

Hamiltonian Dynamics as the Engine of Biological Computation

Hamiltonian

Dynamics as the Engine of Biological Computation

Linking

Gamma Oscillations to Scale-Inseparable Memory

Author: Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzinis **Contact:** rowan.quni@outlook.com **ORCID:** 0009-0002-4317-5604 **ISNI:** 0000000526456062 **URL:** <https://papers.qnfo.org/papers/hamiltonian-dynamics-as-the-engine-of-biological-computation/> **Date:** 2026-01-09 **Version:** 1.0

Abstract

This study investigates the physical basis of biological computation, focusing on the tension between static structuralism and dynamic evolution. Utilizing a Hamiltonian formulation of the Kuramoto model, we simulate a biological reservoir to rigorously evaluate the relationship between “Scale Inseparability” (coupling strength), Gamma oscillations (30-50 Hz), and computational utility. Our results demonstrate that biological Hamiltonian dynamics achieve ****superior dynamic stability and a 3.1x thermodynamic efficiency advantage**** over discrete digital baselines. However, we identify a critical “Readout Gap”: while the system forms stable, energy-minimized synchronization manifolds capable of protecting information, standard linear regression fails to decode this phase-encoded memory ($MC \approx 0$). This finding suggests that biological “memory” is physically instantiated as Hamiltonian energy minimization, but its extraction requires non-linear, phase-aware readout mechanisms distinct from those used in von Neumann architectures.

Keywords: Biological Reservoir Computing, Hamiltonian Dynamics, Gamma Oscillations, Scale Inseparability, Neuromorphic Engineering, Thermodynamic Efficiency

1.0 Introduction

1.1 The Static

vs. Dynamic Tension in Computation

The fundamental architecture of contemporary computing remains deeply rooted in the von Neumann paradigm, where the “state” of a system is defined by static structural configurations—specifically, the discrete charge levels in memory cells and the fixed logic of processor gates. This **static structuralism** views computation as the manipulation of symbolic representations, separated rigidly from the physical substrate that executes them (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025). While this abstraction has enabled the exponential scaling of digital technology, it faces a growing epistemic and thermodynamic crisis when compared to biological intelligence. Biological systems do not compute by manipulating static states; rather, they rely on ****continuous Hamiltonian evolution****, where the computation is intrinsic to the physical dynamics of the substrate itself (Chiba et al., 2024).

In this biological paradigm, the “algorithm” is not a set of instructions executed *on* hardware, but rather the natural relaxation of the system’s energy landscape toward a stable minimum (Greydanus et al., 2019). This distinction creates a core tension in neuromorphic engineering: the conflict between the precise, error-corrected recall of digital systems and the energy-efficient dynamic stability of biological wetware. Conventional approaches attempt to

simulate biological dynamics on static digital hardware, incurring massive energetic penalties for every simulated oscillation. True biological computation, however, leverages the physics of the substrate—specifically the tendency of coupled oscillators to synchronize—to perform computation “for free” as part of the system’s natural thermodynamic evolution. Resolving this tension requires moving beyond metaphors of neural networks to a physics-instantiated understanding of how dynamic stability encodes information.

1.2 Biological

Reservoir Computing: The Bridge

To bridge the gap between abstract biological theory and practical engineering, **Biological Reservoir Computing (BRC)** has emerged as a critical experimental methodology. Unlike traditional Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) that require computationally expensive training of internal weights, BRC utilizes the natural, untrained dynamics of a physical substrate—such as a network of coupled oscillators—to map input signals into high-dimensional state space (Chiba et al., 2024). The reservoir acts as a dynamic kernel, separating complex input patterns through its intrinsic non-linearities before a simple, trained readout layer decodes the result.

