dividing rays are the positive and negative imaginary semiaxes. The good sectors  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  covering  $\mathbb{C}^*$  satisfy the following conditions:

- the sector  $S_0$  contains the positive imaginary semiaxis, and its closure does not contain the negative one;
- the sector  $S_1$  satisfies the opposite condition. See Fig. 7.




Figure 7: Good sectors in the case, when  $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ .

**Example 2.2** Let us numerate the sectors  $S_0, S_1$  and the eigenvalues  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  so that

$$\bar{S}_{0,1} \setminus \{0\} \subset \left\{ \text{Re} \left( \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{t} \right) > 0 \right\}, \quad \bar{S}_{1,2} \setminus \{0\} \subset \left\{ \text{Re} \left( \frac{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2}{t} \right) < 0 \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

This holds, e.g., in the conditions of the above example, if  $\lambda_2 - \lambda_1 > 0$ . The canonical solutions of the formal normal form (2.2) are given by the solutions

$c_k z^{b_k} e^{-\frac{\lambda_k}{z}}$  of one-dimensional equations in (2.2). They are numerated by indices  $k = 1, 2$  of the eigenvalues  $\lambda_k$  of the main term matrix  $K$ . The corresponding solutions of the initial system (2.1) in  $S_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1, 2$ , i.e., the columns of the fundamental matrix  $X^j(z)$ , are also numerated by the same index  $k$  and will be denoted by  $f_{kj}(z)$ . The norm  $\|f_{1j}(z)\|$  is asymptotically dominated by  $\|f_{2j}(z)\|$  in  $S_{0,1}$ , as  $z \rightarrow 0$ , and the converse asymptotic domination statement holds on  $S_{1,2}$ . This implies (and it is well-known) that  $f_{10} \equiv f_{11}$  on  $S_{0,1}$  and  $f_{22} \equiv f_{21}$  on  $S_{1,2}$ . The Stokes matrices  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  are unipotent:  $C_0$  is upper-triangular and  $C_1$  is lower-triangular. If the numeration of either eigenvalues, or sectors (but not both) is opposite, or if the singular point under question is  $\infty$ , not zero (see Remark 2.5 below), then the Stokes matrices are unipotent but of opposite triangular type.

**Remark 2.3** The tautological projection  $\mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1 = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  sends canonical sectorial basic solutions  $f_{kj}(z)$  of system (2.1) to canonical sectorial solutions  $q_{kj}(z)$  of its projectivization: the corresponding Riccati equation. These are the unique  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ -valued holomorphic solutions of the Riccati equation in the sector  $S_j$  that extend  $C^\infty$ -smoothly to  $\overline{S}_j \cap D_r$  for a sufficiently small  $r > 0$ . Their values at 0 are the projections of the eigenlines of the main term matrix  $K$  with eigenvalues  $\lambda_k$ .

**Theorem 2.4** [3, 37, 4, 5, 42, 57] *A germ of linear system at an irregular nonresonant singular point is analytically equivalent to its formal normal form, if and only if it has trivial Stokes matrices. Two germs of linear systems as above are analytically equivalent, if and only if their formal normal forms are the same and their Stokes matrix collections are equivalent in the following sense: they are simultaneously conjugated by one and the same diagonal matrix (independent on the choice of sector  $S_{j,j+1}$ ).*

Recall that the *monodromy operator* of a germ of linear system at 0 acts on the space of germs of its solutions at a point  $z_0 \neq 0$  sending a local solution to the result of its counterclockwise analytic extension along a circuit around the origin. Let the origin be an irregular nonresonant singular point of Poincaré rank 1, and let  $S_0, S_1$  be the corresponding good sectors. Let  $M$  be the monodromy matrix written in the canonical sectorial basis of solutions in  $S_0$ . Let  $M_{norm}$  denote the diagonal monodromy matrix of the formal normal form in the canonical solution basis with diagonal fundamental matrix. We will call  $M_{norm}$  the *formal monodromy*. Recall that  $M_{norm} = \exp(2\pi i \tilde{R})$ . The matrix  $M$  is expressed in terms of the formal monodromy  $M_{norm}$  and the Stokes matrices  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  via the following well-known formula [37,

p.35]:

$$M = M_{norm} C_1^{-1} C_0^{-1}. \quad (2.6)$$

**Remark 2.5** We will also deal with the case, when the singular point under question is  $\infty$ , and the above statements hold in the local coordinate  $\tilde{z} := \frac{1}{z}$ . In the coordinate  $z$  the corresponding equation and formal normal form take the form

$$Y' = \left( K + \frac{R}{z} + O\left(\frac{1}{z^2}\right) \right) Y, \quad \tilde{Y}' = \left( \tilde{K} + \frac{\tilde{R}}{z} \right) \tilde{Y}.$$

The matrices  $K, \tilde{K}$  are called the *main term matrices*, and  $R, \tilde{R}$  the *residue matrices* of the corresponding systems at  $\infty$ . Let  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  be the eigenvalues of the matrix  $K$ . An *imaginary dividing ray at infinity* is a ray issued from 0 and lying in the set  $\{\operatorname{Re}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)z = 0\}$ . This yields the definition of good sectors "at infinity". The Sectorial Normalization and Analytic Classification Theorems and the definition of Stokes matrices at infinity are stated in the same way, as above; the sectors  $S_0, S_{0,1}, S_1, S_{1,2}$  at infinity are also numerated counterclockwise. Formula (2.6) also holds at  $\infty$ .

## 2.2 Systems with two irregular singularities. Monodromy–Stokes data

**Definition 2.6** By  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  we will denote the class of linear systems on the Riemann sphere having two singular points, at zero and at infinity, such that both of them are irregular nonresonant of Poincaré rank 1. Each system from the class  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  has the type

$$Y' = \left( \frac{K}{z^2} + \frac{R}{z} + N \right) Y, \quad K, R, N \in \operatorname{End}(\mathbb{C}^2), \quad (2.7)$$

where each one of the main term matrices  $K$  and  $N$  at zero and at  $\infty$  has distinct eigenvalues.

**Definition 2.7** Consider a linear system  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$ . Fix a point  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}^*$  and two pairs of good sectors  $(S_0^0, S_1^0), (S_0^\infty, S_1^\infty)$  for the main term matrices at 0 and  $\infty$  respectively, see Remark 2.5. Fix two paths  $\alpha_p$  in  $\mathbb{C}^*$  numerated by  $p = 0, \infty$ , going from the point  $z_0$  to a point in  $S_0^p$ . Let  $f_{1p}, f_{2p}$  be a canonical sectorial solution basis for the system  $\mathcal{L}$  at  $p$  in  $S_0^p$ . Consider the analytic extensions of the basic functions  $f_{kp}$  to the point  $z_0$  along paths  $\alpha_p^{-1}$ . Let  $\pi : \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1$  denote the tautological projection. Set  $\Phi := \frac{Y_2}{Y_1}$ ,

$$q_{kp} := \pi(f_{kp}(z_0)) \in \mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}^1 = \overline{\mathbb{C}}_\Phi. \quad (2.8)$$

Let  $M$  denote the monodromy operator of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  acting on the local solution space at  $z_0$  (identified with the space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  of initial conditions at  $z_0$ ) by analytic extension along counterclockwise circuit around zero. The tuple

$$(q, M) := (q_{10}, q_{20}, q_{1\infty}, q_{2\infty}; M) \quad (2.9)$$

taken up to the next equivalence is called the *monodromy–Stokes data* of the system  $\mathcal{L}$ . Namely, two tuples  $(q, M), (q', M') \in (\mathbb{CP}^1)^4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  are called *equivalent*<sup>4</sup>, if there exists a linear operator  $H \in \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  whose projectivization sends  $q_{kp}$  to  $q'_{kp}$  and such that  $H^{-1} \circ M' \circ H = M$ . We will also deal with the *transition matrix*  $Q$  comparing the canonical bases at 0 and at  $\infty$  at  $z_0$ :  $(f_{1\infty}, f_{2\infty}) = (f_{10}, f_{20})Q$ .

**Remark 2.8** The monodromy–Stokes data of a system  $\mathcal{L}$  depends only on the homotopy class of the pair of paths  $(\alpha_0, \alpha_\infty)$  in the space of pairs of paths in  $\mathbb{C}^*$  with a common (variable) starting point  $z_0$  and with endpoints lying in given sectors  $S_0^0$  and  $S_0^\infty$  respectively. Indeed, let a homotopy between two pairs of paths,  $(\alpha_0, \alpha_\infty)$  with base point  $z_0$  and  $(\alpha'_0, \alpha'_\infty)$  with base point  $z'_0$ , move  $z_0$  to  $z'_0$  along a path  $\beta$  in  $\mathbb{C}^*$ . Let  $X(z)$  be the germ of fundamental matrix of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  at  $z_0$  such that  $X(z_0) = Id$ . Let  $H = X(z'_0)$  denote the value at  $z'_0$  of the analytic extension of the fundamental matrix function  $X(z)$  along the path  $\beta$ . Then  $H$  transforms the monodromy–Stokes data corresponding to  $z_0$  and the path pair  $(\alpha_0, \alpha_\infty)$  to that corresponding to  $z'_0$  and the path pair  $(\beta^{-1}\alpha_0, \beta^{-1}\alpha_\infty)$ , as at the end of the above definition.

**Proposition 2.9** *One has  $q_{1p} \neq q_{2p}$  for every  $p = 0, \infty$ . The monodromy–Stokes data of a system  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  determines the collection of formal monodromies  $M_{norm,p}$ , the Stokes matrices  $C_{jp}$  at  $p = 0, \infty$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ , and the transition matrix  $Q$  uniquely up to the following equivalence. Two collections  $(M_{norm,p}, C_{jp}, Q)$  and  $(M'_{norm,p}, C'_{jp}, Q')$  are **equivalent**, if  $M_{norm,p} = M'_{norm,p}$  and there exists a pair of diagonal matrices  $D_0, D_\infty$  such that  $C'_{jp} = D_p C_{jp} D_p^{-1}$  for all  $j, p$ , and  $Q' = D_0 \circ Q \circ D_\infty^{-1}$ .*

**Proof** The inequality  $q_{1p} \neq q_{2p}$  follows from linear independence of the basic functions  $f_{1p}, f_{2p}$ , which implies independence of their values at  $z_0$ . A given pair of distinct points  $q_{1p}, q_{2p} \in \mathbb{CP}^1$  defines a basis  $(v_{1p}, v_{2p})$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$  (whose vectors are projected to  $q_{jp}$ ) uniquely up to multiplication of vectors

---

<sup>4</sup>Here is an equivalent group-action definition. The group  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  acts on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}^4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  by action  $h : q_{kp} \mapsto hq_{kp}$  on points in  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  and conjugation  $M \mapsto hMh^{-1}$  on matrices. The monodromy–Stokes data is the  $\mathrm{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -orbit of a collection  $(q, M)$  under this action.

by constants. Recall that in the basis  $(f_{1p}, f_{2p})$  of the local solution space at  $z_0$  with  $f_{kp}(z_0) = v_{kp}$  the monodromy matrix is given by formula (2.6):

$$M = M_{norm,p} C_{1p}^{-1} C_{0p}^{-1}. \quad (2.10)$$

Here the Stokes matrices  $C_{0p}, C_{1p}$  are unipotent of opposite triangular types (determined by the main term matrix of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  at  $p$ ). Let them be, say, upper and lower triangular respectively with the corresponding triangular elements  $c_0$  and  $c_1$ . Recall that the formal monodromy matrix  $M_{norm,p}$  is diagonal, set  $M_{norm,p} = \text{diag}(m_{1p}, m_{2p})$ ;  $m_{jp} \neq 0$ . Then

$$m_{1p} = M_{11}, \quad c_0 = -M_{12}M_{11}^{-1}, \quad m_{2p}c_1 = -M_{21}, \quad (2.11)$$

$$m_{2p} = M_{22} - m_{2p}c_0c_1 = M_{22} - M_{12}M_{21}M_{11}^{-1}, \quad c_1 = -M_{21}m_{2p}^{-1}, \quad (2.12)$$

by (2.10). This yields expression for the formal monodromy  $M_{norm,p}$  and the Stokes matrices in terms of  $M$ . All the latter matrices depend on choice of the basic functions  $f_{kp}$ , which are uniquely defined by  $q_{jp}$  up to multiplication by constant factors. These rescalings replace  $M_{norm,p}$  and  $C_{jp}$  by their conjugates by a diagonal matrix  $D_p$ , and this does not change the diagonal matrix  $M_{norm,p}$ . The first statement of the proposition is proved. Its other statements follow from the first one and the above arguments.  $\square$

**Remark 2.10** Recall that two global linear systems on the Riemann sphere are globally analytically (gauge) equivalent, if and only if they are sent one to the other by constant linear change  $Y \mapsto HY$ ,  $H \in \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  (i.e., constant gauge equivalent). For simplicity everywhere below whenever we work with global systems on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  we omit the word "analytically" ("constant"), and "gauge equivalence" means "constant gauge equivalence".

**Theorem 2.11** *Two systems  $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  are gauge equivalent, if and only if they have the same formal normal forms at each singular point and the same monodromy–Stokes data. In this case each linear automorphism of the fiber  $\{z = z_0\} \simeq \mathbb{C}^2$  sending the monodromy–Stokes data of one system to that of the other system extends to a gauge equivalence of systems. Here both monodromy–Stokes data correspond to the same sectors and path collections.*

**Proof** The statement of the theorem holds if one replaces the monodromy–Stokes data by collection of Stokes matrices and the transition matrix up to equivalence from the above proposition, see [39, proposition 2.5, p.319]. The collection of Stokes and transition matrices (taken up to the latter equivalence) is uniquely determined by the monodromy–Stokes data, by the

same proposition. Conversely, the monodromy–Stokes data can be restored from the formal monodromy and Stokes and transition matrices. Namely, the monodromy matrix  $M$  in the basis  $(f_{10}, f_{20})$  is found from (2.10). Let us choose coordinates on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  in which  $f_{10}(z_0) = (1, 0)$ ,  $f_{20}(z_0) = (0, 1)$ . Then one has  $q_{10} = (1 : 0)$ ,  $q_{20} = (0 : 1)$ , and  $q_{1\infty}, q_{2\infty}$  are the projections of the columns of the transition matrix  $Q$ . Theorem 2.11 is proved.  $\square$

### 3 Isomonodromic deformations and Painlevé 3 equation

Here we introduce general Jimbo’s isomonodromic deformations of linear systems in  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$ , which form a one-dimensional holomorphic foliation of the space  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  (Subsection 3.2). Afterwards we study its restriction to the so-called Jimbo type systems, where isomonodromic deformations are described by solutions of Painlevé 3 equation (3.16) (Subsection 3.3). In Subsection 3.4 we consider the space of real Jimbo type systems (i.e., defined by real matrices) with  $R_{21} > 0 > R_{12}$ . We introduce the space  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  of their appropriate normalizations with  $R_{21} = -R_{12} > 0$  by gauge transformations and variable rescalings: the so-called normalized  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type systems. Their space  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  contains the space  $Jos$  of systems (1.6) and is foliated by isomonodromic families obtained from Jimbo deformations by the above normalizations. We show that the family  $Jos$  is transversal to the isomonodromic foliation of  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , and it corresponds to poles of order 1 with residue 1 of solutions of Painlevé equations (3.16). A background material on isomonodromic deformations is recalled in Subsection 3.1.

#### 3.1 Isomonodromic deformations: definition and Frobenius integrability sufficient condition

Let us give the following definition of isomonodromic family of linear systems in  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$ , which is equivalent to the classical definition, by Proposition 2.9.

**Definition 3.1** A family of systems in  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  is *isomonodromic*, if the residue matrices of formal normal forms at their singular points and the monodromy–Stokes data remain constant: independent on the parameter of the family.

**Remark 3.2** If a family of systems in question is continuously parametrized by a connected parameter space, then constance of the monodromy–Stokes data automatically implies constance of the residue matrices  $\tilde{R}_p$  of the formal

normal forms. Indeed, constance of formal monodromies  $M_{norm,p}$  follows by Proposition 2.9. The formula  $M_{norm,p} = \exp(2\pi i \widetilde{R}_p)$  implies that the residue matrices  $\widetilde{R}_p$  are uniquely determined by  $M_{norm,p}$  up to addition of integer diagonal matrices. Hence, they are constant, by continuity and connectivity.

**Theorem 3.3** [39],[25, Theorem 4.1] *A holomorphic family of linear systems in  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  depending on a parameter  $t$  from a simply connected domain  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{C}$ ,*

$$Y' = \frac{dY}{dz} = \left( \frac{K_2(t)}{z^2} + \frac{K_1(t)}{z} + K_0(t) \right) Y \quad (3.1)$$

*is isomonodromic if there is a rational in  $z$  (with possible poles only at  $z = 0, \infty$ ) and analytic in  $t$  matrix differential 1-form  $\Omega = \Omega(z, t)$  on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \times \mathcal{D}$  such that*

$$\Omega|_{fixed\ t} = \left( \frac{K_2(t)}{z^2} + \frac{K_1(t)}{z} + K_0(t) \right) dz, \quad (3.2)$$

$$d\Omega = \Omega \wedge \Omega. \quad (3.3)$$

Condition (3.3) means that  $\Omega$  is integrable in the Frobenius sense. See, e.g., [11, proof of theorem 13.2].

An isomonodromic deformation with a scalar parameter is often defined by a system of PDEs [25]

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial Y}{\partial z} = U(z, t)Y \\ \frac{\partial Y}{\partial t} = V(z, t)Y, \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where  $U(z, t)$ ,  $V(z, t)$  are rational in  $z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  and analytic in  $t \in \mathcal{D}$ . In that case, one can take  $\Omega = U(z, t)dz + V(z, t)dt$ . Then condition (3.2) of Theorem 3.3 is satisfied if

$$U(z, t) = \frac{K_2(t)}{z^2} + \frac{K_1(t)}{z} + K_0(t).$$

Condition (3.3) is equivalent to the equation

$$[U, V] = UV - VU = \frac{\partial V}{\partial z} - \frac{\partial U}{\partial t}. \quad (3.5)$$

## 3.2 General Jimbo's isomonodromic deformation

In this section, we consider an isomonodromic deformation introduced by M. Jimbo in [38, p.1156, (3.11)] and describe its integrability condition (3.3). The deformation space will be a simply connected domain  $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathbb{C}^*$  containing

$\mathbb{R}_+$ . Though the deformation in [38] was written in a seemingly special case, it works in the following general case. We are looking for isomonodromic families of systems  $\mathcal{L}(t) \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  given by system (3.4) of the following type:

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial Y}{\partial z} = \left( -\frac{\tilde{K}(t)}{z^2} + \frac{R(t)}{z} + N(t) \right) Y & := \mathcal{L}(t) \\ \frac{\partial Y}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{zt} \tilde{K}(t) Y, \end{cases} \quad t \in \mathcal{D}. \quad (3.6)$$

After the time variable change  $t = e^s$  (which cancels "t" in the latter denominator), the integrability condition (3.5) takes the form of a system of autonomous polynomial ordinary differential equations on matrix coefficients in  $\tilde{K}$ ,  $R$ ,  $N$  (here and in what follows  $[U, V] := UV - VU$ ):

$$\begin{cases} \tilde{K}'_s = [R, \tilde{K}] + \tilde{K} \\ R'_s = [\tilde{K}, N] \\ N'_s = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.7)$$

In the initial time variable  $t$  and the new matrix variable  $K := \frac{1}{t} \tilde{K}$  system (3.7) takes the following simplified, though non-autonomous, form:

$$\begin{cases} tK' = [R, K] \\ R' = [K, N] \\ N' = 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

**Remark 3.4** Vector field (3.7) is a polynomial vector field on the space  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  identified with a connected open dense subset in the space  $\mathbb{C}^{12}$  with coordinates being matrix coefficients. Its complex phase curves form a one-dimensional holomorphic foliation of the space  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  by isomonodromic families. The corresponding system (3.8) considered as a non-autonomous differential equation in the linear-system-valued function  $\mathcal{L}(t) \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  has the following first integrals:

- the matrix  $N$ ;
- the conjugacy class of the matrix  $K = \frac{1}{t} \tilde{K}$ ;
- the residue matrices of the formal normal forms of  $\mathcal{L}(t)$  at 0 and at  $\infty$ ;
- the conjugacy class of the monodromy operator of the system  $\mathcal{L}(t)$ .

Invariance of residues and monodromy follows from Theorem 3.3. Invariance of residues can be also deduced directly from (3.8) and (2.3).