This approach aligns with the principle of **criticality**, where the reservoir operates at the edge of chaos, balancing the order required for memory with the disorder required for separability (Wang et al., 2021). By harnessing physical substrates like the Kuramoto model, BRC allows us to test theoretical claims about “biological computation” in a rigorous, quantifiable environment. It serves as a translation layer, converting the vague notions of “emergence” into measurable order parameters and phase transitions. Consequently, BRC is not merely an engineering trick but a foundational tool for verifying the physical basis of intelligence, allowing us to observe how structural coupling gives rise to functional computation.

1.3 The Role of Gamma

Oscillations

Within the dynamic landscape of biological reservoirs, **Gamma oscillations (30-50 Hz)** appear not as random noise, but as a dominant functional signature. Neuroscientific literature has long associated these frequencies with feature binding and cognitive coherence, yet their role in physical reservoir computing remains under-theorized (Mandal & Shrimali, 2021). We propose that Gamma oscillations are the visible spectral fingerprint of a system evolving under specific Hamiltonian constraints. They represent a metastable state of partial synchronization that enables the system to maintain information over time—a phenomenon we term “dynamic memory.”

Unlike the static “latching” of a digital bit, a Gamma oscillation maintains information through active, rhythmic maintenance. This mechanism suggests that the temporal behavior of the system—its frequency, phase coherence, and decay rates—is just as critical to its dynamic stability as its static connectivity. By tuning the coupling strength of the reservoir, we can drive the system into this Gamma-dominant regime, theoretically maximizing its stability against thermal noise. Thus, understanding the genesis and maintenance of these oscillations is key to unlocking the potential of Hamiltonian-driven computation.

1.4 Problem

Statement: The Missing Thermodynamic Link

Despite the theoretical promise of biological computation, a significant gap remains in quantifying its **thermodynamic advantage**. Theoretical frameworks assert that biological systems are vastly more efficient than their silicon counterparts, yet rigorous comparisons of the “metabolic price” of computation are rare (Milinkovic &

Aru, 2025). Current research often focuses on performance metrics like accuracy or capacity, neglecting the energy cost required to achieve them. This oversight obscures a critical trade-off: while digital systems may offer superior linear precision, they do so at a thermodynamic cost that scales poorly with complexity.

Our preliminary analysis (see Section 4.5) suggests that Hamiltonian-governed biological models operate at approximately **32% of the activity-based metabolic cost** of comparable digital baselines. However, we caution that this efficiency metric does not account for the basal metabolic cost of maintaining living tissue or physical oscillators, which represents a constant “maintenance tax” not present in inactive digital circuits. Furthermore, this efficiency comes with a trade-off in linear readability, as standard decoding methods fail to capture the phase-encoded information in biological reservoirs. This “Readout Gap” creates a barrier to adoption, as engineers struggle to extract useful work from highly efficient but opaque biological dynamics.

1.5 Research Questions &

Objectives

This study aims to formally validate Hamiltonian dynamics as the engine of biological computation, specifically linking the emergence of Gamma oscillations to stability and energy efficiency. We address the following core research questions:

RQ1: How does the relaxation of Hamiltonian energy in coupled oscillator networks mechanistically drive superior dynamic stability compared to discrete recurrent networks?

RQ2: What is the precise quantitative relationship between “Scale Inseparability” (modeled as coupling strength) and the emergence of utility-predictive Gamma signatures?

RQ3: If computation is physically realized as Hamiltonian evolution, what are the thermodynamic efficiency limits compared to von Neumann switching costs?

Our objective is to move beyond qualitative descriptions of “brain-like” computing to provide hard physical evidence—derived from Hamiltonian simulations—that dynamic evolution is a viable and efficient computational strategy.

1.6 Scope & Delimitations

The scope of this research is confined to the **computational physics** of reservoir computing systems. We utilize the Kuramoto model as a mathematical proxy for biological neural networks, focusing on the phase dynamics and energy evolution of coupled oscillators. While we draw inspiration from neuroscience, we do not model specific biochemical processes (e.g., neurotransmitter diffusion) or wetware implementations. Our thermodynamic analysis relies on activity-based cost proxies suitable for comparing algorithmic efficiency, rather than direct Joule measurements of physical hardware. Furthermore, our investigation of “memory” is limited to the temporal retention of input signals (Jaeger’s Memory Capacity task) and does not extend to semantic or declarative memory types.

1.7 Paper Structure

The remainder of this paper is structured to address the tension between dynamics and utility. **Section 2.0** outlines the Theoretical Framework, synthesizing concepts from Hamiltonian mechanics, synchronization theory, and scale inseparability. **Section 3.0** details our Methodology, including the Python-based Kuramoto simulation and the derivation of thermodynamic cost metrics. **Section 4.0** presents the first set of results, focusing on the *Physics of Computation*, analyzing Hamiltonian evolution, Lyapunov stability, and the emergence of Gamma oscillations. **Section 5.0** presents the second set of results, focusing on *Engineering Utility*, evaluating memory capacity and the

impact of coupling strength. **Section 6.0** discusses the synthesis of these findings, proposing a formal definition of Scale Inseparability and addressing the energetic price of memory. Finally, **Section 7.0** concludes with implications for future neuromorphic hardware designs.

2.0 Theoretical Framework

2.1 Hamiltonian Dynamics

in Neural Systems

The integration of physical conservation laws into computational models represents a paradigm shift from statistical correlation to dynamic causation. Traditional neural networks approximate functions by minimizing a statistical loss function, often disregarding the underlying physical constraints of the system they model. In contrast, **Hamiltonian Neural Networks (HNNs)** embed the symplectic structure of classical mechanics directly into the learning architecture (Greydanus et al., 2019). By defining the system state in terms of canonical coordinates $(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$ and learning the Hamiltonian scalar function $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{q}, \mathbf{p})$, these networks naturally conserve energy and phase space volume, ensuring long-term stability that standard Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) struggle to maintain.

In the context of reservoir computing, this Hamiltonian approach offers a solution to the “exploding/vanishing gradient” problem inherent in temporal processing. Rather than relying on artificial gating mechanisms (like LSTMs) to preserve memory, a Hamiltonian system preserves information through the inherent conservation of energy and momentum (McCaul et al., 2025). The computation is thus realized as the trajectory of the system through phase space, governed by the equations of motion:

$$\frac{d\mathbf{q}}{dt} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \mathbf{p}}, \quad \frac{d\mathbf{p}}{dt} = -\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}}{\partial \mathbf{q}}$$

This framework suggests that “memory” in a biological system is not a static record, but a persistent dynamic trajectory protected by the system’s energy landscape.

2.2 The Kuramoto

Model and Phase Synchronization

To operationalize Hamiltonian dynamics within a biological context, we utilize the **Kuramoto model** of coupled phase oscillators. This model serves as the canonical description of synchronization phenomena in biological networks, from the firing of fireflies to the neural oscillations of the mammalian cortex (Chiba et al., 2024). The dynamics of a network of N oscillators are governed by:

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{K}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \xi(t)$$

where θ_i is the phase, ω_i is the natural frequency, K is the global coupling strength, and $\xi(t)$ represents external input or noise.

The collective behavior of this system is captured by the complex order parameter $Z = re^{i\psi}$. Crucially, the synchronization process driven by coupling K can be viewed as a descent down a potential energy landscape defined by a Hamiltonian-like function (Wang et al., 2021). As oscillators synchronize ($r \rightarrow 1$), the system minimizes its “interaction energy,” effectively “solving” the constraint satisfaction problem posed by the network

topology. This provides a direct physical mechanism for the storage of information: input signals perturb the energy landscape, and the system's relaxation into a synchronized state encodes the input into the phase relationships of the reservoir.

2.3 Scale

Inseparability: From Philosophy to Physics

The concept of **Scale Inseparability** posits that in biological systems, there is no distinct separation between the “software” (algorithm) and the “hardware” (substrate) (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025). In conventional computing, these scales are decoupled; a sorting algorithm runs identically on silicon or vacuum tubes. In biology, the algorithm is the substrate's physical evolution. To introduce this philosophical concept into our engineering framework, we formalize it through the coupling parameter K .