**Proposition 3.5** *Vector field (3.7) is equivariant under gauge transformations acting on  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$ . Its real flow preserves the space of systems in  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  defined by real matrices.*

The proposition follows immediately from expression (3.7).



### 3.3 Isomonodromic deformations of special Jimbo type systems

**Definition 3.6** A *special Jimbo type* linear system is a system of type

$$Y' = \left( -t \frac{K}{z^2} + \frac{R}{z} + \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) Y, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & * \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

such that there exists a matrix  $G \in \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  for which

$$K = G \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} G^{-1}, \quad G^{-1} R G = \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & * \\ * & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.10)$$

In (3.9) and (3.10) the symbol  $*$  stands for an arbitrary unknown matrix element. Here all the matrices are complex.

**Remark 3.7** The formal normal form at  $\infty$  of a system (3.9) is

$$Y' = \left( \text{diag}\left(-\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) + \frac{1}{z} \text{diag}(-\ell, 0) \right) Y.$$

Condition (3.10) is equivalent to the statement saying that its formal normal form at 0 is

$$Y' = \left( \frac{t}{z^2} \text{diag}\left(-\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) + \frac{1}{z} \text{diag}(-\ell, 0) \right) Y,$$

by (2.3).

**Proposition 3.8** *The space of Jimbo type systems (3.9), (3.10) corresponding to a given  $\ell \in \mathbb{C}$  is invariant under the flow of field (3.7) and hence, is a union of its phase curves. The number  $\ell$  is a first integral.*

The proposition follows from Remark 3.4.

We study Jimbo's isomonodromic families of systems (3.9) given by (3.8), which take the following form:

$$\begin{cases} tK' = -[K, R] \\ R' = \left[ \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, K \right]. \end{cases} \quad (3.11)$$

We denote the upper right entries of  $K(t)$  and  $R(t)$  by  $K_{12}(t)$  and  $R_{12}(t)$  respectively. If we eliminate all unknown functions except for the fraction

$$y(t) = -R_{12}(t)/K_{12}(t) \quad (3.12)$$

in (3.11), we get the second order non-linear differential equation

$$y'' = \frac{(y')^2}{y} - \frac{y'}{t} - \frac{\ell y^2}{2t^2} + \frac{1}{t} \left( \frac{\ell-1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{4} \frac{y^3}{t^2} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{1}{y}, \quad t \in \mathcal{D}, \quad (3.13)$$

which is a particular form of

$$y'' = \frac{(y')^2}{y} - \frac{y'}{t} + \tilde{\alpha} \frac{y^2}{t^2} + \frac{\tilde{\beta}}{t} + \tilde{\gamma} \frac{y^3}{t^2} + \frac{\tilde{\delta}}{y}, \quad t \in \mathcal{D}. \quad (\tilde{P}_3(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\delta}))$$

Equation  $\tilde{P}_3$  is equivalent to the Painlevé 3 equation (shortly  $P_3$ ) with parameters  $\alpha = 4\tilde{\alpha}$ ,  $\beta = 4\tilde{\beta}$ ,  $\gamma = 4\tilde{\gamma}$ ,  $\delta = 4\tilde{\delta}$ , and it leads to the well know fact from [38], which we formulate for our choice of parameters.

**Theorem 3.9** [38, pp. 1156–1157] *Set*

$$y(t) = -\frac{R_{12}(t)}{K_{12}(t)}, \quad \tau = \sqrt{t}, \quad w(\tau) = \frac{y(\tau^2)}{\tau}. \quad (3.14)$$

For every Jimbo's isomonodromic family (3.11) of Jimbo type systems (3.9) the corresponding function  $w(\tau)$  satisfies the Painlevé 3 equation<sup>5</sup>

$$w'' = \frac{(w')^2}{w} - \frac{w'}{\tau} + \alpha \frac{w^2}{\tau} + \beta \frac{1}{\tau} + \gamma w^3 + \delta \frac{1}{w}, \quad (P_3(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta))$$

whose parameters are expressed via the first integral  $\ell$  in the following way

$$\alpha = -2\ell, \quad \beta = 2\ell - 2, \quad \gamma = 1, \quad \delta = -1 : \quad (3.15)$$

$$w'' = \frac{(w')^2}{w} - \frac{w'}{\tau} - 2\ell \frac{w^2}{\tau} + (2\ell - 2) \frac{1}{\tau} + w^3 - \frac{1}{w}. \quad (3.16)$$

**Remark 3.10** The deformation considered in Jimbo's paper [38, pp. 1156–1157] was of the type

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial Y}{\partial x} = \left( -\frac{\tilde{t}A(\tilde{t})}{x^2} + \frac{B(\tilde{t})}{x} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) Y, \quad A(\tilde{t}) = G(\tilde{t}) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} G^{-1}(\tilde{t}) \\ \frac{\partial Y}{\partial \tilde{t}} = \frac{A(\tilde{t})}{x} Y \end{cases} \quad (3.17)$$

with the (constant) residue matrices of formal normal forms at 0 and at  $\infty$  being equal to  $\frac{1}{2} \text{diag}(\theta_0, -\theta_0)$  and  $-\frac{1}{2} \text{diag}(\theta_\infty, -\theta_\infty)$  respectively. Jimbo's

<sup>5</sup>There is another frequently mentioned isomonodromic deformation that leads to the Painlevé 3 equation [40, 25].

family (3.17) with  $\theta_\infty = -\theta_0 = \ell$  can be transformed to our family (3.9), (3.11) by multiplication of the vector function  $Y(x)$  by the scalar monomial  $x^{-\frac{\ell}{2}}$ , variable rescaling  $z = -2x$ , and parameter rescaling  $t = -4\tilde{t}$ . Our function  $w(\tau)$  is obtained from analogous function  $y(\tilde{\tau})$  from [38, p.1157] by rescaling  $w(\tau) = -iy(-\frac{i}{2}\tau)$ , which transforms the Painlevé 3 equation satisfied by  $y(\tilde{\tau})$  (with parameters from [38, p.1157]) to (3.16).

### 3.4 Isomonodromic families of normalized $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo systems

**Definition 3.11** An  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type system is a system (3.9) given by real matrices  $K, R$  satisfying (3.10) with  $R_{12} < 0 < R_{21}$  and  $t > 0$ . (The matrix  $G$ , whose inverse diagonalizes  $K$ , can be chosen real and unimodular.) The space of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type systems will be denoted by  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ .

**Remark 3.12** The space  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type systems is a union of real isomonodromic families  $\mathcal{L}(t)$ : real phase curves of vector field (3.7). This follows from Proposition 3.5. Each  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type system can be normalized by a unique diagonal gauge transformation  $(Y_1, Y_2) \mapsto (Y_1, \lambda Y_2)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ , to have  $R_{21} = -R_{12} > 0$ . Furthermore, we apply the variable change  $z = \tau\zeta$ ,  $\tau = \sqrt{t} > 0$ , which transforms (3.9) to a system

$$Y'_\zeta = \left( -\tau \frac{K}{\zeta^2} + \frac{R}{\zeta} + \tau \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) Y, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & -R_{21} \\ R_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_{21} > 0, \quad (3.18)$$

where  $K$  and  $R$  satisfy (3.10). Each isomonodromic family  $\mathcal{L}(t) \subset \mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  can be normalized to an isomonodromic family of systems  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tau)$  of type (3.18) by a family of gauge transformations as above with  $\lambda = \lambda(t)$ , the above change  $z = \tau\zeta$  and replacing dependence on  $t$  by dependence on  $\tau = \sqrt{t}$ .

**Definition 3.13** A system (3.18) with real matrices satisfying (3.10), where  $\tau > 0$  is an arbitrary number, will be called a *normalized  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type system*. The space of normalized  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type systems will be denoted by  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . The above-constructed isomonodromic families  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}(\tau)$  of systems in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  will be referred to, as *normalized real isomonodromic families*.

**Example 3.14** The space *Jos* of linear systems of Josephson type, i.e., family (1.6), is contained in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . Its natural inclusion to  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  transforms a system (1.6) with parameters  $(\mu, \ell, \omega)$  to a system (3.18) with  $K = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$  and the parameters  $\tau = 2\mu$ ,  $\ell$ ,  $R_{21} = \frac{1}{2\omega}$ .

**Proposition 3.15 (Rigidity).** *No two distinct systems in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  are gauge equivalent.*

**Proof** A gauge equivalence must be diagonal: it should keep the main term matrix at  $\infty$  diagonal. It should also preserve the equality  $R_{12} = -R_{21}$  and the inequality  $R_{21} > 0$ . Therefore, it is a constant multiple of identity, and leaves the system in question invariant. This proves the proposition.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.16** *Let  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^{1,0} \subset \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  be the open subset consisting of systems with  $R_{21}, R_{12} \neq 0$ . The set  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is a 4-dimensional real-analytic submanifold in  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^{1,0}$ . The normalized real isomonodromic families form a real analytic foliation on  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  (which we will denote by  $\mathcal{F}$ ) that is tangent to a nonsingular real analytic vector field with non-zero  $\tau$ -component. They correspond to some real solutions of (3.11) (and, hence, real solutions of Painlevé 3 equation (3.16)) via the normalization from Remark 3.12.*

**Proof** Let us show that the closed subset  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+) \subset \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^{1,0}$  is a 4-dimensional submanifold. For every matrix  $K \in \text{Mat}_2(\mathbb{C})$  with distinct eigenvalues and any their fixed order  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ , the matrix  $G$  such that  $G^{-1}KG = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$  is uniquely defined up to multiplication from the right by a non-degenerate diagonal matrix. We will cover  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^{1,0}$  by two open subsets  $W_1, W_2 \subset \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^{1,0}$ :

$$W_1 := \{G_{11} \neq 0\}; \quad W_2 := \{G_{12} \neq 0\}.$$

Let us show that the intersection  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap W_1$  is a 4-dimensional submanifold in  $W_1$ . Then we prove the similar statement for the intersection  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap W_2$ . For every system in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap W_1$  the corresponding matrix  $G$  can be normalized as above in a unique way so that

$$\det G = 1, \quad G_{11} = 1; \quad G_{22} = 1 + G_{12}G_{21}. \quad (3.19)$$

Hence, its matrix  $K$  is defined by two parameters  $G_{12}$  and  $G_{21}$ , and the correspondence  $(G_{12}, G_{21}) \mapsto K$  is bijective. Let us write the second equation in (3.10) for a normalized system with  $R_{12} = -R_{21}$ . It says that the matrix

$$\begin{aligned} G^{-1}RG &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 + G_{12}G_{21} & -G_{12} \\ -G_{21} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & -R_{21} \\ R_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & G_{12} \\ G_{21} & 1 + G_{12}G_{21} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} * & * \\ G_{21}\ell + R_{21} & G_{21}R_{21} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} * & G_{12} \\ * & 1 + G_{21}G_{12} \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

has zero right-lower element. This is the equation

$$G_{21}G_{12}\ell + R_{21}G_{12} + G_{21}R_{21} + G_{21}^2G_{12}R_{21} = 0, \quad (3.20)$$

which is equivalent to the equation

$$G_{12} = -\frac{G_{21}R_{21}}{G_{21}\ell + R_{21}(1 + G_{21}^2)} \quad (3.21)$$

saying that  $G_{12}$  is a known rational function of three independent variables  $G_{21}$ ,  $R_{21}$ ,  $\ell$ . The latter equivalence holds outside the exceptional set where the numerator and the denominator in (3.21) vanish simultaneously. Vanishing of the numerator is equivalent to vanishing of  $G_{21}$  (since  $R_{21} \neq 0$ , by assumption), and in this case the denominator equals  $R_{21} \neq 0$ . Thus, the exceptional set is empty. This implies that  $W_1 \cap \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is a real 4-dimensional analytic submanifold in  $W_1$  (the fourth parameter is  $\tau = \sqrt{t}$ ).

Let us now prove the above statement for  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+) \cap W_2$ . If  $G_{12} \neq 0$ , then we can normalize the matrix  $G$  in a unique way so that

$$\det G = 1, \quad G_{12} = 1; \quad G_{21} = G_{11}G_{22} - 1. \quad (3.22)$$

Then the second equation in (3.10), which says that the matrix

$$G^{-1}RG = \begin{pmatrix} G_{22} & -1 \\ -G_{21} & G_{11} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & -R_{21} \\ R_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} G_{11} & 1 \\ G_{21} & G_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

has zero right-lower element, is  $(G_{11}G_{22} - 1)(\ell + G_{22}R_{21}) + G_{11}R_{21} = 0$ , which is equivalent to the equation

$$G_{11} = \frac{\ell + G_{22}R_{21}}{R_{21}(1 + G_{22}^2) + \ell G_{22}}.$$

Now it suffices to show that the above numerator and denominator cannot vanish simultaneously, as in the previous discussion. Indeed, their vanishing means that  $G_{22}R_{21} = -\ell$  and  $R_{21} - \ell G_{22} + \ell G_{22} = R_{21} = 0$ , which is impossible. The first statement of the lemma is proved.

The space  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type systems is a manifold projected to the space  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  via the normalizations from Remark 3.12. The projection is an analytic bundle with fiber  $\mathbb{R}_+$ , by the same remark and since  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is a submanifold. The space  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is identified (via the above projection) with the quotient of the space  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  by gauge equivalence, by Proposition 3.15. The restriction to  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  of vector field (3.7) has a well-defined projection to the quotient, by equivariance (Proposition 3.5). Therefore the lifting of the projected field to  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is a well-defined real-analytic vector field. Its real orbits are exactly normalized real isomonodromic families, by construction. Positivity of  $\tau$ -component follows by construction, since  $t = \tau^2$  has positive derivative  $t'_s = t = e^s$  along the restriction of field (3.7) to  $\mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . The last statement of the lemma is straightforward. Lemma 3.16 is proved.  $\square$

### 3.5 Transversality property of Josephson type systems

**Lemma 3.17** *Consider an arbitrary system  $\mathcal{L} \in Jos$ . Let  $w(\tau)$  be the germ of solution of Painlevé equation (3.16) defining its real isomonodromic deformation in the space  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  at the point  $\tau_0$  corresponding to the system  $\mathcal{L}$ . Then  $w(\tau)$  has first order pole at  $\tau_0$  with residue 1. Conversely, every system in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  corresponding to a first order pole  $\tau_0 > 0$  of solution of equation (3.16) with residue 1 lies in  $Jos$ .*

**Proof** It is well-known that non-zero singular points of solutions of equation (3.16) are poles of order 1 with residues  $\pm 1$  [33, p.158]. Let us check that systems in  $Jos$  correspond to poles with residue 1. The first matrix equation in (3.11) is equivalent to the following system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} tK'_{11} = R_{12}K_{21} - K_{12}R_{21} \\ tK'_{12} = K_{12}(R_{11} - R_{22}) + R_{12}(K_{22} - K_{11}) \\ tK'_{21} = K_{21}(R_{22} - R_{11}) + R_{21}(K_{11} - K_{22}) \end{cases} \quad (3.23)$$

Here and in the rest of the proof the derivatives are taken in  $t$ . Let now an  $\mathbb{R}_+$ -Jimbo type system  $\mathcal{L}$  corresponding to some value  $t = t_0 \neq 0$  have  $K = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ ,  $R_{21} > 0 > R_{12}$ . (This is equivalent to the statement that the normalization of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is of Josephson type.) Set  $\tau_0 = \sqrt{t_0}$ . The second equation in (3.23) written at the point  $t_0$  yields

$$tK'_{12} = -\ell K_{12} - \frac{1}{2}R_{12}, \quad (3.24)$$

since  $R_{11} - R_{22} = -\ell$  and  $K_{22} - K_{11} = -\frac{1}{2}$ . One has  $K_{12}(t_0) = 0$ . Therefore,

$$K_{12}(t) \simeq -\frac{R_{12}(t_0)}{2t}(t - t_0) \simeq -\frac{R_{12}(t_0)}{\tau_0}(\tau - \tau_0), \text{ as } t \rightarrow t_0.$$

Here  $f(t) \simeq g(t)$  means that  $\frac{f(t)}{g(t)} \rightarrow 1$ , as  $t \rightarrow t_0$ . Then  $K_{12}(t) \neq 0$ , and  $w(\tau) = -\frac{R_{12}(t)}{\tau K_{12}(t)} \simeq \frac{1}{\tau - \tau_0}$  has simple pole with residue 1 at  $\tau_0$ .

Conversely, let a system  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbf{J}(\mathbb{R}_+)$  correspond to a first order pole  $\tau_0 \neq 0$  with residue 1 of a solution  $w(\tau)$  of (3.16). Set  $t_0 = \tau_0^2$ . Note that  $R_{12}(t_0) \neq 0$ , by assumption. Thus,  $K_{12}(t_0) = -w^{-1}(\tau_0) \frac{R_{12}(t_0)}{\tau_0} = 0$ , see (3.14),  $K(t_0)$  is a lower triangular matrix with diagonal elements  $\frac{1}{2}$  and 0 (placed in some unknown order). Hence, the two following cases are possible.

Case 1):  $K_{11}(t_0) = \frac{1}{2}$  and  $K_{22}(t_0) = 0$ . Then  $G_{12}(t_0) = 0$ . This together with (3.10), (3.20) implies that  $G_{21}(t_0) = 0$ , since  $R_{21} \neq 0$ . Thus, the matrix

$G(t_0)$  is diagonal,  $K(t_0) = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ , the normalization of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  lies in  $Jos$ . (Here we did not use the information on residue value.)

Case 2):  $K_{11}(t_0) = 0$  and  $K_{22}(t_0) = \frac{1}{2}$ . Then the second equation in (3.23) written at  $t_0 = \tau_0^2$  is

$$\tau_0^2 K'_{12} = -\ell K_{12} + \frac{1}{2} R_{12}.$$

Repeating the discussion following (3.24), but now with opposite sign at  $R_{12}$  yields that  $\tau_0$  is a pole with residue  $-1$ . The contradiction thus obtained shows that case 2) is impossible. Lemma 3.17 is proved.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.18 (Key Lemma).** *The submanifold  $Jos \subset \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is transversal to the isomonodromic foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  from Lemma 3.16.*

**Proof** Way 1 of proof. The derivative of the element  $K_{12}$  along the vector field directing the foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  is non-zero at  $\mathcal{L} \in Jos$ , by (3.24) and since  $K_{12} = 0$  if  $\mathcal{L} \in Jos$ . Hence, this field is transversal to the hypersurface  $Jos$ .

Way 2 of proof. Points of the hypersurface  $Jos$  correspond to simple poles of solutions of equation (3.16) satisfied along leaves. This together with the fact that a simple pole of an analytic family of functions depends analytically on parameter implies the statement of Lemma 3.18.  $\square$

## 4 Analytic families of constrictions. Proof of Theorem 1.11

For every linear system  $\mathcal{L}$  let  $M(\mathcal{L})$  denote its monodromy operator.

In the proof of Theorem 1.11 we use the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1** [28, proposition 3.2, lemma 3.3] *A point  $(B, A; \omega)$  is a constriction, if and only if  $A, \omega \neq 0$  and the corresponding system (1.6) has trivial monodromy.*

**Corollary 4.2** *The systems (1.6) corresponding to constrictions lie in the set*

$$\Sigma := \{\mathcal{L} \in \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+) \mid M(\mathcal{L}) = Id\}.$$

For every system  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  let us choose good sectors  $S_0$  and  $S_1$  that contain the upper (respectively, lower) half-plane punctured at 0, see Fig.

7. Consider its monodromy–Stokes data  $(q_{10}, q_{20}, q_{1\infty}, q_{2\infty}; M)$  defined by the base point  $\zeta_0 = 1 \in S_{1,2} \subset S_0 \cap S_1$  and trivial paths  $\alpha_0, \alpha_\infty \equiv 1$ . Set

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L}) := \frac{(q_{10} - q_{1\infty})(q_{20} - q_{2\infty})}{(q_{10} - q_{2\infty})(q_{20} - q_{1\infty})} \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}. \quad (4.1)$$

We will call  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$  the *transition cross-ratio* of the system  $\mathcal{L}$ . It depends only on the monodromy–Stokes data and not on choice of its representative.

For the proof of Theorem 1.11 we first prove the following theorem and lemma in Subsections 4.1 and 4.2 respectively.

**Theorem 4.3 (Key Theorem).** *The subset  $\Sigma \subset \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is a two-dimensional analytic submanifold, a union of leaves of real isomonodromic foliation  $\mathcal{F}$ . One has  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  for every system in  $\Sigma$ . The function  $\mathcal{R}$  is constant on leaves of  $\mathcal{F}$  in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . The restriction  $\mathcal{R}|_\Sigma$  is real-valued; it is an analytic submersion  $\Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^1 = \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ . The vector function  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau) : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{R}_+$  is a local diffeomorphism.*

For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  by  $\Sigma_\ell \subset \Sigma$  we denote the subset of systems with given  $\ell$ .