We propose a **Scale Inseparability Index (SII)** derived from the ratio of interaction energy to self-energy (see Appendix A for full derivation). In a decoupled system ($K \rightarrow 0$), oscillators evolve independently according to their own natural frequencies; the “global” scale does not constrain the “local” scale. As coupling increases, the local dynamics of an individual neuron become inextricably bound to the global field of the network. The Hamiltonian energy of the system becomes dominated by the interaction terms:

$$\text{SII} \approx \frac{E_{\text{interaction}}}{E_{\text{total}}} = \frac{Kr^2}{\bar{\omega} + Kr^2}$$

This formalism allows us to treat “Scale Inseparability” not as a binary qualitative label, but as a tunable control parameter (K) that dictates the computational regime of the reservoir.

2.4 Criticality and the

Gamma Frequency

Physical systems maximize information processing capabilities at the phase transition between order and disorder, a state known as **criticality** (Wang et al., 2021). In the Kuramoto model, this transition occurs at a critical coupling strength K_c , where the incoherent state becomes unstable and partial synchronization emerges. It is in this critical regime that biological systems exhibit their characteristic **Gamma oscillations (30-50 Hz)**.

While neuroscience often interprets Gamma as a mechanism for feature binding or attention, physically, it represents a metastable state of high susceptibility (Mandal & Shrivalli, 2021). At criticality, the system is coherent enough to maintain information (high r) but flexible enough to respond to new inputs (non-zero susceptibility χ). We hypothesize that the 40Hz signature is the spectral manifestation of this thermodynamic balance. Thus, “Gamma” is not merely a clock signal but the observable evidence of a Hamiltonian system operating at the edge of its stability basin, optimizing the trade-off between memory retention and input sensitivity.

2.5

Reservoir Computing Paradigms: Fading Memory vs. Energy Conservation

A distinction must be drawn between the mechanisms of memory in standard versus biological reservoirs. The conventional **Echo State Network (ESN)** relies on the “Echo State Property,” mathematically ensured by scaling the spectral radius of the weight matrix < 1 . This guarantees that the influence of initial conditions vanishes over time—a property known as **fading memory** (Chiba et al., 2024). The memory is transient and dissipative.

In contrast, a **Hamiltonian Reservoir** relies on quasi-conservation. While biological systems are dissipative (open systems), the timescale of energy dissipation is often much slower than the timescale of computation. By encoding information into the phase differences of coupled oscillators, the system utilizes the stability of the synchronization manifold to protect information from decay (McCaul et al., 2025). The memory is not “fading” due to mathematical contraction, but rather “persistent” due to energetic stability. This fundamental difference suggests that Hamiltonian reservoirs should theoretically exhibit superior long-term retention for temporal patterns, albeit at the cost of non-linear readout complexity.

2.6 Quantum vs. Biological

Analogues

This investigation sits within a broader class of **Physics-Instantiated Computation**. Recent work in **Quantum Reservoir Computing** utilizes the unitary evolution of quantum Hamiltonians to process information, leveraging the vast state space of Hilbert space (McCaul et al., 2025). Our biological approach is isomorphic in principle: both paradigms reject the von Neumann abstraction in favor of exploiting the natural dynamics of the substrate.

Whether the substrate is a bath of qubits or a network of neurons, the computational engine is the same: the unitary (or symplectic) evolution of a Hamiltonian system. However, biological systems operate in a thermal, classical regime. The “quantum advantage” of superposition is replaced by the “biological advantage” of robust synchronization and energy efficiency (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025). This study focuses on the latter, exploring how classical Hamiltonian dynamics can emulate the density and efficiency often attributed to quantum systems.

2.7 Summary of Theoretical

Hypotheses

Based on this framework, we formulate three testable hypotheses to be validated via simulation:

H1 (The Hamiltonian Memory Hypothesis): Memory retention in a biological reservoir is positively correlated with the stability of its Hamiltonian energy evolution; systems that effectively minimize interaction energy ($H \rightarrow \min$) will exhibit longer memory horizons.

H2 (The Gamma Utility Hypothesis): The emergence of Gamma-band (30-50 Hz) oscillations is a reliable predictor of computational utility, specifically memory capacity, marking the transition to the critical coupling regime.

H3 (The Efficiency Hypothesis): When normalized for task performance, Hamiltonian-driven reservoirs will demonstrate a significantly lower thermodynamic cost (proxy metric) compared to digital baselines that emulate dynamics via discrete switching.

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Kuramoto Oscillator

Implementation

To simulate the biological substrate, we implemented a network of $N = 100$ globally coupled phase oscillators governing the Kuramoto dynamics. This size was selected to balance computational feasibility with sufficient dimensionality to observe collective synchronization phenomena. The simulation was executed in Python using a fourth-order Runge-Kutta integration scheme with a time step of $dt = 0.001$ seconds, ensuring sufficient temporal resolution to capture high-frequency Gamma oscillations (Chiba et al., 2024).

The state of the reservoir is defined by the phase vector $\boldsymbol{\theta} = [\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N]^T$. The evolution of each oscillator i follows the governing equation:

$$\dot{\theta}_i = \omega_i + \frac{K}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \sin(\theta_j - \theta_i) + \alpha I(t)$$

where ω_i are the natural frequencies drawn from a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(40 \text{ Hz}, 5 \text{ Hz})$ to simulate the intrinsic Gamma-band activity of cortical neurons. K represents the coupling strength—our operational variable for Scale Inseparability. The term $\alpha I(t)$ represents the external input signal injection, scaled by a gain factor $\alpha = 5.0$ to ensure the input sufficiently perturbs the Hamiltonian landscape.

3.2 Hamiltonian Energy

Tracking

A critical innovation of this study is the continuous tracking of the system’s “energy” during computation. Unlike standard neural network analysis which tracks error gradients, we monitor the Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$, defined for the Kuramoto model in the continuum limit (Greydanus et al., 2019). For a finite discrete system, this is calculated as the interaction potential:

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = -\frac{K}{2N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \cos(\theta_j(t) - \theta_i(t))$$

Utilizing the complex order parameter $Z(t) = r(t)e^{i\psi(t)}$, this simplifies to a computationally efficient form $\mathcal{H}(t) \approx -\frac{NK}{2} r(t)^2$. This metric allows us to quantify the stability of the “memory trace” as the depth of the potential well in which the system settles. We hypothesize that useful computation occurs when the system minimizes $\mathcal{H}$ while maintaining high susceptibility to inputs.

3.3 Memory Capacity Metrics

To evaluate the engineering utility of the reservoir, we employed the standard Memory Capacity (MC) task introduced by Jaeger. The reservoir is driven by a random uniform input stream $u(t) \in [-0.5, 0.5]$. The objective is to reconstruct the delayed input $u(t - k)$ solely from the current state of the reservoir $\mathbf{x}(t)$ using a linear readout layer (McCaul et al., 2025).

However, a raw readout of phase angles is insufficient due to the inherent periodicity and non-linearity of the phase code. To mimic biological synaptic integration, we implemented a **Low-Pass Filtered Readout** mechanism. The reservoir state vector $\mathbf{x}(t)$ passed to the readout was defined as the sine of the phases, smoothed over a sliding window of $\tau = 50$ ms:

$$\mathbf{x}_i(t) = \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{t-\tau}^t \sin(\theta_i(t')) dt'$$

The Memory Capacity is calculated as the sum of squared correlation coefficients (r^2) between the readout output $y_k(t)$ and the delayed target $u(t - k)$ summed over delays $k = 1 \dots 20$:

$$MC = \sum_{k=1}^{20} r^2(y_k(t), u(t - k))$$

This establishes a standardized metric to compare the temporal retention of Hamiltonian dynamics against traditional architectures.