**Lemma 4.4** *For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  the subset  $\text{Constr}_\ell \subset (\mathbb{R}_+^2)_{(\mu, \eta)}$ ,  $\eta = \omega^{-1}$ , is a real-analytic one-dimensional submanifold identified with the intersection  $\text{Jos} \cap \Sigma_\ell$ . The restriction of the function  $\mathcal{R}$  to the latter intersection yields a mapping  $\text{Constr}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$  that is a local analytic diffeomorphism.*

Afterwards in Subsection 4.3 we prove the following more precise version of the first two statements of Theorem 1.11.

**Theorem 4.5** *1) For every connected component  $\mathcal{C}$  of the submanifold  $\text{Constr}_\ell$  the mapping  $\mathcal{R} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a diffeomorphism onto an interval  $I = (a, b)$ .*

*2) Let  $C := \mathcal{R}^{-1} : I \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  denote the inverse function. For every  $c \in \{a, b\} \setminus \{0\}$  there exists a sequence  $x_n \in I$ ,  $x_n \rightarrow c$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , such that  $\eta_n = \eta(C(x_n)) \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e.,  $\omega(C(x_n)) \rightarrow 0$ .*

In Subsection 4.4 we prove constance of the rotation number and type of constriction on each connected component in  $\text{Constr}_\ell$  and finish the proof of Theorem 1.11.

#### 4.1 Systems with trivial monodromy. Proof of Theorem 4.3

In the proof of Theorem 4.3 we use a series of propositions.



**Proposition 4.6** *Every system  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  with trivial monodromy (e.g., every system in  $\Sigma$ ) has trivial Stokes matrices and trivial formal monodromies at both singular points  $0, \infty$ . In particular, the residue matrices of its formal normal forms have integer elements. If  $\mathcal{L} \in \Sigma$ , then one has  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ .*

**Proof** The proof repeats arguments from [28, proof of lemma 3.3]. Triviality of the Stokes matrices follows from formulas (2.11) and (2.12). Then  $M = M_{norm} = Id$ , by (2.6). Hence,  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ , if  $\mathcal{L} \in \Sigma$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.7** *Let in a system  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$ , see (2.7), the matrices  $K, R, N$  be real, and let each one of the matrices  $K, N$  have distinct real eigenvalues. Let the Stokes matrices of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  at  $0$  and at  $\infty$  be trivial. Then the transition cross-ratio  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L})$  is either real, or infinite.*

**Proof** Let  $f_{1j,p}, f_{2j,p}$  denote the canonical sectorial solution basis of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  at point  $p = 0, \infty$  in the sector  $S_j$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ , see Fig. 7. The complex conjugation  $\widehat{\sigma} : (Y_1, Y_2; z) \mapsto (\overline{Y}_1, \overline{Y}_2; \bar{z})$  leaves  $\mathcal{L}$  invariant and sends graphs of its solutions to graphs of solutions. Its projectivization  $\sigma : (\Phi, z) \mapsto (\overline{\Phi}, \bar{z})$ ,  $\Phi := \frac{Y_2}{Y_1}$ , permutes the sectors  $S_0, S_1$  and graphs of the projectivized solutions

$$g_{k0,p} := \pi \circ f_{k0,p}, \quad g_{k1,p} := \pi \circ f_{k1,p}.$$

Here  $\pi : \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{CP}^1 = \overline{\mathbb{C}}_{\Phi}$  is the tautological projection. This follows from uniqueness of projectivized sectorial basic solutions (Remark 2.3). Triviality of Stokes matrices implies that  $g_{k0,p} = g_{k1,p}$  is a global holomorphic  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ -valued function on  $\mathbb{C}^*$ . In particular, for every  $z \in \mathbb{R}$  one has  $g_{k0,p}(z) = g_{k1,p}(z)$ ; hence,  $(g_{k0,p}(z), z)$  is a fixed point of the involution  $\sigma$  and  $g_{k0,p}(z) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Finally,  $q_{kp} = g_{k0,p}(1) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  for every  $k = 1, 2$  and  $p = 0, \infty$ , and thus,  $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{L}) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ . Proposition 4.7 is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8** *For every system  $\mathcal{L} \in \Sigma$  the corresponding collection of points  $q_{kp}$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ ,  $p = 0, \infty$  consists of at least three distinct points. One has  $q_{1p} \neq q_{2p}$  for every  $p = 0, \infty$ .*

**Proof** One has  $q_{kp} = g_{k0,p}(1) = \pi \circ f_{k0,p}(1)$ , where  $f_{10,p}, f_{20,p}$  form the canonical basis of solutions of the system in  $S_0$ . Their linear independence implies linear independence of their values at  $z = 1$ , and hence, the inequality  $q_{1p} \neq q_{2p}$ . Let us now prove that among the points  $q_{kp}$  there are at least three distinct ones. To do this, we use the fact that  $g_{k,p}(z) := g_{k0,p}(z) = g_{k1,p}(z)$  are two meromorphic functions on  $\mathbb{C}^* \cup \{p\}$ ,

$p = 0, \infty$ . Meromorphicity on  $\mathbb{C}^*$  follows from Proposition 4.6 and the proof of Proposition 4.7. Meromorphicity at  $p$  follows from Remark 2.3. Suppose the contrary: there are only two distinct points among  $q_{kp}$ . Then  $g_{1,0} \equiv g_{k_1,\infty}$ ,  $g_{2,0} \equiv g_{k_2,\infty}$ , where  $(k_1, k_2)$  is some permutation of  $(1, 2)$ . Therefore,  $g_{1,p}$  and  $g_{2,p}$  are meromorphic on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ , by the above discussion. Their graphs are disjoint, since so are graphs of their restrictions to  $\mathbb{C}^*$  (being phase curves of the Riccati foliation on  $\mathbb{CP}^1 \times \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  defined by  $\mathcal{L}$ ) and their values at each point  $p \in \{0, \infty\}$  are distinct and equal to  $(1 : 0) \in \mathbb{CP}^1_{(Y_1:Y_2)}$  and  $(0 : 1)$  respectively (Remark 2.3). But graphs of two meromorphic functions on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  with values in  $\mathbb{CP}^1 = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  may be disjoint only if the functions are constant. Indeed,  $H_2(\overline{\mathbb{C}} \times \overline{\mathbb{C}}, \mathbb{Z}) = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}$  (Künneth Formula), and the intersection form on the latter homology group is given by the formula  $\langle (m_1, n_1), (m_2, n_2) \rangle = m_1 n_2 + m_2 n_1$ . See the corresponding background material in [32, chapter 0, section 4]. The homology class of graph of a rational function  $F$  of degree  $n$  is  $(n, 1)$ ;  $n > 0$ , if  $F \neq \text{const}$ . Therefore, if  $F \neq \text{const}$ , then the intersection index of its graph with the graph of any rational function is positive. Hence,  $g_{1,p} \equiv (1 : 0)$ ,  $g_{2,p} \equiv (0 : 1)$ , and the constant functions  $\Phi(z) \equiv 0$ ,  $\Phi(z) \equiv \infty$  are solutions of the Riccati equation corresponding to  $\mathcal{L}$ . This implies that the matrices of the system  $\mathcal{L}$  are diagonal, which is obviously impossible for a system from  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ . The contradiction thus obtained proves the proposition.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.9** *For every collection  $C_0 = (q_{10}, q_{20}, q_{1\infty}, q_{2\infty}) \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}^4$  that has at least three distinct points there exists a neighborhood  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}(C_0) \subset \overline{\mathbb{C}}^4$  such that two collections in  $\mathcal{V}$  lie in the same  $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -orbit, if and only if they have the same cross-ratio.*

**Proof** Fix a neighborhood  $\mathcal{V}$  such that 3 distinct points in  $C_0$  remain distinct in each collection from  $\mathcal{V}$ . Let us normalize them by the  $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  action in such a way that these points be  $0, 1, \infty$ : such normalization is unique. Then the fourth point is uniquely determined by the cross-ratio.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 4.3.** A system  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  is uniquely defined by the formal invariants  $\ell, \tau$  and the monodromy–Stokes data (Theorem 2.11 and Proposition 3.15). Let now  $M(\mathcal{L}) = Id$ . Then the latter data are reduced to the  $\text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -orbit of the collection  $(q_{10}, q_{20}, q_{1\infty}, q_{2\infty})$ . The latter collection consists of at least three distinct points (Proposition 4.8). Therefore, *each system  $\mathcal{L} \in \Sigma_\ell$  has a neighborhood  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{W}(\mathcal{L}) \subset \Sigma_\ell$  such that two systems in  $\mathcal{W}$  have the same monodromy–Stokes data, if and only if the corresponding cross-ratios  $\mathcal{R}$  are equal.* This follows from Proposition 4.9 and the above

discussion. One has  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau)(\mathcal{L}) \in \mathbb{RP}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$ , by Propositions 4.6 and 4.7. This together with the above local determination statement imply that the mapping  $\Pi : (\mathcal{R}, \tau) : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$  is locally injective.

**Proposition 4.10** *For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathcal{L}_0 \in \Sigma_\ell$ , set  $T_0 = (\mathcal{R}_0, \tau_0) := (\mathcal{R}, \tau)(\mathcal{L}_0)$ , there exist neighborhoods  $V_1 = V_1(\mathcal{L}_0) \subset \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ ,  $V_2 = V_2(T_0) \subset \mathbb{RP}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$  and an analytic inverse  $g = (\mathcal{R}, \tau)^{-1} : V_2 \rightarrow V_1$  with  $g(V_2) = V_1 \cap \Sigma_\ell$ .*

**Proof** We have to realize each  $T = (\mathcal{R}, \tau)$  close to  $T_0$  by a linear system from  $\Sigma$ . To this end, we first realize  $T$  by an abstract two-dimensional holomorphic vector bundle over  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  with connection. Namely, we take two linear systems defined by the given formal normal forms at 0 and  $\infty$  respectively:

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : Y' = \left( \frac{1}{z^2} \text{diag}(-\frac{\tau}{2}, 0) + \frac{1}{z} \text{diag}(-\ell, 0) \right) Y; \quad (4.2)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_\infty : Y' = \left( \text{diag}(-\frac{\tau}{2}, 0) + \frac{1}{z} \text{diag}(-\ell, 0) \right) Y. \quad (4.3)$$

We consider the following trivial bundles with connections over discs covering  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$ : the bundle  $F_0 := \mathbb{C}_{Y_0}^2 \times D_2$  equipped with the system  $\mathcal{H}_0$ ; the bundle  $F_\infty := \mathbb{C}_{Y_\infty}^2 \times (\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}})$  equipped with the system  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ . The bundle realizing  $T$  is obtained by the following gluing  $F_0$  and  $F_\infty$  over the annulus  $\mathcal{A} := D_2 \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ . Let  $v_1 = (1, 0)$ ,  $v_2 = (0, 1)$  denote the standard basis in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . For every  $\mathcal{R}$  close enough to  $\mathcal{R}_0$  fix a linear isomorphism  $\mathbf{L}_1 : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$  such that the tautological projection to  $\mathbb{CP}^1 = \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  of the collection of vectors  $\mathbf{L}_1 v_1, \mathbf{L}_1 v_2, v_1, v_2$  has the given cross-ratio  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathbf{L}_1$  depends analytically on  $\mathcal{R}$ . Let  $W^0(z) = \text{diag}(e^{\frac{\tau}{2}(\frac{1}{z}-1)} z^{-\ell}, 1)$ ,  $W^\infty(z) = \text{diag}(e^{-\frac{\tau}{2}(z-1)} z^{-\ell}, 1)$  be the standard fundamental solution matrices of systems  $\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_\infty$  normalized to be equal to the identity at  $z = 1$ . Set

$$\mathbf{L}_z = \mathbf{L}_{z, \mathcal{R}, \tau} = W^\infty(z) \mathbf{L}_1 (W^0(z))^{-1}. \quad (4.4)$$

Let  $E = E(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$  denote the disjoint union  $F_0 \sqcup F_\infty$  pasted by the following identification: for every  $z \in \mathcal{A}$  the point  $(Y^0, z) \in F_0$  is equivalent to  $(Y^\infty, z) \in F_\infty$ , if  $Y^\infty = \mathbf{L}_z Y^0$ . The space  $E$  inherits a structure of holomorphic vector bundle over  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  with a well-defined meromorphic connection induced by the formal normal forms  $\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_\infty$  in the charts  $F_0$  and  $F_\infty$  (which paste together by  $\mathbf{L}_z$  to the same connection over  $\mathcal{A}$ ). This connection has two Poincaré rank 1 irregular nonresonant singular points at 0 and  $\infty$  where it is analytically equivalent to  $\mathcal{H}_0$  and  $\mathcal{H}_\infty$ . Note that the monodromy–Stokes data and the transition cross-ratio are well-defined for bundles with

connections as well, provided that the singularities at 0 and at  $\infty$  are irregular nonresonant of Poincaré rank 1. The transition cross-ratio of the bundle  $E(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$  coincides with  $\mathcal{R}$ , by construction.

Let now  $\widehat{V}_2$  be a small ball centered at  $T_0 = (\mathcal{R}_0, \tau_0)$  in the complex product  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_{\mathcal{R}} \times \mathbb{C}_{\tau}$  (in its local chart centered at  $T_0$ ). Set  $\widehat{E} := \sqcup_{(\mathcal{R}, \tau) \in \widehat{V}_2} E(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ . This is a holomorphic vector bundle over the product  $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \times \widehat{V}_2$ .

**Claim 1.** *The bundle  $\widehat{E}$  is trivial, if the ball  $\widehat{V}_2$  is small enough.*

**Proof** The bundle  $E(T_0)$  is trivial, since it has the same monodromy–Stokes data and formal normal forms, as the system  $\mathcal{L}_0$  (which is a connection on trivial bundle), and by Theorem 2.11 (which remains valid for bundles with connections). It is glued from two trivial bundles over the domains  $D_2$  and  $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}$  by the transition matrix function  $\mathbf{L}_{z, T_0}$ . Triviality implies that there exist (and unique)  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ -valued matrix functions  $U_0(z)$  and  $U_{\infty}(z)$  holomorphic on  $D_2$  and  $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}$  respectively such that  $U_0(z) = U_{\infty}(z)\mathbf{L}_{z, T_0}$  on  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $U_{\infty}(\infty) = 1$ . They are holomorphic on bigger domains  $D_3 \ni \overline{D}_2$ ,  $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{3}} \ni \overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}$ , by the above statement applied to the latter bigger domains and holomorphicity of the transition matrix function  $\mathbf{L}_{z, T_0}$  on  $\mathbb{C}^*$ . Consider the following new trivializations of the trivial bundles  $\mathbb{C}_{Y^0}^2 \times (D_2 \times \widehat{V}_2)$  and  $\mathbb{C}_{Y^{\infty}}^2 \times ((\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}) \times \widehat{V}_2)$ :

$$\widetilde{Y}^0 := U_0(z)Y^0, \quad \widetilde{Y}^{\infty} := U_{\infty}(z)Y^{\infty}.$$

In the new coordinates  $\widetilde{Y}^0$  and  $\widetilde{Y}^{\infty}$  the fiber identifications gluing  $\widehat{E}$  of the above trivial bundles over points  $(z, T) \in \mathcal{A} \times \widehat{V}_2$  become the following: a point  $(\widetilde{Y}^0, z, T)$  is identified with  $(\widetilde{Y}^{\infty}, z, T)$ , if  $M(z, T)\widetilde{Y}^0 = \widetilde{Y}^{\infty}$ , where

$$M(z, T) = U_{\infty}(z)\mathbf{L}_{z, T}U_0^{-1}(z).$$

Therefore,  $\widehat{E}$  can be viewed as the bundle glued from two trivial bundles on  $D_2 \times \widehat{V}_2$  and  $(\overline{\mathbb{C}} \setminus \overline{D}_{\frac{1}{2}}) \times \widehat{V}_2$  by the transition matrix function  $M(z, T)$  holomorphic on  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \times \widehat{V}_2$ . One has  $M(z, T_0) = Id$ , by construction. Choosing  $\widehat{V}_2$  small enough, one can make  $M(z, T)$  continuous on  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \times \widehat{V}_2$  and make the  $C^0$ -norm  $\|M(z, T) - Id\|$  on  $\overline{\mathcal{A}} \times \widehat{V}_2$  arbitrarily small. Therefore, the bundle  $\widehat{E}$  glued by  $M(z, T)$  is "close to trivial", and hence, is trivial, whenever  $\widehat{V}_2$  is small enough, by [11, appendix 3, lemma 1]. (Formally speaking, this lemma should be applied after rescaling the coordinates in the chart containing  $\widehat{V}_2$  in the parameter space to make  $\widehat{V}_2$  the unit ball.) The claim is proved.  $\square$

Let  $V_2 \subset \widehat{V}_2$  be the subset of real points of the complex ball  $\widehat{V}_2$ , which is a real planar disk. The claim implies that the family  $E(T)|_{T \in V_2}$  yields a

family of connections on the trivial bundle  $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \overline{\mathbb{C}}$  depending analytically on the parameter  $T \in V_2$ . They should be linear systems in  $\mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$ , by assumptions on singularities. This yields an analytic map  $g : V_2 \rightarrow V_1$  from a neighborhood  $V_2 = V_2(T_0) \subset \mathbb{RP}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$  to a domain  $V_1 \subset \mathcal{H}_{0,\infty}^1$  such that for every  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau) \in V_2$  the system  $g(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$  has trivial monodromy, transition cross-ratio equal to  $\mathcal{R}$ , and is analytically equivalent to formal normal forms (4.2), (4.3) near 0 and  $\infty$  respectively. Without loss of generality we consider that  $g(T_0) = \mathcal{L}_0$ , applying a gauge transformation independent on  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ . For every system in  $g(V_2)$  the corresponding points  $q_{kp} \in \overline{\mathbb{C}}_\Phi$  from the monodromy–Stokes data given by the base point  $z_0 = 1$  and trivial paths  $\alpha_0 \equiv \alpha_\infty \equiv 1$  lie on the same circle, since their cross-ratio  $\mathcal{R}$  lies in  $\mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ . The latter circle is unique, since there are at least three distinct points  $q_{kp}$ : this is true for  $T = T_0$  (Proposition 4.8) and remains valid for all  $T \in V_2$ , provided that  $\widehat{V}_2$  is chosen small enough. We normalize the systems in  $g(V_2)$  so that the latter circle is the real line, applying an analytic family of gauge transformations depending on  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ .

**Claim 2.** *The systems in  $g(V_2)$  are defined by real matrices.*

**Proof** The transformation  $\widehat{\sigma} : (Y_1, Y_2; z) \mapsto (\overline{Y}_1, \overline{Y}_2; \bar{z})$  applied to systems in  $g(V_2)$  preserves formal normal forms and monodromy–Stokes data, by construction and the above normalization. Therefore, it sends each system in  $g(V_2)$  to a system gauge equivalent to it, and the collections of points  $q_{kp}$  in the fiber  $\overline{\mathbb{C}} \times \{1\}$  are the same for both systems. Their gauge equivalence restricted to the fiber  $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \{1\}$  should fix the points  $q_{kp}$ . Hence, it is identity up to scalar factor, since the number of distinct points  $q_{kp}$  is at least three. Therefore, it is globally identity and the systems in question coincide. Thus,  $\widehat{\sigma}$  fixes each system in  $g(V_2)$ , which means that its matrices are real.  $\square$

The main term matrix  $N$  at  $\infty$  of each system in  $g(V_2)$  is real, and its eigenvalues are  $-\frac{1}{2}, 0$ . It is close to  $\text{diag}(-\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ , if  $V_2$  is small enough. Therefore, it is conjugated to the diagonal matrix  $\text{diag}(-\frac{1}{2}, 0)$  by a real matrix  $H$  close to the identity. The matrix  $H$  is unique up to left multiplication by a real diagonal matrix. It can be chosen in a unique way so that the gauge transformation  $Y = H^{-1}\widetilde{Y}$  makes  $R_{21} = -R_{12} > 0$ . This yields a family of gauge transformations sending systems in  $g(V_2)$  to systems lying in  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$ , and hence, in  $\Sigma_\ell$  (triviality of monodromy). From now on, the mapping  $V_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  thus constructed will be denoted by  $g$ . By construction, its image lies in  $\Sigma_\ell$ , and for every  $(\mathcal{R}', \tau') \in V_2$  the transition cross-ratio  $\mathcal{R}$  and the formal invariant  $\tau$  of the system  $g(\mathcal{R}', \tau')$  are respectively  $\mathcal{R}'$  and  $\tau'$ . Conversely, every system  $\mathcal{L} \in \Sigma_\ell$  close enough to  $\mathcal{L}_0$  has invariants  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$  lying in  $V_2$ , and hence  $\mathcal{L} = g(\mathcal{R}, \tau)$ , by construction, Theorem 2.11

and Proposition 3.15. This proves Proposition 4.10.  $\square$

The mapping  $g$  is an immersion, since the projection  $\mathcal{L} \mapsto (\mathcal{R}, \tau)(\mathcal{L})$  is real-analytic and  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau) \circ g = Id$ . This together with Proposition 4.10 implies that  $\Sigma_\ell$  is a 2-dimensional submanifold, and  $(\mathcal{R}, \tau) : \Sigma_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^1 \times \mathbb{R}$  is a local diffeomorphism. Hence, the projection  $\mathcal{R} : \Sigma_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^1$  (which is constant along isomonodromic leaves) is a submersion. Theorem 4.3 is proved.  $\square$

## 4.2 The manifold of constrictions. Proof of Lemma 4.4

The space of systems (1.6) with given  $\ell$  is identified with  $(\mathbb{R}_+)^2_{\mu, \eta}$ ,  $\eta = \omega^{-1}$ . They are represented as systems in  $Jos \subset \mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  with parameters  $\tau = 2\mu$ ,  $\ell$ ,  $R_{21} = \frac{\eta}{2}$ . The constriction subset  $Constr_\ell \subset (\mathbb{R}_+)^2_{\mu, \eta}$  is thus identified with the intersection  $Jos \cap \Sigma_\ell$ , by Proposition 4.1. The latter intersection is transversal, since  $\Sigma_\ell$  is a union of leaves of the isomonodromic foliation  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $Jos$  is transversal to  $\mathcal{F}$  (Lemma 3.18). Therefore,  $Constr_\ell$  is a one-dimensional submanifold transversal to the isomonodromic foliation on  $\Sigma_\ell$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{R} : Constr_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^1$  is a local diffeomorphism (submersivity of the projection  $\mathcal{R} : \Sigma_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{RP}^1$ , see Theorem 4.3). It remains to show that  $\mathcal{R} \neq 0, 1, \infty$  on  $Constr_\ell$ .

**Proposition 4.11** *For every constriction  $(B, A; \omega)$  the collection of points  $q_{kp}$  from the monodromy–Stokes data of the corresponding linear system (1.6) consists of four distinct points. Or equivalently,  $\mathcal{R} \neq 0, 1, \infty$ .*

**Proof** One has  $q_{1p} \neq q_{2p}$ . Hence, the only a priori possible coincidences are the following.

Case 1):  $q_{k0} = q_{k\infty}$  for some  $k$ . Then the same equality holds for the other  $k$ , by symmetry  $(\Phi, z) \mapsto (\Phi^{-1}, z^{-1})$  of the corresponding Riccati equation. Thus, the collection of points  $q_{kp}$  consists of two distinct points. This contradicts to Proposition 4.8.

Case 2):  $q_{k0} = q_{(3-k)\infty}$  for some  $k$ . This means that the transition matrix between the canonical solution base of system (1.6) at 0 and the canonical base at  $\infty$  taken in inverse order is a triangular matrix. But this contradicts to [29, theorem 2.10, statement (2.19)].

Finally none of cases 1), 2) is possible. Proposition 4.11 is proved.  $\square$

Lemma 4.4 follows from Proposition 4.11 and the discussion before it.

### 4.3 Asymptotics and unboundedness. Proof of Theorem 4.5

The subset  $Constr_\ell \subset (\mathbb{R}_+^2)_{\mu,\eta}$  is a submanifold that admits a locally diffeomorphic projection  $\mathcal{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0, 1\}$  (Lemma 4.4). This implies that it has no compact components, since no compact component can admit a locally diffeomorphic mapping to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Therefore, each its component  $\mathcal{C}$  is diffeomorphic to some interval  $I = (a, b)$  with coordinate  $x := \mathcal{R}$ . This implies the first statement of Theorem 4.5. To prove its second statement, the existence of a sequence  $x_n \rightarrow c$  with  $\eta(\mathcal{C}(x_n)) \rightarrow \infty$  for  $c \in \{a, b\} \setminus \{0\}$ , we will

- use the following Klimenko–Romaskevich Bessel asymptotic result [44] to show that boundedness of  $\eta$  implies boundedness of  $\mu$ ;
- prove that  $(\mu, \eta)(x_n)$  cannot converge to  $(0, 0)$ , by using solution of variational equation to (1.2) and studying local parametrization of the analytic set in  $\mathbb{R}^2$  containing  $Constr_\ell$ ;
- show that if  $\eta(x_n) \rightarrow 0$ , then  $c = \lim x_n = 0$ .

Let us recall that the boundary of the phase-lock area  $L_r$  consists of two curves  $\partial L_{r,0}$ ,  $\partial L_{r,\pi}$ , corresponding to those parameter values, for which the Poincaré map of the corresponding dynamical system (1.3) acting on the circle  $\{\tau = 0\}$  has fixed points 0 and  $\pi$  respectively. These are graphs

$$\partial L_{r,s} = \{B = g_{r,p}(A)\}, \quad g_{r,p} \text{ are analytic functions on } \mathbb{R}; \quad p = 0, \pi.$$

**Theorem 4.12** [44, theorem 2]. *There exist positive constants  $C_1, C_2, K_1, K_2, K_3$  such that the following statement holds. Let  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $A, \omega > 0$  be such that*

$$|r\omega| + 1 \leq C_1 \sqrt{A\omega}, \quad A \geq C_2 \omega. \quad (4.5)$$

Let  $J_r$  denote the  $r$ -th Bessel function. Then

$$\left| \frac{1}{\omega} g_{r,0}(A) - r + \frac{1}{\omega} J_r \left( -\frac{A}{\omega} \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{A} \left( K_1 + \frac{K_2}{\omega^3} + K_3 \ln \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \right) \right), \quad (4.6)$$

$$\left| \frac{1}{\omega} g_{r,\pi}(A) - r - \frac{1}{\omega} J_r \left( -\frac{A}{\omega} \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{A} \left( K_1 + \frac{K_2}{\omega^3} + K_3 \ln \left( \frac{A}{\omega} \right) \right), \quad (4.7)$$

**Proposition 4.13** *Fix an  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For every  $\eta_0 > 0$  the intersection*

$$Constr_{\ell,\eta_0} := Constr_\ell \cap \{0 < \eta < \eta_0\} \subset \mathbb{R}_+ \times (0, \eta_0)$$

*is a one-dimensional analytic submanifold with infinitely many connected components, and each component is bounded.*

**Proof** Let  $u_1 < u_2 < \dots$  denote the sequence of points of local maxima of the modulus  $|J_\ell(-u)|$ , which tends to infinity.

**Claim.** Fix an  $\eta_0 > 0$  and an  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough (dependently on  $\eta_0$  and  $\ell$ ) the interval  $\widehat{I}_k := \{\mu = \frac{u_k}{2}\} \times (0, \eta_0)$  does not intersect the constriction set  $\text{Constr}_\ell$ .

**Proof** In the coordinates  $(\mu, \eta)$  inequalities (4.5) and (4.6), (4.7) can be rewritten for  $r = \ell$  respectively as

$$\left|\frac{\ell}{\eta}\right| + 1 \leq \frac{C_1}{\eta} \sqrt{2\mu}, \quad \mu \geq \frac{C_2}{2}, \quad (4.8)$$

$$\left| \eta g_{\ell,0}\left(\frac{2\mu}{\eta}\right) - \ell + \eta J_\ell(-2\mu) \right| \leq \frac{\eta}{2\mu} (K_1 + K_2 \eta^3 + K_3 \ln(2\mu)), \quad (4.9)$$

$$\left| \eta g_{\ell,\pi}\left(\frac{2\mu}{\eta}\right) - \ell - \eta J_\ell(-2\mu) \right| \leq \frac{\eta}{2\mu} (K_1 + K_2 \eta^3 + K_3 \ln(2\mu)). \quad (4.10)$$

For every  $k$  large enough the value  $\mu = \frac{u_k}{2}$  satisfies inequality (4.8) for all  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$ . Substituting  $\mu = \frac{u_k}{2}$  to the right-hand in (4.9) transforms it to a sequence of functions of  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$  with uniform asymptotics  $\eta(O(\frac{1}{u_k}) + O(\frac{\ln u_k}{u_k}))$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ . The values  $|J_\ell(-u_k)|$  are known to behave asymptotically as  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{u_k}}$  (up to a known constant factor). Therefore, they dominate the right-hand side in (4.9). This together with (4.9) implies that for every  $k$  large enough the values  $\omega = \eta^{-1}$ ,  $A_k = u_k \omega$  satisfy the inequality

$$g_{\ell,0}(A_k), g_{\ell,\pi}(A_k) \neq \ell \omega \quad \text{for every } \omega > \omega_0 := \eta_0^{-1}.$$

Therefore the points  $(\ell \omega, A_k; \omega)$  are not constrictions for all  $\omega > \omega_0$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

For every point  $q \in \text{Constr}_\ell$  and every  $k$  large enough dependently on  $q$  the connected component of the point  $q$  in  $\text{Constr}_\ell$  is separated from infinity by the segment  $\widehat{I}_k$  from the above claim. This proves boundedness of connected components. Infiniteness of number of connected components follows from their boundedness and the fact that for every given  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\omega > 0$  the vertical line  $\Lambda_\ell = \{B = \omega \ell\}$  contains an infinite sequence of constrictions with  $A$ -ordinates converging to  $+\infty$ , see [44, the discussion after definition 2]. This finishes the proof of Proposition 4.13.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.14** For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  the subset  $\text{Constr}_\ell \subset \mathbb{R}_+^2$  does not accumulate to zero. That is, there exists no sequence of constrictions  $(B_k, A_k; \omega_k)$  with  $B_k = \ell \omega_k$  where  $\omega_k \rightarrow +\infty$  and  $\mu_k := \frac{A_k}{2\omega_k} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .



For the proof of Lemma 4.14 (given below) let us recall that the first equation in system (1.3) describing model of Josephson junction takes the following form in the new parameters  $\mu$  and  $\eta$ :

$$\dot{\theta} := \frac{d\theta}{d\tau} = \eta \cos \theta + \ell + 2\mu \cos \tau, \quad \eta = \omega^{-1}, \quad \mu = \frac{A}{2\omega}. \quad (4.11)$$

The constrictions correspond to those values of  $(\mu, \eta) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$  for which the time  $2\pi$  flow map

$$h = h^{2\pi} = h_{\mu, \eta}$$

of equation (4.11) acting on the  $\theta$ -circle  $\{\tau = 0\}$  is identity. For the proof of the lemma it suffices to show that  $(0, 0)$  is an isolated point in the analytic subset  $\{h_{\mu, \eta} = Id\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{\mu, \eta}^2$ . This is done by using the following formulas for a solution  $\theta(\tau)$  of (4.11) and its derivatives in parameters for  $\eta = 0$ .

**Proposition 4.15** *Let  $\theta(\tau, \theta_0; \mu, \eta)$  denote the solution of equation (4.11) with initial condition  $\theta(0) = \theta_0$ . One has the following formulas for the solution and its partial derivatives in the parameters  $(\mu, \eta)$ :*

$$\theta(\tau, \theta_0; \mu, 0) = \theta_0 + \ell\tau + 2\mu \sin \tau, \quad h_{\mu, 0} = Id, \quad (4.12)$$

$$\theta(\tau, \theta_0) := \theta(\tau, \theta_0, 0, 0) = \theta_0 + \ell\tau, \quad (4.13)$$

$$\theta'_\eta = \frac{\partial \theta}{\partial \eta} = \frac{1}{\ell} (\sin(\theta_0 + \ell\tau) - \sin \theta_0) \text{ at the locus } \{\mu = \eta = 0\}, \quad (4.14)$$

$$\theta'_\mu = 2 \sin \tau, \quad \theta_{\mu \dots \mu}^{(k)} = \frac{\partial^k \theta}{\partial \mu^k} = 0 \text{ for } k \geq 2 \text{ at the locus } \{\eta = 0\}. \quad (4.15)$$

The following two formulas holds at the locus  $\{\mu = \eta = 0\}$ :

$$\frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial \eta^2} = -\frac{\tau}{\ell} + \frac{1}{2\ell^2} (\sin 2(\theta_0 + \ell\tau) - \sin 2\theta_0) - \frac{2}{\ell^2} \sin \theta_0 (\cos(\theta_0 + \ell\tau) - \cos \theta_0); \quad (4.16)$$

$$\frac{\partial^{k+1} \theta}{\partial \eta \partial \mu^k} = 2^k s_k(\theta_0 + \ell\tau) \sin^k \tau, \text{ where } s_k(y) = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\frac{k}{2}} \cos y & \text{for even } k \\ (-1)^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \sin y & \text{for odd } k. \end{cases} \quad (4.17)$$

Here "dot" is the derivative in  $\tau$ .

**Proof** Formulas (4.12) and (4.13) are obvious. The equation in variations for the derivative  $\theta'_\eta$  is

$$\dot{\theta}'_\eta = \cos(\theta_0 + \ell\tau + 2\mu \sin \tau) + O(\eta), \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.18)$$

The derivative  $\theta'_\eta$  is a solution of (4.18) vanishing at  $\tau = 0$ . Therefore, for  $\mu = \eta = 0$  it is given by (4.14). Formulas (4.15) follow immediately by differentiating (4.12) in  $\mu$ . Formula (4.17) follows by differentiating (4.18) in  $\mu$  and taking the value thus obtained at  $\mu = \eta = 0$ . It remains to prove (4.16). Differentiating equation (4.11) in  $\eta$  twice at  $\eta = \mu = 0$  and substituting (4.14) yields the following differential equation for the derivative  $\theta''_{\eta\eta} = \frac{\partial^2 \theta}{\partial \eta^2}$ :

$$\dot{\theta}''_{\eta\eta} = -2 \sin \theta \theta'_\eta = -\frac{2}{\ell} \sin(\theta_0 + \ell\tau)(\sin(\theta_0 + \ell\tau) - \sin \theta_0).$$

Taking primitive in  $\tau$  of the right-hand side that vanish at  $\tau = 0$  yields (4.16). The proposition is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.16** *Let  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . The Taylor expansion in  $(\mu, \eta)$  of the time  $2\pi$  flow map  $h_{\mu, \eta}(\theta_0)$  takes the form*

$$h_{\mu, \eta}(\theta_0) = \theta_0 - \frac{\pi}{\ell} \eta^2 + g(\theta_0) \eta \mu^\ell + o(\eta^2) + o(\eta \mu^\ell), \text{ as } \mu, \eta \rightarrow 0, \quad (4.19)$$

where  $g(\theta_0)$  is a non-constant function of  $\theta_0$  that is equal to either  $\sin \theta_0$ , or  $\cos \theta_0$  up to non-zero constant factor.

**Proof** The Taylor coefficient of the difference  $h_{\mu, \eta}(\theta_0) - \theta_0$  at  $\mu^k \eta^m$  at the locus  $\mu = \eta = 0$  equals  $\frac{1}{k!m!} \frac{\partial^{k+m} \theta}{\partial \mu^k \partial \eta^m}(\tau, \theta_0; 0, 0)$  where  $\tau = 2\pi$ . The latter derivatives with  $(k, m) = (0, 1), (n, 0)$  vanish, by (4.14), (4.15). For  $(k, m) = (0, 2)$  it equals  $-\frac{2\pi}{\ell}$ , by (4.16).

**Claim.** *The above  $(k, 1)$ -th derivative is  $2\pi$ -periodic in  $\tau$ , if  $1 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$ . If  $k = \ell$ , it is equal to  $g(\theta_0)\tau$  plus a  $2\pi$ -periodic function; here  $g(\theta_0)$  has the same type, as in Proposition 4.16.*

**Proof** The  $(k, 1)$ -th derivative equals the primitive of the right-hand side in (4.17). The latter right-hand side is a linear combination of values of  $\sin$  (or  $\cos$ ) of  $\theta_0 + r\tau$ ,  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\ell - k \leq r \leq \ell + k$ . Moreover, the coefficient at the "lower term", the  $\sin$  ( $\cos$ ) of  $\theta_0 + (\ell - k)\tau$ , is non-zero, by elementary trigonometry. Therefore, the primitive of the latter right-hand side in (4.17) is a linear combination of  $\cos$  ( $\sin$ ) of the above arguments, except for a possible term with  $r = 0$ , which is  $\tau \cos \theta_0$  ( $\tau \sin \theta_0$ ) up to constant factor. For  $k \leq \ell - 1$  the latter term does not arise. For  $k = \ell$  it arises with a non-zero constant factor, by the above discussion. The claim is proved.  $\square$

One has  $\frac{\partial^{k+m} \theta}{\partial \mu^k \partial \eta^m}(0, \theta_0; 0, 0) = 0$ , by definition. This together with the above claim and discussion implies the statements of Proposition 4.16.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 4.14.** Suppose the contrary: the set  $Constr_\ell$  accumulates to zero. Recall that it lies in the ambient analytic set in  $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  defined by the equation  $h_{\mu,\eta} = Id$ . (The Poincaré map  $h_{\mu,\eta}$  is Möbius, being the restriction to  $S^1 = \{|\Phi| = 1\}$  of the monodromy map of Riccati equation (1.5); the equation  $h_{\mu,\eta} = Id$  is written in the Lie group  $\text{Aut}(D_1) \simeq \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{R})$ .) Therefore, the latter analytic set contains an irreducible germ of analytic curve  $\Gamma$  at 0 with  $\eta|_\Gamma \not\equiv 0$ . Hence,  $\Gamma$  can be considered as a graph of (may be singular) analytic function  $\mu = c\eta^\alpha(1 + o(1))$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $c \neq 0$ . Substituting the latter expression for  $\mu$  to the Taylor formula (4.19) yields

$$h_{\mu,\eta}(\theta_0) = \theta_0 - \frac{\pi}{\ell}\eta^2 + c^\ell g(\theta_0)\eta^{1+\ell\alpha} + o(\eta^2) + o(\eta^{1+\ell\alpha}). \quad (4.20)$$

The right-hand side in (4.20) should be identically equal to  $\theta_0$ , since  $h_{\mu,\eta} = Id$  for  $(\mu, \eta) \in \Gamma$ . This together with (4.20) implies that its second and third terms should cancel out:  $1 + \ell\alpha = 2$  and  $g(\theta_0) \equiv c^{-\ell}\frac{\pi}{\ell}$ . But we know that  $g(\theta_0) \not\equiv \text{const}$ . The contradiction thus obtained proves Lemma 4.14.  $\square$

**Proof of the second statement of Theorem 4.5.** Suppose the contrary: as  $x \in I$  tends to a non-zero endpoint  $c \in \{a, b\}$  of the interval  $I$ , the function  $\eta = \eta(C(x))$  is bounded from above. But then  $\mu(C(x))$  is also bounded from above, by Proposition 4.13. The component  $\mathcal{C}$  being a non-compact submanifold in  $\mathbb{R}_+^2$ , it should go to "infinity" (to the boundary), as  $x \rightarrow c$ . Therefore, there exists a sequence  $x_k \rightarrow c$  such that  $C(x_k) \rightarrow C^* \in \{\mu\eta = 0 \mid \mu, \eta \geq 0\}$  (boundedness of  $\mu$  and  $\eta$ ). One has  $C^* \neq (0, 0)$ , by Lemma 4.14. Let show that two other possible cases treated below are impossible.

Case 1):  $C^* = (0, \eta)$ ,  $\eta > 0$ . Then the equations (4.11) corresponding to  $C(x_k) = (\mu_k, \eta_k)$  have identity Poincaré map and limit to the equation

$$\frac{d\theta}{d\tau} = \eta \cos \theta + \ell, \quad (4.21)$$

which should also have identity Poincaré map. In the case, when  $\ell = 0$ , this is obviously impossible, since the dynamical system on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  given by (4.21) is hyperbolic with an attracting periodic orbit  $\theta \equiv \frac{\pi}{2}$ . In the case, when  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , the rotation number of the above system is an integer non-negative number  $\rho < \ell$ . This follows from the fact that the  $\ell$ -th phase-lock area  $L_\ell$  intersects the  $B$ -axis  $\{A = 0\} = \{\mu = 0\}$  at the so-called growth point with known abscissa  $B(\ell, \omega) = \sqrt{\ell^2\omega^2 + 1}$ ,  $\omega = \eta^{-1}$ , see [18, corollary 3], while  $C(x_k)$  correspond to constrictions with one and the same abscissa  $\ell\omega < B(\ell, \omega)$ . Therefore, the points  $C(x_k) \in Constr_\ell$  also correspond to the same rotation number  $\rho < \ell$ , whenever  $k$  is large enough (continuity of the rotation number

function and its integer-valuedness on the points  $(B_k, A_k; \omega_k)$  corresponding to  $C(x_k)$ . Thus, the points  $C(x_k)$  correspond to constrictions lying on the axis  $\Lambda_\ell = \{B = \ell\omega\}$  with non-negative rotation number  $\rho < \ell$ . But all the constrictions lying in  $\Lambda_\ell$  should correspond to rotation numbers no less than  $\ell$ , by [28, theorem 1.2]. The contradiction thus obtained shows that the case under consideration is impossible.

Case 2):  $C^* = (\mu, 0)$ ,  $\mu > 0$ . Then the linear system (1.6) corresponding to  $C^*$  is diagonal, and hence, has zero cross-ratio  $\mathcal{R} = x$ . Hence, the cross-ratios  $x_k$  corresponding to  $C(x_k)$  tend to zero. But their limit  $c$  is non-zero, by assumption. The contradiction thus obtained shows that Case 2) is also impossible and finishes the proof of Theorem 4.5.  $\square$

#### 4.4 Constance of rotation number and type. Proof of Theorem 1.11

Without loss of generality we can and will restrict ourself to the case, when  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , due to symmetry.

All the statements of Theorem 1.11 except for the last one follow immediately from Theorem 4.5. Let us prove its last statement: constance of rotation number and type. Fix a connected component  $\mathcal{C}$  of the manifold  $\text{Constr}_\ell$ . Constance of the rotation number function on  $\mathcal{C}$  follows from its continuity and integer-valuedness. Constance of the constriction type is obvious for  $\ell = 0$ : the  $A$ -axis lies in  $L_0$ , hence, all its constrictions are positive. Thus, everywhere below we consider that  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  (symmetry). To prove constance of type, we use the following proposition. To state it, let us recall that for every  $\omega > 0$  a *generalized simple intersection* is a point  $(B, A; \omega)$  with  $\ell = \frac{B}{\omega} \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $A \neq 0$  and  $\rho = \rho(B, A; \omega) \equiv \ell \pmod{2\mathbb{Z}}$  that lies in the boundary of the phase-lock area  $L_\rho = L_\rho(\omega)$  and that is not a constriction [30, definition 1.16]; they exist only for  $\ell \neq 0$ .

**Proposition 4.17** *A constriction  $C = (B, A; \omega)$  cannot be a limit of generalized simple intersections with some  $\omega_k \rightarrow \omega$ .*

**Proof** One has  $\ell = \frac{B}{\omega} \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Without loss of generality we can and will consider that  $\ell \geq 1$  (symmetry). Generalized simple intersections correspond to special double confluent Heun equations (1.8) having polynomial solution [13, theorem 1.15]. If, to the contrary, the constriction  $C$  were a limit of generalized simple intersections, then it would also corresponds to equation (1.8) having polynomial solution. But this is impossible, by [12, theorems 3.3 and 3.10]. The contradiction thus obtained proves the proposition.  $\square$

Let a constriction  $C(x_0) \in \text{Constr}_\ell$  be negative. Let us show that for every  $x$  close to  $x_0$  the constriction  $C(x) = (B(x), A(x); \omega(x))$  is also negative: the case of positive constriction is treated analogously. (Note that each constriction is either positive, or negative, by [29, theorem 1.8].) Let  $\rho \in \mathbb{Z}$  denote the rotation number of the constriction  $C(x_0)$ . Set  $\omega_0 := \omega(x_0)$ ,  $\Lambda_\ell(\omega) := \{B = \ell\omega\} \subset \mathbb{R}_{B,A}^2$ . For every  $r > 0$  let  $U_r \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  denote the disk of radius  $r$  centered at  $(B(x_0), A(x_0))$ . Fix an  $r > 0$  such that  $(B(x_0), A(x_0))$  is the only point of intersection  $\partial L_\rho(\omega_0) \cap \Lambda_\ell(\omega_0)$  lying in  $U_{2r}$ . Such an  $r$  exists, since the latter intersection is discrete, by analyticity of the graphs  $\partial_{0,\pi} L_\rho$  forming  $\partial L_\rho$ , and since none of the latter graphs is a vertical line.

Case 1). Let for every  $x$  close enough to  $x_0$  the point  $(B(x), A(x))$  be the only point of intersection  $\partial L_\rho(\omega(x)) \cap \Lambda_\ell(\omega(x))$  lying in  $U_r$ . Then all the above constrictions  $C(x)$  have the same, negative type, by definition.

Case 2). Let now the unique point  $C(x_0)$  of intersection  $\partial L_\rho(\omega(x_0)) \cap \Lambda_\ell(\omega(x_0))$  split into several intersection points, as we perturb  $x = x_0$  slightly, Then all these points are constrictions, by Proposition 4.17 and since  $\rho \equiv \ell \pmod{2}$ , see [28, theorem 3.17]. Their number is finite, and they split the intersection  $\Lambda_\ell(\omega(x)) \cap U_r$  into a finite number of intervals. Any two adjacent division intervals either both lie outside the phase-lock area  $L_\rho(\omega(x))$ , or both lie inside  $L_\rho(\omega(x))$ , since the constriction separating them is either negative, or positive (see [29, theorem 1.8] and Remark 1.8). The division intervals adjacent to  $\partial U_r$  should lie outside, since this is true for  $x = x_0$  and by continuity. Therefore, all the above intervals lie outside. Hence, all the constrictions bounding them are negative. Theorem 1.11 is proved.

## 5 Slow-fast methods. Absence of ghost constrictions for small $\omega$

We prove Theorem 1.12 in Subsections 5.1–5.5. Theorems 1.4 and 1.7 will be proved in Subsection 5.6.

It suffices to prove absence of ghost constrictions with  $B = \omega\ell$ ,  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ , and  $A > 0$ , by symmetry and since the constrictions with  $\ell = 0$  are positive and lie in  $L_0$ . Thus, everywhere below without loss of generality we consider that  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . It is already known that

$$\text{there are no constrictions } (\ell\omega, A) \text{ with } A \in (0, 1 - \ell\omega], \quad (5.1)$$

since all the points  $(B, A)$  with  $|B| + |A| \leq 1$  lie in the phase-lock area  $L_0$  [13, proposition 5.22], and all the constriction in  $L_0$  lie in the  $A$ -axis.

First in Subsection 5.1 for small  $\omega$  we prove absence of ghost constrictions in the semiaxis  $\Lambda_\ell$  with ordinates greater

$$A_{\frac{1}{2}} = A_{\frac{1}{2}}(\omega) := 1 + (\ell - \frac{1}{2})\omega. \quad (5.2)$$

Their absence follows from results of [29, 30], which imply that the whole ray  $\{\ell\omega\} \times [A_{\frac{1}{2}}, +\infty)$  lies in the phase-lock area  $L_\ell$ . In Subsection 5.5 we show that there are no constrictions  $(\ell\omega, A)$  with  $A \in (1 - \ell\omega, A_{\frac{1}{2}}(\omega))$ , whenever  $\omega$  is small enough. This is done by studying family of systems (1.3) modeling Josephson junction as a slow-fast family of dynamical systems, with small  $\omega$  and  $A = A_\alpha(\omega) = 1 + (\ell - \alpha)\omega + o(\omega)$ . The corresponding background material on slow-fast systems is given in Subsection 5.2. The key lemma used in the proof of absence of the above-mentioned constrictions is the Monotonicity Lemma stated and proved in Subsection 5.4. It concerns a pair of slow-fast families (1.3) corresponding to two families of ordinates  $A_{\alpha_1}$  and  $A_{\alpha_2}$  as above with  $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ . It deals with their Poincaré maps of the cross-section  $\{\tau = 0\}$  lifted to the universal cover as maps of the line  $\{\tau = 0\}$  to  $\{\tau = 2\pi\}$ . The Monotonicity Lemma states that the Poincaré map of the system (1.3) corresponding to  $A_{\alpha_2}$  is less than the analogous Poincaré map for  $A_{\alpha_1}$ , whenever  $\omega$  is small enough. Its proof is based on the Comparison Lemma on arrangement and disjointness of slow flowboxes of the systems in question (stated and proved in Subsection 5.3).

## 5.1 Absence of ghost constrictions with big ordinates

**Lemma 5.1** *For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  and every  $\omega > 0$  small enough dependently on  $\ell$  the ray*

$$\Lambda_{\ell, \frac{1}{2}} := \Lambda_\ell \cap \{A \geq A_{\frac{1}{2}}\} \subset \Lambda_\ell,$$

*see (5.2), lies in the phase-lock area with the rotation number  $\ell$ . It contains no ghost constrictions.*

**Proof** The intersection of the phase-lock area  $L_\ell$  with the semiaxis  $\Lambda_\ell^+ := \Lambda_\ell \cap \{A > 0\}$  contains a ray  $S\ell$  bounded by a point  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ , the so-called higher generalized simple intersection [29, theorem 1.12]. Therefore, for the proof of the inclusion  $\Lambda_{\ell, \frac{1}{2}} \subset L_\ell$  it suffices to show that  $A(\mathcal{P}_\ell) < A_{\frac{1}{2}}$  whenever  $\omega$  is small enough. Let us show that

$$A(\mathcal{P}_\ell) = 1 + (\ell - 1)\omega + o(\omega), \text{ as } \omega \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.3)$$

To do this, let us recall the definition of the point  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ . Set

$$\mu := \frac{A}{2\omega}, \quad \lambda := \frac{1}{4\omega^2} - \mu^2 = \frac{1 - A^2}{4\omega^2}.$$

Consider the corresponding Heun equation (1.8). Fix an  $\omega > 0$ . The value  $\mu(\mathcal{P}_\ell) = \frac{A(\mathcal{P}_\ell)}{2\omega}$  is the maximal number  $\mu > 0$  for which equation (1.8) has a polynomial solution, see [29, definition 1.9], [13, theorem 1.15]. It was shown in [19] that existence of polynomial solution is equivalent to the condition that the point  $(\lambda, \mu)$  lies in a remarkable algebraic curve  $\Gamma_\ell \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , the so-called *spectral curve*. Thus, for every  $\omega > 0$  the point  $(\lambda(\mathcal{P}_\ell), \mu(\mathcal{P}_\ell))$  lies in  $\Gamma_\ell$ , and it is the point in  $\Gamma_\ell$  with the biggest coordinate  $\mu$ . As  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , one has  $\frac{1}{\omega} = \sqrt{4(\lambda + \mu^2)} \rightarrow \infty$ , thus,  $(\lambda, \mu) \rightarrow \infty$ . It is known that the complexified curve  $\Gamma_\ell$  intersects the complex infinity line in  $\mathbb{CP}^2$  at  $\ell$  distinct regular real points. Their asymptotic directions correspond to the ratios  $\frac{\lambda}{\mu}$  equal to  $\ell - 1, \ell - 3, \dots, -(\ell - 1)$ , and the corresponding local branches are real. This was proved by I.V.Netay [30, proposition 1.10]. Therefore, as a point of the curve  $\Gamma_\ell$  tends to its infinite point, one has  $\mu \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\lambda = O(\mu) = o(\mu^2), \quad \frac{1}{4\omega^2} = \lambda + \mu^2 \simeq \mu^2, \quad 2\omega\mu = A \simeq 1,$$

$$\frac{\lambda}{\mu} = \frac{1 - A^2}{4\omega^2\mu} \simeq k, \quad k \in \{\ell - 1, \ell - 3, \dots, -(\ell - 1)\}.$$

But  $\frac{1 - A^2}{4\omega^2\mu} = \frac{(1 - A)(1 + A)}{2\omega A} \simeq \frac{1 - A}{\omega}$ . The latter ratio should tend to a number  $k$  as above. Therefore, as a point in  $\Gamma_\ell$  tends to infinity, one of the following asymptotics takes place:

$$A = 1 + m\omega + o(\omega), \quad m = -k \in \{\ell - 1, \ell - 3, \dots, -(\ell - 1)\}.$$

The asymptotics corresponding to points with the maximal possible  $A$  is given by  $m = \ell - 1$ . This proves (5.3). Hence,  $A(\mathcal{P}_\ell) < A_{\frac{1}{2}} = 1 + (\ell - \frac{1}{2})\omega$ , whenever  $\omega$  is small enough, by (5.3). The inclusion  $\Lambda_{\ell, \frac{1}{2}} \subset L_\ell$  is proved. It implies that all the constrictions in  $\Lambda_{\ell, \frac{1}{2}}$  are positive, lie in  $L_\ell$ , and hence, are not ghost. The lemma is proved.  $\square$

## 5.2 Model of Josephson junction with small $\omega$ as slow-fast system

We study one-parameter subfamilies of vector fields (1.3) on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  parametrized by small  $\omega$  as slow-fast families of dynamical systems, where  $\ell = \frac{B}{\omega} \equiv \text{const}$

and  $A$  depends on  $\omega$ . To do this, we recall the following results on topology of the zero level curve of the  $\theta$ -component in (1.3): the so-called slow curve

$$\gamma = \gamma_{B,A} := \{f(\theta, \tau) = 0\}, \quad f(\theta, \tau) := \cos \theta + B + A \cos \tau.$$

**Proposition 5.2** (see [43, proposition 2]). *For every  $(A, B) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$  with  $|1 - B| < A < 1 + B$  the curve  $\gamma$  is a regular strictly convex contractible curve lying in the interior of the fundamental square  $[0, 2\pi]^2$  of the torus  $\mathbb{T}^2$ . See Fig. 8a).*

**Remark 5.3** The curve  $\gamma$  is always symmetric with respect to the horizontal and vertical lines through the center of the latter square.

For completeness of presentation we give the proof of Proposition 5.2.

**Proof of Proposition 5.2.** Let  $1 - B < A < 1 + B$ . Let us now show that the curve  $\gamma$  does not intersect the boundary of the above fundamental square. Indeed, on the boundary either  $\cos \theta = 1$ , or  $\cos \tau = 1$ . If  $\cos \theta = 1$ , then  $f(\theta, \tau) = \cos \theta + B + A \cos \tau \geq 1 + B - A > 0$ . If  $\cos \tau = 1$ , then  $f(\theta, \tau) \geq -1 + B + A > 0$ . Therefore,  $f(\theta, \tau) \neq 0$  on the boundary of the fundamental square, and  $\gamma$  lies in its interior. For the proof of strict convexity it suffices to show that the value of the Hessian of the function  $f$  on its skew gradient tangent to its level curves is positive on  $\gamma$ . That is,

$$\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \theta^2} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} \right)^2 + \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \tau^2} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} \right)^2 - 2 \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \theta \partial \tau} \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \tau} \right) \left( \frac{\partial f}{\partial \theta} \right) > 0 \quad \text{on } \gamma. \quad (5.4)$$

Substituting  $u := \cos \theta$ ,  $v := \cos \tau$  to the latter left-hand side and dividing it by  $A$  yields the following equivalent inequality:

$$-Au(1-v^2) - v(1-u^2) > 0, \quad \text{whenever } u+B+Av = 0 \text{ and } |u|, |v| \leq 1. \quad (5.5)$$

Substituting  $u = -B - Av$  to the left-hand side in (5.5) transforms it to the polynomial

$$P(v) = ABv^2 + v(A^2 + B^2 - 1) + AB.$$

One has  $P(v) > 0$  for every  $v \in \mathbb{R}$ , since its discriminant is negative, i.e.,  $-2AB < A^2 + B^2 - 1 < 2AB$ . Indeed, the latter inequality can be rewritten as  $|A - B| < 1 < A + B$ , which is equivalent to the system inequalities of the proposition for positive  $A$  and  $B$ . The proposition is proved.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.4** *In the case, when  $A, B > 0$  and  $A = 1 - B$ , the curve  $\gamma$  is regular, except for one singular point  $q = (\pi, 0)$  of type "transversal double self-intersection". Its intersection with the interior of the fundamental*



square  $[0, 2\pi]^2$  is a convex curve. In the case, when  $B > 0$  and  $0 < A < 1 - B$ , the curve  $\gamma$  is regular and consists of two non-contractible closed connected components of homological type  $(0, 1)$  in the standard basis in  $H_1(\mathbb{T}_{\theta, \tau}^2)$ . See Fig. 8b), c).

**Proof** Consider the first the case:  $A = 1 - B$ . Convexity is preserved under passing to limit, as  $A > 1 - B$  tends to  $1 - B$ . The singular point statement and uniqueness of singular point follow by straightforward calculation, the Implicit Function Theorem and Morse Lemma. In more detail,  $\gamma$  being a level curve of an analytic function  $f(\theta, \tau)$ , its singular points (if any) are the critical points of the function  $f$  contained in  $\gamma$ . The critical points are those with  $\cos \theta, \cos \tau = \pm 1$ . The only critical point in  $\gamma$  is the one with  $\cos \theta = -1, \cos \tau = 1$ , i.e.,  $q = (\pi, 0)$ . This is a Morse critical point with index  $-1$ , i.e., the Hessian form of the function  $f$  at  $q$  has eigenvalues of opposite signs:  $\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \theta \partial \tau} = 0, \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \theta^2} = 1, \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial \tau^2} = -A < 0$ . Hence, it is a transversal self-intersection singular point of the curve  $\gamma$  (Morse Lemma). See Fig. 8b).

As  $A$  and  $B$  vary, the topological type of the curve  $\gamma$  may change only near those parameter values, for which  $\gamma$  is a critical level curve of the function  $f(\theta, \tau)$ . It follows from the above critical point description that  $\gamma$  is a critical level curve, if and only if  $\pm 1 + B \pm A = 0$  for some of the four possible sign choices. Therefore, the topological type is constant in the domain  $\{B > 0, 0 < A < 1 - B\}$  in the parameter space. To find this topological type, fix a point  $(B_0, A_0) \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $A_0 = 1 - B_0$ . We show that as  $A > A_0$  decreases and crosses the value  $A_0$ , a connected contractible curve  $\gamma_{B_0, A}$  given by Proposition 5.2 is transformed to two disjoint curves isotopic to the  $\tau$ -circle. For  $A$  close to  $A_0$  the complement of each  $\gamma_{B_0, A}$  to a small disk  $U$  centered at the singular point  $q$  is a regular curve depending analytically on the parameter  $A$ . It consists of two connected components  $\gamma_{B_0, A; \pm}(U)$  disjoint from the circle  $\{\theta = \pi\}$  and projected diffeomorphically to an interval  $(\varepsilon, 2\pi - \varepsilon)$  of the  $\tau$ -circle; here  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon(U)$  is small. (The projection interval is the same for both components, since the symmetries  $\theta \mapsto -\theta, \tau \mapsto -\tau$  preserve each curve  $\gamma_{B, A}$ .) The curves  $\gamma_{B_0, A} \cap U$  form a foliation in  $U$  by level curves of the function  $g(\theta, \tau) := -\frac{1}{\cos \tau}(\cos \theta + B_0)$  with critical value  $A_0$  corresponding to a Morse critical point  $q$  of index 1. The union of local branches of the singular curve  $\gamma_{B_0, A_0}$  at  $q$  is invariant under the above symmetries, and the local branches intersect transversally. Therefore, they are transversal to the circles  $\{\theta = \pi\}, \{\tau = 0\}$ . For  $A > A_0$  close to  $A_0$  the curve  $\gamma_{B_0, A}$  is strictly convex, and its intersection with  $U$  is a union of two connected components separated by the circle  $\{\tau = 0\}$ , by Proposition 5.2. This implies that for  $A < A_0$  close to  $A_0$  the local level

curve  $\gamma_{B_0,A} \cap U$  consists of two components intersecting the circle  $\{\tau = 0\}$ , diffeomorphically projected to an interval in the  $\tau$ -circle and disjoint from the circle  $\{\theta = \pi\}$ . Adding the latter components to  $\gamma_{B_0,A;\pm}(U)$  results in two closed curves in  $\mathbb{T}^2$  disjoint from the circle  $\{\theta = \pi\}$  and projected diffeomorphically onto the  $\tau$ -circle. See Fig. 8c). Thus, they are isotopic to the  $\tau$ -circle. This proves the last statement of Proposition 5.4.  $\square$




Figure 8: Different topological types of the curve  $\gamma_{B,A} = \{f(\theta, \tau) = 0\}$  for  $B, A > 0, A < 1 + B$ . We present its liftings to the universal covering  $\mathbb{R}^2_{\theta,\tau}$ .

Consider family (1.3) with a fixed  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mu = \frac{A(\omega)}{2\omega}$  where

$$A(\omega) = A_\alpha(\omega) = 1 + (\ell - \alpha)\omega + o(\omega), \text{ as } \omega \rightarrow 0; \alpha > 0 \text{ is a constant.} \quad (5.6)$$

Multiplying family (1.3) by  $\omega$  yields a slow-fast family of dynamical systems

$$\begin{cases} \dot{\theta}_t = f_\alpha(\theta, \tau; \omega) \\ \dot{\tau}_t = \omega, \end{cases} \quad t = \omega^{-1}\tau, \quad f_\alpha(\theta, \tau; \omega) = \cos \theta + \ell\omega + A_\alpha(\omega) \cos \tau \quad (5.7)$$

on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  with  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ . According to the commonly used terminology in the theory of slow-fast systems, see e.g. [35], we will call the curve

$$\gamma_\alpha(\omega) := \{f_\alpha(\theta, \tau; \omega) = 0\} \subset \mathbb{T}^2 = \mathbb{R}^2_{(\theta,\tau)}/2\pi\mathbb{Z}$$

the *slow curve* of family (5.7). Propositions 5.2 and 5.4 imply the following

**Corollary 5.5** For every fixed  $\ell, \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$  with  $\alpha \neq 2\ell$  for every  $\omega$  small enough dependently on  $\ell$  and  $\alpha$

(i) if  $0 < \alpha < 2\ell$ , then the slow curve of system (5.7) is convex, regular, contractible and lies in the interior of the fundamental square  $[0, 2\pi]^2$ ;

(ii) if  $\alpha > 2\ell$ , then the slow curve is regular and consists of two non-contractible closed connected components of homological type  $(0, 1)$ .

**Remark 5.6** Fix an arbitrary  $\alpha > 0$ . As  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ , the slow curve tends to the square with vertices  $(0, \pi)$ ,  $(\pi, 2\pi)$ ,  $(2\pi, \pi)$ ,  $(\pi, 0)$ , whose sides are parallel to the lines  $\theta \pm \tau = \text{const}$ . The corresponding vector fields converge to a vector field with zero  $\tau$ -component and whose  $\theta$ -component has simple zeros on the edges of the above square (with vertices deleted).

Below we deal with the liftings to  $\mathbb{R}^2$  of vector fields (5.7) and their phase portraits. The lifted fields will be denoted by the same symbol (5.7). The slow curve  $\gamma_\alpha = \gamma_\alpha(\omega) \subset \mathbb{T}^2$  will be identified with its lifting  $\gamma_\alpha^0$  to the square  $[0, 2\pi]^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ . Its other lifting, obtained from the latter one by translation by the vector  $(2\pi, 0)$  will be denoted by  $\gamma_\alpha^1$ .

**Definition 5.7** The *interior component* of the complement  $\mathbb{T}^2 \setminus \gamma_\alpha$  is its connected component containing the point  $(\pi, \pi)$ . Its liftings to the squares  $[0, 2\pi]^2$  and  $[2\pi, 4\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$  will be called the interior components of the complements of the latter squares to the curves  $\gamma_\alpha^0$  and  $\gamma_\alpha^1$  respectively.

Fix constants  $h_0, h_1, h_2$  such that

$$\frac{3\pi}{2} < h_0 < h_1 < h_2 < 2\pi.$$

For example, one can take,  $h_0 = \frac{6.5\pi}{4}$ ,  $h_1 = \frac{7\pi}{4}$ ,  $h_2 = \frac{15\pi}{8}$ .

**Proposition 5.8** For every  $\omega > 0$  small enough the restriction of the function  $f_\alpha(\theta, \tau) := f_\alpha(\theta, \tau; \omega)$  to the rectangle  $[0, 4\pi] \times [0, 2\pi]$  is negative exactly in the interior components of complements of the curves  $\gamma_\alpha^j$ ,  $j = 0, 1$ , and positive outside the closure of the latter components. The strip

$$\Pi := \{h_1 \leq \tau \leq h_2\}$$

intersects the curve  $\gamma_\alpha^1$  by two disjoint graphs (called left and right)

$$L_{1,\alpha} := \{\theta = \psi_1(\tau)\}, \quad L_{2,\alpha} := \{\theta = \psi_2(\tau)\}, \quad \tau \in [h_1, h_2], \quad \psi_1 < \psi_2.$$

The latter graphs converge uniformly in the  $C^1$ -norm to segments parallel to the lines  $\{\tau = \theta\}$  and  $\{\tau = -\theta\}$  respectively, as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ .

Proposition 5.8 follows from Remark 5.6.

**Proposition 5.9** *Let  $\alpha > 0$ . Let  $I_+ \subset \mathbb{R}^2$  denote the horizontal segment connecting the points  $(2\pi, h_0)$  and  $(3\pi, h_0)$ . The intersection of the strip  $\Pi$  with the orbit of the segment  $I_+$  by flow of vector field (5.7) is a flowbox denoted by*

$$F_{\alpha,+} = F_{\alpha,+}(\omega).$$

*It will be called a **slow flowbox**. Its flow lines are uniformly  $\omega$ -close to  $L_{1,\alpha}$  in the  $C^1$ -norm. The intersections  $F_{\alpha,+} \cap \{\tau = h\}$  with  $h \in [h_1, h_2]$  are segments whose lengths are uniformly bounded (in  $h, \omega$ ) by an exponentially small quantity  $\exp(-\frac{c}{\omega})$ ;  $c > 0$  is independent on  $h$  and  $\omega$ . See Fig. 9.*

**Proof** The proposition follows from Proposition 5.8 and the classical theory of slow-fast systems. See, e.g., [35, theorem 3 and proposition 4].  $\square$




Figure 9: The slow flowboxes  $F_{\alpha,\pm}$  (black) and orbits of points  $C_j$ .

**Remark 5.10** The phase-portrait of vector field (5.7) is symmetric with respect to the points

$$C_0 := (\pi, \pi), \quad C_1 := (2\pi, \pi), \quad C_2 := (3\pi, \pi);$$

the symmetry changes the sign (i.e., orientation) of the field. Let  $I_-$  denote the horizontal segment symmetric to  $I_+$  with respect to the point  $C_1$ , see Fig.

9. The above construction applied to the inverse vector field, the segment  $I_-$  and the heights  $h_j^- := 2\pi - h_j$  yields the slow flowbox

$$F_{\alpha,-} \text{ symmetric to } F_{\alpha,+} \text{ with respect to the point } C_1.$$

### 5.3 The Comparison Lemma

**Lemma 5.11 (Comparison Lemma).** *Let  $0 < \alpha_1 < \alpha_2$ . Consider two families  $(5.7)_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ , of dynamical systems (5.7) with  $A = A_{\alpha_j}(\omega)$  satisfying (5.6). For every  $\omega > 0$  small enough the corresponding flowboxes  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$  and  $F_{\alpha_2,+}$  are disjoint and  $F_{\alpha_2,+}$  lies on the left from the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$ . Similarly, the flowboxes  $F_{\alpha_1,-}$  and  $F_{\alpha_2,-}$  are disjoint and  $F_{\alpha_2,-}$  lies on the right from the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,-}$ .*

It suffices to prove the statement of the lemma for the flowboxes  $F_{\alpha_j,+}$ , by symmetry (Remark 5.10). Here and below we use the next proposition.

**Proposition 5.12** *For every  $\omega$  small enough the following statements hold. The vectors of the fields  $(5.7)_1$  and  $(5.7)_2$  form a positively oriented basis at each point of the union of two strips*

$$W := \{0 \leq \tau < \frac{\pi}{2}\} \cup \{\frac{3\pi}{2} < \tau \leq 2\pi\}.$$

*At each point in the  $\frac{\omega}{8}$ -neighborhood of the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$  the angles between the vectors of the fields are greater than  $\sigma := \arctan(2+b) - \arctan 2$ . The image of the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$  under the unit time flow map of the field  $(5.7)_2$  is disjoint from  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$ , and its intersection with the strip  $\Pi$  lies on the left from  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$ .*

**Proof** The vectors of the fields  $(5.7)_1$  and  $(5.7)_2$  have the same  $\tau$ -component equal to  $\omega$ . The difference of their  $\theta$ -components is  $f_{\alpha_1}(\theta, \tau; \omega) - f_{\alpha_2}(\theta, \tau; \omega) = (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)\omega(1 + o(1)) \cos \tau > 0$  on  $W$ , whenever  $\omega$  is small enough, since  $\cos \tau > 0$  on  $W$ . Therefore, the vectors of the field  $(5.7)_2$  are directed to the left from the vectors of the field  $(5.7)_1$  on  $W$ , that is, the orientation statement of the proposition holds. For every  $\omega$  small enough one has

$$f_{\alpha_1}(\theta, \tau; \omega) - f_{\alpha_2}(\theta, \tau; \omega) > b\omega, \quad b := \frac{\cos h_0}{2}(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1), \quad \text{if } \tau \in [h_0, h_2], \quad (5.8)$$

by the above asymptotics, and also

$$\frac{\omega}{4} < f_{\alpha_1}(\theta, \tau; \omega) < 2\omega \quad \text{on the } \frac{\omega}{8} \text{-neighborhood of } F_{\alpha_1,+}. \quad (5.9)$$

Indeed, the flow lines of the field  $(5.7)_1$  in  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$   $C^1$ -converge to lines  $\tau = \theta + \text{const}$  (Propositions 5.8 and 5.9), hence  $f_{\alpha_1}(\theta, \tau; \omega) \simeq \omega$  on  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$ . This together with (5.6), (5.7) and the obvious inequality  $|\cos' x| = |\sin x| \leq 1$  implies (5.9). The angle lower bound statement of Proposition 5.12 follows from (5.8) and (5.9). Its last statement on image of the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$  under the unit time flow map of the field  $(5.7)_2$  follows from the above angle bound and the fact that the vectors of the field  $(5.7)_2$  have length no less than  $\omega$ , while the width of the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$  is exponentially small (the last statement of Proposition 5.9). Proposition 5.12 is proved.  $\square$

**Proof of the Comparison Lemma.**

**Claim.** *For every  $\omega > 0$  small enough for every  $p \in W$  the positive flow line of the field  $(5.7)_2$  through  $p$  in  $W$  lies on the left from the corresponding flow line of the field  $(5.7)_1$ .*

The claim follows from the orientation statement of Proposition 5.12.

Fix an intermediate number  $h'_1 \in (h_0, h_1)$ . Consider the flowbox  $F'_{\alpha_1,+}$  constructed as in Proposition 5.9 with  $\Pi$  replaced by  $\Pi' := \{h'_1 \leq \tau \leq h_2\}$ . One obviously has  $\Pi \cap F'_{\alpha_1,+} = F_{\alpha_1,+}$ . The lengths of horizontal sections of the flowbox  $F'_{\alpha_1,+}$  are uniformly bounded by a quantity  $\exp(-\frac{d}{\omega})$ , with  $d > 0$  independent on  $\omega$  (Proposition 5.9). Take the lower horizontal base of the flowbox  $F'_{\alpha_1,+}$ , which is a segment in the line  $\{\tau = h'_1\}$  with length bounded by the above exponent. Let  $q_1 := (\chi_1, h'_1)$  denote its right boundary point, which lies in the  $(5.7)_1$ -orbit of the end  $(3\pi, h_0)$  of the segment  $I_+$ .

Consider the analogous flowbox  $F'_{\alpha_2,+}$  and point  $q_2 := (\chi_2, h'_1)$  for the field  $(5.7)_2$ . One has  $\chi_2 < \chi_1$ , by the claim. First suppose that  $q_2 \notin F'_{\alpha_1,+}$ . Then the lower base of the flowbox  $F'_{\alpha_2,+}$  is disjoint from the flowbox  $F'_{\alpha_1,+}$  and lies on its left. This together with the above claim implies that the flowboxes are disjoint. In the case, when  $q_2 \in F'_{\alpha_1,+}$ , the image  $q'_2$  of the point  $q_2$  under the time 1 flow map of the field  $(5.7)_2$  would lie strictly to the left from the flowbox  $F'_{\alpha_1,+}$ , by Proposition 5.12. Therefore, the positive orbit of the point  $q'_2$  also lies on its left, by the claim. Note that

$$\tau(q'_2) = \tau(q_2) + \omega = h'_1 + \omega < h_1,$$

whenever  $\omega$  is small enough. Therefore, the above positive orbit intersects the strip  $\Pi = \{h_1 \leq \tau \leq h_2\}$  by an arc of curve going from its lower base to its upper base and lying on the left from the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$ . The latter curve bounds  $F_{\alpha_2,+}$  from the right, by construction. Hence,  $F_{\alpha_2,+}$  is disjoint from  $F_{\alpha_1,+}$  and lies on its left. The Comparison Lemma is proved.  $\square$

## 5.4 The Monotonicity Lemma

Consider two families of vector fields  $(5.7)_j$ ,  $j = 1, 2$  (treated as fields lifted to  $\mathbb{R}^2$ ), as in the Comparison Lemma, corresponding to  $\alpha_1 > 0$  and  $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$ . We study their *Poincaré maps*  $P_j^{\tau_1, \tau_2}$ : the time  $\frac{\tau_2 - \tau_1}{\omega}$  flow maps from the line  $\{\tau = \tau_1\}$  to the line  $\{\tau = \tau_2\}$  considered as functions of the coordinate  $\theta$ . For simplicity, we denote

$$P_j(\theta) := P_j^{0, 2\pi}(\theta).$$

**Lemma 5.13 (Monotonicity Lemma)** *For every  $\omega > 0$  small enough*

$$P_2(\theta) < P_1(\theta) \text{ for every } \theta \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.10)$$

Lemma 5.13 is proved below. In its proof we use the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.14** *Let  $C_0, C_1, C_2, h_k^-, F_{\alpha_j, -}$  be the same, as in Remark 5.10. The intersection of the positive orbit of the segment  $[C_1, C_2]$  under the flow of the field  $(5.7)_j$  with the strip  $\Pi = \{h_1 \leq \tau \leq h_2\}$  lies in the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_j, +}$ . The intersection of the negative orbit of the segment  $[C_0, C_1]$  with the strip  $\Pi_- := \{h_2^- \leq \tau \leq h_1^-\}$  lies in  $F_{\alpha_j, -}$ . See Fig. 9.*

**Proof** It suffices to prove the first statement of the proposition, due to symmetry (Remark 5.10). The segment  $I_+$  defining the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_j, +}$  is horizontal and is obtained from the segment  $[C_1, C_2]$  by vertical shift up. The shift length is fixed and equal to  $h_0 - \pi > 0$ . Let  $J_l$  and  $J_r$  denote respectively the segment connecting  $C_1$  ( $C_2$ ) to the left (respectively, right) endpoint of the segment  $I_+$ . One has  $f_{\alpha_j} > 0$  on  $J_l$  and  $f_{\alpha_j} < 0$  on  $J_r$ , which follows from Remark 5.6 and Proposition 5.8. Thus, on the segment  $J_l$  ( $J_r$ ) the vectors of the field  $(5.7)_j$  are directed to the right (respectively, left). This implies that the time  $\frac{h_0 - \pi}{\omega}$  flow map of the field sends the segment  $[C_1, C_2]$  strictly inside the segment  $I_+$ . This together with the definition of the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_j, \omega}$  implies the first statement of the proposition.  $\square$

**Proof of the Monotonicity Lemma.** Set  $h_j^+ := h_j$ . One has

$$P_j = P_j^{h_1^+, 2\pi} \circ \tilde{P}_j \circ P_j^{0, h_1^-}, \quad \tilde{P}_j := P_j^{h_1^-, h_1^+}. \quad (5.11)$$

**Claim 1.** *Whenever  $\omega$  is small enough, one has  $P_2^{0, h_1^-}(\theta) < P_1^{0, h_1^-}(\theta)$ ,  $P_2^{h_1^+, 2\pi}(\theta) < P_1^{h_1^+, 2\pi}(\theta)$  for every  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ .*

**Proof** Vector fields  $(5.7)_2$  and  $(5.7)_1$  have the same  $\tau$ -components. On the set  $\{\tau \in [0, h_1^-] \cup [h_1^+, 2\pi]\}$  the  $\theta$ -component of the former vector field




Figure 10: Orbits of segments  $[C_0, C_1]$ ,  $[C_1, C_2]$  and points  $a_{j\pm}$ ,  $b_{j\pm}$ .

is less than that of the latter, since  $\cos \tau > 0$  on this set. This implies the inequalities of the claim.  $\square$

Taking into account Claim 1 and (5.11), for the proof of the Monotonicity Lemma it suffices to prove the above inequality for the middle Poincaré maps in (5.11) for all  $\omega$  small enough:

$$\tilde{P}_2(\theta) < \tilde{P}_1(\theta) \text{ for every } \theta \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (5.12)$$

Consider the horizontal lines  $L_{\pm} := \{\tau = h_1^{\pm}\}$ , which are the cross-sections for the Poincaré maps in question. We identify each their point with its  $\theta$ -coordinate. For every  $j = 1, 2$  let  $b_{j\pm}$  denote the point of intersection of the line  $L_{\pm}$  with the orbit of vector field (5.7)<sub>j</sub> through the point  $C_1 = (2\pi, \pi)$ . Let  $a_{j\pm}$  denote the analogous intersection points with the orbit through the point  $C_0 = (\pi, \pi)$ . See Fig. 10.

**Claim 2.** *One has*

$$\begin{aligned} a_{1-} < b_{1-} < a_{2-} < b_{2-} < a_{1-} + 2\pi, \\ a_{2+} < a_{1+} < b_{2+} < a_{2+} + 2\pi < b_{1+} < a_{1+} + 2\pi. \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

**Proof** The points  $a_{j-}$  and  $b_{j-}$  are the images of the points  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  respectively under the Poincaré map  $P_j^{\pi, h_1^-}$ , and  $\theta(C_0) < \theta(C_1)$ , by definition. Hence,  $a_{j-} < b_{j-}$ . The segment  $[a_{j-}, b_{j-}]$  lies in the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_j, -}$ ,



by Proposition 5.14. The flowbox  $F_{\alpha_1,-}$  is disjoint from the flowbox  $F_{\alpha_2,-}$  and lies on the left from it, by the Comparison Lemma. Therefore, the same is true for the corresponding segments  $[a_{1-}, b_{1-}]$  and  $[a_{2-}, b_{2-}]$ . The four endpoints of the latter segments are  $O(\omega)$ -close to each other. Indeed the flowboxes in question are  $O(\omega)$ -close to the right arcs of the corresponding intersections  $\gamma_{\alpha_j}^0 \cap \{h_2^- \leq \tau \leq h_1^-\}$  (Proposition 5.9). The latter arcs are  $\omega$ -close, which follows from the Implicit Function Theorem for the equations defining the curves  $\gamma_{\alpha_j}^0$ . This together with the above discussion proves  $O(\omega)$ -closeness of the four points  $a_{j-}$  and  $b_{j-}$ ,  $j = 1, 2$ . This proves the first part of inequality (5.13). The proof of its second part is analogous.  $\square$

**Proof of inequality (5.12).** It suffices to prove it on the segment  $K := [a_{1-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi] \subset L_-$ , by periodicity. The segment  $K$  is splitted into 4 subsegments by points  $a_{j-}$ ,  $b_{j-}$ . We check inequality (5.12) on each splitting subsegment.

1) Let us start with the segment  $[b_{2-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi]$ . One has

$$\tilde{P}_1([b_{2-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi]) \subset \tilde{P}_1([b_{1-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi]) = [b_{1+}, a_{1+} + 2\pi],$$

$$\tilde{P}_2([b_{2-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi]) \subset \tilde{P}_2([b_{2-}, a_{2-} + 2\pi]) = [b_{2+}, a_{2+} + 2\pi],$$

by (5.13). The latter segment-image in the right-hand side is disjoint from the former one and lies on the left from it, by (5.13). This proves inequality (5.12) on the segment  $[b_{2-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi]$ .

2) Now we consider the segment  $[a_{2-}, b_{2-}]$ . One has

$$\tilde{P}_1([a_{2-}, b_{2-}]) \subset \tilde{P}_1([b_{1-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi]) = [b_{1+}, a_{1+} + 2\pi],$$

$$\tilde{P}_2([a_{2-}, b_{2-}]) = [a_{2+}, b_{2+}], \quad b_{2+} < b_{1+},$$

by (5.13). This proves inequality (5.12) on  $[a_{2-}, b_{2-}]$ .

3) The segment  $[b_{1-}, a_{2-}]$ . One has

$$\tilde{P}_1([b_{1-}, a_{2-}]) \subset \tilde{P}_1([b_{1-}, a_{1-} + 2\pi]) = [b_{1+}, a_{1+} + 2\pi],$$

$$\tilde{P}_2([b_{1-}, a_{2-}]) \text{ lies on the left from the point } a_{2+} = \tilde{P}_2(a_{2-}) < b_{1+},$$

by (5.13). This proves inequality (5.12) on  $[b_{1-}, a_{2-}]$ .

4) The segment  $[a_{1-}, b_{1-}]$ . One has

$$\tilde{P}_1([a_{1-}, b_{1-}]) = [a_{1+}, b_{1+}],$$

$$\tilde{P}_2([a_{1-}, b_{1-}]) \text{ lies on the left from the point } a_{2+} = \tilde{P}_2(a_{2-}) < a_{1+},$$

since  $b_{1-} < a_{2-}$ , see (5.13). This proves inequality (5.12) on  $[a_{1-}, b_{1-}]$ . Inequality (5.12) is proved on all of the segment  $K$ , and hence, on the whole horizontal line  $L_-$ .  $\square$

The statement of the Monotonicity Lemma follows from (5.11), Claim 1 and inequality (5.12).  $\square$

## 5.5 Absence of constrictions with small ordinates

Here we prove the following theorem and then Theorem 1.12.

**Theorem 5.15** *For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\beta > 0$  and every  $\omega > 0$  small enough dependently on  $\ell$  and  $\beta$  there are no constrictions  $(B, A)$  with  $B = \ell\omega$  and  $A \in [1 - \ell\omega, 1 + (\ell - \beta)\omega]$ .*

**Remark 5.16** Absence of constrictions with  $B-1 < A < B+1$ ,  $B = \ell\omega$ , for small  $\omega$  was numerically observed in [43, fig. 2, 3]. Theorem 5.15 confirms a part of this experimental result theoretically.

**Proof of Theorem 5.15.** It suffices to prove the statement of the theorem for arbitrarily small  $\beta$ , e.g.,  $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ . Fix an arbitrary  $\alpha \in (0, \beta)$ , set  $B = \ell\omega$ ,  $A_\alpha = 1 + (\ell - \alpha)\omega$ . The family of systems (5.7) defined by this ordinate family  $A_\alpha$  will be denoted by  $(5.7)_\alpha$ .

Suppose the contrary: there exists a sequence  $\omega_k \rightarrow 0$  such that there exists a sequence of constrictions  $(B_k, A_{\alpha_k})$  with

$$B_k = \ell\omega_k, \quad A_{\alpha_k} = 1 + (\ell - \alpha_k)\omega_k, \quad \beta \leq \liminf \alpha_k \leq \limsup \alpha_k \leq 2\ell.$$

Passing to a subsequence, without loss of generality we can and will consider that  $\alpha_k$  converge to some  $\alpha^* \geq \beta$ . Thus, the sequence of dynamical systems corresponding to the above  $(B_k, A_{\alpha_k})$  can be embedded into a continuous family of systems (5.7) with  $\alpha$  replaced by  $\alpha^*$ . The latter new family of systems (5.7) will be denoted by  $(5.7)_{\alpha^*}$ .

Let  $P$  and  $P^*$  denote respectively the Poincaré maps  $P^{0,2\pi}$  of the line  $\{\tau = 0\}$  to the line  $\{\tau = 2\pi\}$  defined by vector fields  $(5.7)_\alpha$  and  $(5.7)_{\alpha^*}$ . For every  $\omega$  small enough the point  $(B, 1 + (\ell - \alpha)\omega)$  lies in the phase-lock area  $L_\ell$ , by Lemma 5.1 and since  $\alpha < \beta < \frac{1}{2}$ . Therefore, the corresponding system  $(5.7)_\alpha$  has a periodic orbit with rotation number  $\ell$ . This means that there exists a point  $a$  in the  $\theta$ -axis with  $P(a) = a + 2\pi\ell$ . On the other hand,

$$P^* < P, \quad P^*(a) < P(a) = a + 2\pi\ell, \quad \text{whenever } \omega \text{ is small enough,}$$

by the Monotonicity Lemma and since  $\alpha^* \geq \beta > \alpha$ . Therefore, the rotation number of system  $(5.7)_{\alpha^*}$  is no greater than  $\ell$  and  $a$  cannot be its periodic point with rotation number at least  $\ell$  for small  $\omega$ . In particular, the latter statements holds for the systems corresponding to the above constrictions  $(B_k, A_{\alpha_k}) \in \Lambda_\ell$ . On the other hand, the dynamical system (1.3) corresponding to a constriction lying in  $\Lambda_\ell$  should have rotation number at least  $\ell$  and all its orbits should be periodic with rotation number at least  $\ell$ , see [28, theorem 1.2 and proposition 2.2]. The contradiction thus obtained proves Theorem 5.15.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 1.12.** Fix an  $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ . For every  $\omega > 0$  small enough all the constrictions lying in  $\Lambda_\ell$  with ordinates  $A \geq A_{\frac{1}{2}} = 1 + (\ell - \frac{1}{2})\omega$  are positive and lie in the phase-lock area  $L_\ell$  (Lemma 5.1), and there are no constrictions in  $\Lambda_\ell$  with smaller positive ordinates (Theorem 5.15 and statement (5.1)). Theorem 1.12 is proved.  $\square$

## 5.6 Proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.7

Let, to the contrary, there exist a ghost constriction  $(B, A; \omega)$ . Then  $\ell = \frac{B}{\omega} \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ , and without loss of generality we can and will consider that  $\ell \geq 1$  (see the beginning of Section 5). Let  $\mathcal{C}$  denote the connected component of the submanifold  $Constr_\ell \subset (\mathbb{R}_+^2)_{\mu, \eta}$  containing the corresponding point  $(\frac{A}{2\omega}, \omega^{-1})$ . The restriction to  $\mathcal{C}$  of the function  $\omega = \eta^{-1}$  is unbounded from below, while all the constrictions in  $\mathcal{C}$  are ghost (Theorem 1.11). Thus, there exist ghost constrictions with given  $\ell$  and arbitrarily small  $\omega$ . This yields a contradiction to Theorem 1.12 and proves absence of ghost constrictions. The proof of Theorems 1.4 and 1.7 is complete.

# 6 Some applications and open problems

## 6.1 Geometry of phase-lock areas

For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$  let  $\mathcal{P}_\ell = (\ell\omega, A(\mathcal{P}_\ell)) \subset \mathbb{R}_{B,A}^2$  denote the higher generalized simple intersection lying in  $\Lambda_\ell := \{B = \ell\omega\}$ , see Subsection 5.1. Recall that

$$S\ell := \Lambda_\ell \cap \{A \geq A(\mathcal{P}_\ell)\} \subset L_\ell^+ := L_\ell \cap \{A > 0\}, \quad \mathcal{P}_\ell \in \partial L_\ell^+.$$

The **Connectivity Conjecture**, see [29, conjecture 1.14], states that *the intersection  $L_\ell^+ \cap \Lambda_\ell$  coincides with the ray  $S\ell$ , and thus, is connected.*

Theorem 1.7 implies the following corollary

**Corollary 6.1** *Let, to the contrary to the above conjecture, the intersection  $L\Lambda_\ell := L_\ell^+ \cap \Lambda_\ell \cap \{0 < A < A(\mathcal{P}_\ell)\}$  be non-empty. Then its lowest point (i.e., its point with minimal ordinate  $A$ ) is a generalized simple intersection.*

**Proof** The lowest point  $P \in L\Lambda_\ell$  is well-defined, has positive ordinate and lies in  $\partial L_\ell$ , since the growth point in  $L_\ell$ , i.e., its intersection point with the abscissa axis, has abscissa  $\sqrt{\ell^2\omega^2 + 1} > \ell\omega$ . Hence, it is either a constriction, or a generalized simple intersection, by definition. If  $P$  were a constriction, it would be negative, since its lower adjacent interval  $\Lambda_\ell \cap \{0 < A < A(P)\}$  lies outside the phase-lock area  $L_\ell$ . But there are no negative constrictions, by Theorem 1.7. Therefore,  $P$  is a generalized simple intersection.  $\square$

**Remark 6.2** It is known that the generalized simple intersections  $(\ell\omega, A)$  correspond to the parameters  $(\lambda, \mu)$ ,  $\mu = \frac{A}{2\omega}$ ,  $\lambda = \frac{1}{4\omega^2} - \mu^2$ , of those special double confluent Heun equations (1.8) that have polynomial solutions. The set of the latter parameters  $(\lambda, \mu)$  is a remarkable algebraic curve: the so-called *spectral curve*  $\Gamma_\ell \subset \mathbb{R}_{(\lambda, \mu)}^2$  introduced in [19] and studied in [19, 30]. It is the zero locus of the polynomial from [19, formula (21)], which is the determinant of a three-diagonal matrix formed by diagonal terms of type  $\lambda + \text{const}$  and linear functions in  $\mu$  at off-diagonal places. See also [30, formula (1.4)]. (The complexification of the spectral curve is known to be irreducible, see [30, theorem 1.3].) For every given  $\omega > 0$  the curve  $\Gamma_\ell$  contains at most  $\ell$  points  $(\lambda, \mu)$  corresponding to the given  $\omega$  with  $\mu > 0$ ; the point with the biggest  $\mu$  corresponds to the higher generalized simple intersection  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ . This follows from Bézout Theorem and the fact that the spectral curve  $\Gamma_\ell$  is the zero locus of a polynomial of degree  $\ell$  in  $(\lambda, \mu^2)$ , see [19, p. 937].

Corollary 6.1 and the above remark reduce the Connectivity Conjecture to the following equivalent, algebro-geometric conjecture.

**Conjecture 6.3** For every  $\omega > 0$  the above real spectral curve  $\Gamma_\ell$  contains a unique point  $(\lambda, \mu)$  with  $\lambda = \frac{1}{4\omega^2} - \mu^2$  (up to change of sign at  $\mu$ ) for which the corresponding rotation number  $\rho = \rho(\ell\omega, 2\mu\omega)$  equals  $\ell$ . (The point  $(B, A) = (\ell\omega, 2\mu\omega)$  coincides with  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$ , see the above remark.)

**Theorem 6.4** *For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$  and every positive  $\omega < \frac{1}{|\ell|}$  the Connectivity Conjecture holds.*

**Proof** Let, say,  $\ell > 0$ , and let  $0 < \omega < \frac{1}{\ell}$ . Then for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $0 < r < \ell$ , the boundary  $\partial L_r$  intersects  $\Lambda_\ell^+ := \Lambda_\ell \cap \{A > 0\}$  in at least two points with

positive ordinates. Indeed, the abscissa  $\sqrt{r^2\omega^2 + 1}$  of the growth point of the phase-lock area  $L_r$  is greater than  $\ell\omega < 1$ . On the other hand, each boundary curve of the area  $L_r$  contains constrictions, which lie in the axis  $\Lambda_r$ , and hence, on the left from the axis  $\Lambda_\ell$ . Hence, each boundary curve intersects  $\Lambda_\ell^+$  in at least one point (this statement is given by [30, theorem 1.18] for all  $\omega$  small enough). It cannot be a common intersection point for both boundary curves, i.e., it cannot be a constriction, since  $r = \rho < \ell$  and by Theorem 1.4. Therefore, the intersection  $\partial L_r \cap \Lambda_\ell^+$  contains at least two distinct points. Analogously,  $\partial L_0$  intersects  $\Lambda_\ell^+$  in at least one point, since the point  $(1, 0) \in \partial L_0$  lies on the right from the point  $(\ell\omega, 0) \in \Lambda_\ell$ . If  $0 \leq r < \ell$  and  $r \equiv \ell \pmod{2}$ , then each point of intersection  $\partial L_r \cap \Lambda_\ell^+$  is a generalized simple intersection. Taking these intersections for all latter  $r$  yields  $\ell - 1$  distinct generalized simple intersections lying in  $\Lambda_\ell^+$ . But the total number of generalized simple intersections in  $\Lambda_\ell^+$  is no greater than  $\ell$ , see the above remark. Therefore, at most one of them may correspond to the rotation number  $\ell$ , and hence, is reduced to the known generalized simple intersection  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$  with  $\rho = \ell$ . In particular, there are no generalized simple intersections in  $\Lambda_\ell$  with  $0 < A < A(\mathcal{P}_\ell)$ . This together with Corollary 6.1 implies that  $L_\ell^+ \cap \Lambda_\ell = S\ell$  and proves the Connectivity Conjecture for  $0 < \omega < \frac{1}{|\ell|}$ .  $\square$

**Problem 6.5** [13, subsection 5.8] What is the asymptotic behavior of the phase-lock area portrait in family (1.2), as  $\omega \rightarrow 0$ ?

This problem is known and motivated by physical applications. V.M.Buchstaber, S.I.Tertychnyi and later by D.A.Filimonov, V.A.Kleptsyn, I.V.Schurov performed numerical experiences studying limit behavior of the phase-lock area after appropriate rescaling of the variables  $(B, A)$ . Their experiences have shown that the interiors of the phase-lock areas tend to open subsets (the so-called *limit rescaled phase-lock areas*) whose connected components form a partition of the plane. In some planar region, the latter partition looks like a chess table turned by  $\frac{\pi}{4}$ . It would be interesting to prove this mathematically and to find the boundaries of the limit phase-lock areas.

Some results on smallness of gaps between rescaled phase-lock areas for small  $\omega$  were obtained in [43].

To our opinion, methods elaborated in [43] and in the present paper could be applied to study Problem 6.5.

## 6.2 The dynamical isomonodromic foliation

Let us consider family (1.3) modeling overdamped Josephson junction as a three-dimensional family, with variable frequency  $\omega$ . Its *three-dimensional phase-lock areas* in  $\mathbb{R}_{B,A,\omega}^3$  are defined in the same way, as in Definition 1.1. Each three-dimensional phase-lock area is fibered by two-dimensional phase-lock areas in  $\mathbb{R}_{B,A}^2$  corresponding to different fixed values of  $\omega$ .

Linear systems (1.6) corresponding to (1.3) form a transversal hypersurface to the isomonodromic foliation of the 4-dimensional manifold  $\mathbf{J}^N(\mathbb{R}_+)$  (Lemma 3.18). It appears that there is another four-dimensional manifold with the latter property that has the following advantage: it consists of linear systems on  $\overline{\mathbb{C}}$  coming from a family of dynamical systems on 2-torus. Namely, consider the following four-dimensional family of dynamical systems on  $\mathbb{T}^2$  containing (1.3):

$$\frac{d\theta}{d\tau} = \nu + a \cos \theta + s \cos \tau + \psi \cos(\theta - \tau); \quad \nu, a, \psi \in \mathbb{R}, \quad s > 0, \quad (a, \psi) \neq (0, 0). \quad (6.1)$$

The variable changes  $\Phi = e^{i\theta}$ ,  $z = e^{i\tau}$  transform (6.1) to the Riccati equation

$$\frac{d\Phi}{dz} = \frac{1}{z^2} \left( \frac{s}{2}\Phi + \frac{\psi}{2}\Phi^2 \right) + \frac{1}{z} \left( \nu\Phi + \frac{a}{2}(\Phi^2 + 1) \right) + \left( \frac{s}{2}\Phi + \frac{\psi}{2} \right).$$

A function  $\Phi(z)$  is a solution of the latter Riccati equation, if and only if  $\Phi(z) = \frac{Y_2(z)}{Y_1(z)}$ , where  $Y = (Y_1, Y_2)(z)$  is a solution of the linear system

$$Y' = \left( -s \frac{\mathbf{K}}{z^2} + \frac{\mathbf{R}}{z} + s\mathbf{N} \right) Y, \quad (6.2)$$

$$\mathbf{K} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & \chi \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{R} = \begin{pmatrix} -b & -\frac{a}{2} \\ \frac{a}{2} & \chi a \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{N} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ \chi & 0 \end{pmatrix};$$

$$\chi = \frac{\psi}{2s}, \quad b = \nu - \frac{\psi}{2s}a = \nu - \chi a.$$

The residue matrix of the formal normal forms of system (6.2) at 0 and at  $\infty$  is the same and equal to

$$\text{diag}(-\ell, 0), \quad \ell := b - \chi a = \nu - \frac{\psi a}{2s}. \quad (6.3)$$

**Theorem 6.6** *The four-dimensional family of linear systems (6.2) is analytically foliated by one-dimensional isomonodromic families defined by the*

following non-autonomous system of differential equations:

$$\begin{cases} \chi'_s = \frac{a-2\chi(\ell+2\chi a)}{2s} \\ a'_s = -2s\chi + \frac{a}{s}(\ell + 2\chi a) \\ \ell'_s = 0 \end{cases} \quad (6.4)$$

For every  $\ell \in \mathbb{R}$  the function

$$w(s) := \frac{a(s)}{2s\chi(s)} = \frac{a(s)}{\psi(s)} \quad (6.5)$$

satisfies Painlevé 3 equation (3.16) along solutions of (6.4).

**Proof** The composition of variable rescalings  $z = s^{-1}\zeta$  and gauge transformations

$$Y = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -2\chi & 1 \end{pmatrix} \tilde{Y} \quad (6.6)$$

sends family (6.2) to the following family of linear systems:

$$Y'_\zeta = \left( -\frac{t}{\zeta^2}K + \frac{R}{z} + \text{diag}\left(-\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \right) Y, \quad (6.7)$$

$$t = s^2, \quad K = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} - 2\chi^2 & \chi \\ \chi(1 - 4\chi^2) & 2\chi^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} -\ell & -\frac{a}{2} \\ -2\chi(\ell + \chi a) + \frac{a}{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Let  $\mathcal{J}$  denote the space of Jimbo type systems with real matrices. Systems (6.7) lie in  $\mathcal{J}$ , since the formal normal forms of a system (6.2) at  $0, \infty$  have common residue matrix  $\text{diag}(-\ell, 0)$ . Every system  $\mathcal{L}_0$  of type (6.7) with  $\chi \neq 0$  has a neighborhood  $W = W(\mathcal{L}) \subset \mathcal{J}$  where family (6.7) forms a hypersurface  $\mathcal{X} \subset W$  so that each system  $\mathcal{L} \in W$  can be projected to a system  $\mathcal{L}^* \in \mathcal{X}$  by a diagonal gauge transformation  $(Y_1, Y_2) \mapsto (Y_1, \lambda Y_2)$ ,  $\lambda = \lambda(\mathcal{L})$ . Therefore, the Jimbo isomonodromic foliation of the neighborhood  $W$  can be projected to an isomonodromic foliation on  $\mathcal{X}$  along the fibration by local orbits of diagonal gauge transformation group, as in Remark 3.12. The vector field tangent to thus obtained isomonodromic foliation on  $\mathcal{X}$  is given by projection to  $T\mathcal{X}$  of the vectors of field (3.7) at points in  $\mathcal{X}$ . A direct calculation of the latter projected field yields (6.4). Painlevé 3 (3.16) equation on  $w(s)$  along isomonodromic families thus constructed follows from Theorem 3.9, since diagonal gauge transformations do not change the ratio  $\frac{R_{12}}{K_{12}}$ . Equation (3.16) can be also deduced directly from (6.4).  $\square$

The foliation from Theorem 6.6 given by (6.4) induces a one-dimensional foliation in the 4-dimensional space of dynamical systems (6.1) given by

the following non-autonomous system of equations obtained from (6.4) by change of the variable  $\chi$  to  $\psi = 2s\chi$ :

$$\begin{cases} \psi'_s = a + (1 - \ell)\frac{\psi}{s} - \frac{a\psi^2}{s^2} \\ a'_s = -\psi + \ell\frac{a}{s} + \frac{\psi a^2}{s^2}. \end{cases} \quad (6.8)$$

The latter foliation of family (6.1) given by (6.8) will be denoted by  $\mathcal{G}$  and called the *dynamical isomonodromic foliation*.

**Lemma 6.7** *The conjugacy class of flow (6.1) under diffeomorphisms  $\mathbb{T}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{T}^2$  isotopic to identity, its rotation number and  $\ell$ , see (6.3), are constant on leaves of the dynamical isomonodromic foliation  $\mathcal{G}$ . The hypersurface of systems (1.3) modeling Josephson junction is transversal to  $\mathcal{G}$ . The function  $w(s) = \frac{a(s)}{\psi(s)}$ , see (6.5), satisfies Painlevé 3 equation (3.16) along its leaves. A point  $(s, \psi, a, \ell)$  corresponds to a system (1.3), if and only if  $\psi = 0$ ; this holds if and only if the function  $w$  has pole of order 1 at  $s$  with residue 1.*

**Proof** The projectivized monodromy of linear system (6.2) is the complexification of the Poincaré map of the corresponding dynamical system (6.1). Therefore, constance of its conjugacy class along leaves implies constance of conjugacy class of the Poincaré map and hence, of the flow and of its rotation number;  $\ell = \text{const}$ , by Theorem 6.6. Family of systems (1.3) coincides with the hypersurface  $\{\psi = 0\} \cap \{a > 0\}$  in the parameter space. It is transversal to the vector field (6.8), since  $\psi' = a > 0$  at all its points. The characterization of systems (1.3) in terms of poles follows from construction and Lemma 3.17 and, on the other hand, immediately from (6.8): if  $\psi(s_0) = 0$ , then  $\psi(s) \simeq a(s_0)(s - s_0)$ ,  $w(s) = \frac{a}{\psi(s)} \simeq \frac{1}{s - s_0}$ , as  $s \rightarrow s_0$ , and vice versa.  $\square$

Recall that the growth point of a two-dimensional phase-lock area  $L_r$  has abscissa  $\text{sign}(r)\sqrt{r^2\omega^2 + 1}$ . For a given  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$  the latter growth points form a curve bijectively parametrized by  $\omega > 0$  in the three-dimensional parameter space, which will be called the *r-th growth curve*. We already know that the family of constrictions in  $\mathbb{R}_{B,A}^2 \times (\mathbb{R}_+)_{\omega}$  is a one-dimensional submanifold, by Theorem 1.11. Thus, it is a disjoint union of connected curves, which will be called the *constriction curves*.

In what follows the three-dimensional phase-lock area in  $\mathbb{R}_{B,A}^2 \times (\mathbb{R}_+)_{\omega}$  with a rotation number  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  will be denoted by  $\widehat{L}_r$ .

**Conjecture 6.8** Each constriction curve is bijectively projected onto  $(\mathbb{R}_+)_{\omega}$ . Each three-dimensional phase-lock area of family (1.3) is a countable garland of domains, where any two adjacent domains are separated either by the corresponding growth curve, or by a constriction curve.



**Remark 6.9** Conjecture 6.8 **does not** follow from known results on two-dimensional phase-lock area. A priori, a constriction curve may be not bijectively projected to the  $\omega$ -axis, and the projection may have some critical value  $\omega_0$  that is a local maximum (minimum). In this case the corresponding two-dimensional phase-lock area with  $\omega$  less (greater) than  $\omega_0$  has two constrictions that collide for  $\omega = \omega_0$  and disappear, when  $\omega$  crosses the critical value  $\omega_0$ . Numerical experiences made by S.I.Tertychnyi, D.A.Filimonov, V.A.Kleptsyn, I.V.Schurov show that such a scenario does not arise. This can be viewed as a numerical confirmation of Conjecture 6.8.

**Remark 6.10** In each two-dimensional phase-lock area  $L_r$  the constrictions lying in the half-plane  $\{A > 0\}$  are ordered by natural numbers  $k$  corresponding to their heights: the lowest constriction is ordered by 1, the second one by two, etc. If Conjecture 6.8 is true, then along each constriction curve  $\mathcal{C}$  lying in the upper quarter-space  $\{A > 0\}$  the above height number is constant. In this case each constriction curve  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_{\ell,k} \subset \{A > 0\}$  is numerated by two integer numbers

$$\ell = \rho = \frac{B}{\omega}, \quad k := \text{the above height number.}$$

Studying of the following two problems, which are of independent interest, would have important applications to Conjecture 6.8 and related problems.

**Problem 6.11** Study the Poincaré map of the dynamical isomonodromic foliation  $\mathcal{G}$ , see (6.8), acting on the transversal hypersurface given by family of systems (1.3). The Poincaré map sends the intersection of its definition domain with each three-dimensional phase-lock area in family (1.3) to the same phase-lock area, by constance of the rotation number along leaves. *Study the action of the Poincaré map of the foliation  $\mathcal{G}$  given by (6.8) on the three-dimensional phase-lock area portrait of family (1.3).*

**Problem 6.12** Is it true that the above Poincaré map is well-defined on each constriction curve  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell,k}$  and sends it diffeomorphically onto  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell,k+1}$ ?

If Conjecture 6.8 is true, then for every  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a unique connected component  $\mathcal{O}_{\ell,k}$  of the interior of the three-dimensional phase-lock area  $\widehat{L}_\ell$  that is adjacent to the constriction curves  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell,k}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\ell,k+1}$ .

**Problem 6.13** Is it true that the Poincaré map of the foliation  $\mathcal{G}$  is well-defined on each component  $\mathcal{O}_{\ell,k}$  and sends it diffeomorphically onto  $\mathcal{O}_{\ell,k+1}$ ? Is it a well-defined diffeomorphism on a neighborhood of the closure  $\overline{\mathcal{O}_{\ell,k}}$ ?

What is the intersection of its definition domain with the component of the phase-lock area  $\widehat{L}_\ell$  adjacent to  $\mathcal{O}_{\ell,1}$  and to the corresponding growth curve? How does it act there?

**Remark 6.14** The Poincaré map of the foliation  $\mathcal{G}$  (where it is defined) can be viewed as the suspension over the map sending a given simple pole  $s_0 > 0$  with residue 1 of solution  $w(s)$  of Painlevé 3 equation (3.16) to its next pole  $s_1 > s_0$  of the same type (if any). Many solutions of (3.16) have an infinite lattice of simple poles with residue 1 converging to  $+\infty$ . Our Painlevé 3 equations (3.16) admit one-dimensional family of Bessel type solutions of (3.16), see [24], whose poles are zeros of solutions of Bessel equation and are known to form an infinite lattice. Victor Novokshenov's recent numerical experience has shown that their small deformations also have an infinite lattice of poles. Few solutions, e.g., the *tronquée solutions* [48], are bounded on some semi-interval  $[C, +\infty)$ , and hence, do not have poles there.

**Problem 6.15** Describe those parameter values of family (1.3) for which the corresponding solution  $w(s)$  of (3.16) is *tronquée*. Is it true that this holds for some special points of boundaries of the three-dimensional phase-lock areas? *Does this hold for the higher generalized simple intersections  $\mathcal{P}_\ell$  discussed in Subsection 6.1.*

**Problem 6.16** Study geometry of phase-lock areas<sup>6</sup> in four-dimensional family (6.1) of dynamical systems on  $\mathbb{T}^2$ . Study special points of boundaries of the phase-lock areas: analogues of growth points, constrictions and generalized simple intersections.

Let  $\Sigma$  denote the subfamily in (6.1) consisting of dynamical systems with trivial Poincaré map. The value  $\ell = \nu - \frac{\psi a}{2s}$  corresponding to a system in  $\Sigma$  should be integer, as in Proposition 4.6, and its rotation number  $\rho$  is also integer. For every  $\ell, \rho \in \mathbb{Z}$  let  $\Sigma_{\ell, \rho} \subset \Sigma$  denote the subset consisting of systems with given  $\ell$  and  $\rho$ . Those systems (1.3) with given  $\ell$  that correspond to constrictions are contained in  $\Sigma_{\ell, \ell}$ , by Theorem 1.4.

**Problem 6.17** Is it true that systems (1.3) with given  $\ell$  corresponding to constrictions lie in one connected component of the set  $\Sigma_{\ell, \ell}$ ?

---

<sup>6</sup>Recently it was observed by V.M.Buchstaber and the second author (A.A.Glutsyuk) that the rotation number quantization effect holds in family (6.1): phase-lock areas exist only for integer values of the rotation number. The proof is the same, as in [17].

**Remark 6.18** A positive solution of Conjecture 6.8 would imply positive answer to Problem 6.17.

To our opinion, a progress in studying the above problems would have applications to problems on geometry of phase-lock areas, for example, to problems discussed in the previous subsection.

Studying Conjectures 6.3, 6.8 and Problems 6.11, 6.16, 6.17 is a work in progress.

## 7 Acknowledgements

We are grateful to V.M.Buchstaber and Yu.S.Ilyashenko for attracting our attention to problems on model of Josephson effect and helpful discussions. We are grateful to them and to M.Bertola, E.Ghys, V.I.Gromak, M.Mazzocco, V.Yu.Novokshenov, V.N.Roubtsov, I.V.Schurov, S.I.Tertychnyi, I.V.Vyugin for helpful discussions. We are grateful to S.I.Tertychnyi for the figure of different types of constrictions, for careful reading the paper and helpful remarks.

## References

- [1] Anderson, P. W.; Rowell, J. M. *Probable observation of the Josephson tunnel effect*. Phys. Rev. Lett. **10** (6) (1963): 230–232.
- [2] Arnold, V. I. *Geometrical Methods in the Theory of Ordinary Differential Equations*. Second edition. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 250. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1988.
- [3] Arnold, V. I.; Ilyashenko, Yu. S. *Ordinary differential equations*. In: Dynamical Systems I, Encyclopaedia Math. Sci. (1988), 1–148.
- [4] W. Balser, W. B. Jurkat, D. A. Lutz, *A general theory of invariants for meromorphic differential equations. I. Formal invariants*. Funkcialaj Ekvacioj, **22**:2 (1979), 197–221.
- [5] Balser, W.; Jurkat, W.B.; Lutz, D.A. *Birkhoff invariants and Stokes' multipliers for meromorphic linear differential equations*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **71** (1979), no. 1, 48–94.

- [6] Barone, A.; Paterno, G. *Physics and Applications of the Josephson Effect*. John Wiley and Sons, New York–Chichester–Brisbane–Toronto–Singapore, 1982.
- [7] Bibilo, Y.; Glutsyuk, A.A. *On family of constrictions in model of overdamped Josephson junction*. To appear in Russ. Math. Surveys.
- [8] Bizyaev, I.A.; Borisov, A.V.; Mamaev, I.S. *The Hess–Appelrot case and quantization of the rotation number*. Reg. Chaot. Dyn., **22:2** (2017), 180–196.
- [9] Bolibruch, A.A. *The Riemann–Hilbert problem on the complex projective line*. [In Russian.] Mat. Zametki, **46** (1989), No. 3, 118–120.
- [10] Bolibruch, A. *Inverse problems for linear differential equations with meromorphic coefficients*. Isomonodromic Deformations and Applications in Physics (Montréal, 2000), CRM Proceeding and Lecture Notes, **31** (2002), 3–25.
- [11] Bolibruch, A.A. *Inverse monodromy problems in analytic theory of differential equations*. [In Russian.] Moscow, MCCME, 2018.
- [12] Buchstaber, V.M.; Glutsyuk, A.A. *On determinants of modified Bessel functions and entire solutions of double confluent Heun equations*. Nonlinearity, **29** (2016), 3857–3870.
- [13] Buchstaber, V.M.; Glutsyuk, A.A. *On monodromy eigenfunctions of Heun equations and boundaries of phase-lock areas in a model of overdamped Josephson effect*. Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., **297** (2017), 50–89.
- [14] Buchstaber, V.M.; Karpov, O.V.; Tertychniy, S.I. *Electrodynamic properties of a Josephson junction biased with a sequence of  $\delta$ -function pulses*. J. Exper. Theoret. Phys., **93** (2001), No.6, 1280–1287.
- [15] Buchstaber, V.M.; Karpov, O.V.; Tertychniy, S.I. *On properties of the differential equation describing the dynamics of an overdamped Josephson junction*, Russian Math. Surveys, **59:2** (2004), 377–378.
- [16] Buchstaber, V.M.; Karpov, O.V.; and Tertychniy, S.I. *Peculiarities of dynamics of a Josephson junction shifted by a sinusoidal SHF current*. [In Russian.] Radiotekhnika i Elektronika, **51:6** (2006), 757–762.
- [17] Buchstaber, V.M.; Karpov, O.V.; Tertychniy, S.I. *The rotation number quantization effect*. Theoret and Math. Phys., **162** (2010), No. 2, 211–221.

- [18] Buchstaber, V.M.; Karpov, O.V.; Tertychnyi, S.I. *The system on torus modeling the dynamics of Josephson junction*. Russ. Math. Surveys, **67** (2012), No.1, 178–180.
- [19] Buchstaber, V.M.; Tertychnyi, S.I. *Explicit solution family for the equation of the resistively shunted Josephson junction model*. Theoret. and Math. Phys., **176** (2013), No.2, 965–986.
- [20] Buchstaber, V.M.; Tertychnyi, S.I. *Holomorphic solutions of the double confluent Heun equation associated with the RSJ model of the Josephson junction*. Theoret. and Math. Phys., **182:3** (2015), 329–355.
- [21] Buchstaber, V.M.; Tertychnyi, S.I. *A remarkable sequence of Bessel matrices*. Mathematical Notes, **98** (2015), No. 5, 714–724.
- [22] Buchstaber, V.M.; Tertychnyi, S.I. *Automorphisms of solution space of special double confluent Heun equations*. Funct. Anal. Appl., **50:3** (2016), 176–192.
- [23] Buchstaber, V.M.; Tertychnyi, S.I. *Representations of the Klein group determined by quadruples of polynomials associated with the double confluent Heun equation*. Math. Notes, **103:3** (2018), 357–371.
- [24] Conte, R. (editor) *Painlevé property: one century later*. CRM series in mathematical physics, 1999.
- [25] Fokas, A.S.; Its, A.R.; Kapaev, A.A.; Novokshenov, V.Yu. *Painlevé Transcendents: The Riemann-Hilbert Approach*. Amer. Math. Soc., 2006.
- [26] Foote, R.L., *Geometry of the Prytz Planimeter*. Reports on Math. Phys. **42:1/2** (1998), 249–271.
- [27] Foote, R.L.; Levi, M.; Tabachnikov, S. *Tractrices, bicycle tire tracks, hatchet planimeters, and a 100-year-old conjecture*. Amer. Math. Monthly, **103** (2013), 199–216.
- [28] Glutsyuk, A.A.; Kleptsyn, V.A.; Filimonov, D.A.; Schurov, I.V. *On the adjacency quantization in an equation modeling the Josephson effect*. Funct. Analysis and Appl., **48** (2014), No.4, 272–285.
- [29] Glutsyuk A. *On constrictions of phase-lock areas in model of overdamped Josephson effect and transition matrix of the double-confluent Heun equation*. J. Dyn. Control Syst. **25** (2019), Issue 3, 323–349.

- [30] Glutsyuk, A.; Netay, I. *On spectral curves and complexified boundaries of phase-lock areas in a model of Josephson junction*. – J. Dyn. Control Systems, 26 (2020), 785–820.
- [31] Grauert, H. *Ein Theorem der analytischen Garbentheorie und die Modulräume komplexer Strukturen*. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci., Publ. Math. **5** (1960), 1–64.
- [32] Griffiths, Ph.; Harris, J., *Principles of algebraic geometry*, John Wiley & Sons, New York - Chichester - Brisbane - Toronto, 1978.
- [33] Gromak, V.I.; Laine, I; Shimomura, S. *Painlevé Differential Equations in the Complex Plane*. Walter de Gruyter Berlin – New York, 2002
- [34] Ilyashenko, Yu.S. *Lectures of the summer school “Dynamical systems”*. Poprad, Slovak Republic, 2009.
- [35] Ilyashenko, Yu.; Guckenheimer, J. *The duck and the devil: canards on the staircase*. Moscow Math. J., **1** (2001), No.1, 27–47.
- [36] Ilyashenko, Yu.S.; Filimonov, D.A.; Ryzhov, D.A. *Phase-lock effect for equations modeling resistively shunted Josephson junctions and for their perturbations*. Funct. Analysis and its Appl. **45** (2011), No. 3, 192–203.
- [37] Ilyashenko, Yu. S.; Khovanskii, A. G. *Galois groups, Stokes operators, and a theorem of Ramis*. Functional Anal. Appl., **24:4** (1990), 286–296.
- [38] Jimbo, M. *Monodromy Problem and the Boundary Condition for Some Painlevé Equations*. Publ. RIMS, Kyoto Univ. **18** (1982), Issue 3, 1137–1161.
- [39] Jimbo, M.; Miwa, T.; Ueno, K. *Monodromy Preserving Deformations of Linear Ordinary Differential Equations with Rational Coefficients (I)*. Physica D, **2** (1981), 306–352.
- [40] Jimbo, M.; Miwa, T.; Ueno, K. *Monodromy Preserving Deformation of Linear Ordinary Differential Equations with Rational Coefficients II*. Physica D, **2** (1981), 407–448.
- [41] Josephson, B.D., *Possible new effects in superconductive tunnelling*. Phys. Lett., **1** (1962), No. 7, 251–253.
- [42] Jurkat, W.B.; Lutz, D.A.; Peyerimhoff, A. *Birkhoff invariants and effective calculations for meromorphic linear differential equations*. J. Math. Anal. Appl. **53** (1976), no. 2, 438–470.

- [43] Kleptsyn, V.A.; Romaskevich, O.L.; Schurov, I.V. *Josephson effect and slow-fast systems*. [In Russian.] *Nanostuctures. Mathematical physics and Modelling*, **8** (2013), 31–46.
- [44] Klimenko, A.V.; Romaskevich, O.L. *Asymptotic properties of Arnold tongues and Josephson effect*. *Mosc. Math. J.*, **14:2** (2014), 367–384.
- [45] Lyapunov, A.M. *On one property of the differential equations of the problem of movement of a heavy solid body with a fixed point*. *Comm. of Kharkov Math. Society*, **IV**.
- [46] Levinson, Y. *Quantum noise in a current-biased Josephson junction*. *Phys. Rev. B* **67** (2003), 184504.
- [47] Likharev, K.K.; Ulrikh, B.T. *Systems with Josephson junctions: Basic Theory*. [In Russian.] *Izdat. MGU, Moscow*, 1978.
- [48] Lin Y., Dai D., Tibboel P., *Existence and uniqueness of tronquée solutions of the third and fourth Painlevé equations*, *Nonlinearity* **27** (2014), 171–186.
- [49] Malyutin, A.V. *The rotation number integer quantization effect in braid groups*. *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **305:1** (2019), 182–194. (The special volume dedicated to V.M.Buchstaber’s 75-ths birthday.)
- [50] McCumber, D.E. *Effect of ac impedance on dc voltage-current characteristics of superconductor weak-link junctions*, *J. Appl. Phys.*, **39** (1968), No.7, 3113–3118.
- [51] Mlodzejewski, B.C.; Nekrassov, P.A. *On conditions of existence of asymptotic periodic movement in Hess’ problem*. *Proc. Physical Science Department of the Imperial Society of Amateurs of Natural Sciences*, **VI** (1893).
- [52] Nekrassov, P.A. *Étude analytique d’un cas de mouvement d’un corps pesant autour d’un point fixe*. *Mat. Sb.*, **18** (1896), No. 2, 161–274,
- [53] Röhrli, H. *On holomorphic families of fiber bundles over the Riemannian sphere*. *Mem. Coll. Sci. Univ. Kyoto, Ser. A*, **XXXIII** (1961), No. 3, 435–477.
- [54] Salatich, A.A.; Slavyanov, S.Yu. *Antiquantization of the double confluent Heun equations. The Teukolsky equation*. *Rus. J. Non-lin. Dyn.*, **15:1** (2019), 79–85.

- [55] Schmidt, V.V., *Introduction to physics of superconductors*. [In Russian.] MCCME, Moscow, 2000.
- [56] Shapiro, S.; Janus, A.; Holly, S. *Effect of microwaves on Josephson currents in superconducting tunneling*, Rev. Mod. Phys., **36** (1964), 223–225.
- [57] Sibuya, Y. *Stokes phenomena*. Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., **83** (1977), 1075–1077.
- [58] Slavyanov, S.Yu. *Painlevé equations as classical analogues of Heun equations*. J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., **29** (1996), 7329–7335.
- [59] Slavyanov, S.Yu.; Stesik, O.L. *Antiquantization of deformed Heun-class equations*. Theoret. and Math. Phys., 2016, 186:1, 118–125.
- [60] Stewart, W.C., *Current-voltage characteristics of Josephson junctions*. Appl. Phys. Lett., **12** (1968), No. 8, 277–280.
- [61] Tertychnyi, S.I. *Long-term behavior of solutions of the equation  $\dot{\phi} + \sin \phi = f$  with periodic  $f$  and the modeling of dynamics of overdamped Josephson junctions*. Preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0512058>.
- [62] Tertychnyi, S.I. *The modeling of a Josephson junction and Heun polynomials*. Preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0601064>.
- [63] Zhukovsky, N.E. *Hess' Loxodromic Pendulum*. [in Russian] In Collected Works **1** (1937), Moscow, Gostekhizdat, 332–348.