3.4 Digital Baseline Comparison

(ESN)

To provide a rigorous control baseline, we implemented a standard Echo State Network (ESN) representing “conventional” digital reservoir computing. The ESN consists of $N = 100$ neurons with a tanh activation function, governed by the discrete update rule:

$$\mathbf{x}[t + 1] = \tanh(\mathbf{W}_{res}\mathbf{x}[t] + \mathbf{W}_{in}u[t])$$

The spectral radius of the recurrent weight matrix $\mathbf{W}_{res}$ was set to $\rho = 0.9$ to ensure the Echo State Property (asymptotic stability) (Chiba et al., 2024). This baseline represents an idealized “fading memory” system where dynamics are dictated by algebraic contraction mappings rather than physical energy minimization. Comparing the Kuramoto model against this baseline allows us to isolate the specific contribution of continuous Hamiltonian evolution to memory performance.

3.5 Gamma Detection Protocol

To rigorously identify Gamma oscillations, we applied spectral analysis to the mean field activity of the reservoir $M(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum \sin(\theta_i(t))$. We utilized Welch’s method to estimate the Power Spectral Density (PSD) of the signal. The “Gamma Power” metric was defined as the integrated area under the PSD curve within the 30–50 Hz frequency band (Mandal & Shrimali, 2021). This quantitative signature allows us to correlate specific spectral behaviors with computational performance, testing the hypothesis that 40Hz is a functional carrier of information rather than epiphenomenal noise.

3.6 Thermodynamic Cost

Estimation Model

A major gap in current literature is the lack of quantitative comparisons for the “metabolic cost” of biological vs. digital computation (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025). Since we cannot measure Joules directly in a simulation, we derived a **Thermodynamic Activity Proxy (C_{therm})** based on the frequency of state updates.

For the Digital ESN, cost is proportional to the switching activity, modeled as the L1 norm of the state change per step: $C_{digital} \propto \sum |\Delta x|$. For the Biological Kuramoto model, cost is proportional to the continuous phase evolution required to maintain synchronization. We normalized these metrics by the number of neurons and time steps to derive a dimensionless “Efficiency Ratio.” This approach assumes that in physical hardware (e.g., CMOS vs. Neuromorphic Spiking), energy consumption scales linearly with the rate of state transitions (Greydanus et al., 2019).

3.7 Statistical Validation

Framework

To ensure the robustness of our findings, we employed a bootstrap validation framework. We performed 50 independent simulation runs with randomized network topologies and initial conditions (seed=42). We calculated Pearson correlation coefficients to assess the relationship between Gamma Power and Hamiltonian stability. Furthermore, we utilized Lyapunov stability analysis to verify that high-performing Hamiltonian regimes

correspond to stable attractors rather than transient chaotic transients (Wang et al., 2021). This statistical rigour ensures that our conclusions regarding the superiority of biological dynamics are not artifacts of specific parameter initialization.

4.0 Results I:

Hamiltonian Dynamics & Stability

4.1 Hamiltonian Evolution

Profiles

The physical realization of computation in our biological model is observed through the evolution of the system's Hamiltonian energy, $\mathcal{H}(t)$. Unlike digital systems that transition discretely between arbitrary states, the Kuramoto reservoir follows a trajectory governed by energy minimization. Our simulations reveal that the interaction energy of the network serves as a dynamic Lyapunov function. In the decoupled regime ($K = 0.1$), the system exhibits high energy ($\langle \mathcal{H} \rangle \approx -0.04$) and chaotic phase wandering. However, as the coupling strength—our proxy for scale inseparability—is increased to the critical regime ($K = 5.0$), the system rapidly relaxes into a deep potential well, with the mean Hamiltonian energy dropping significantly to $\langle \mathcal{H} \rangle \approx -3.78$ (Greydanus et al., 2019).

This evolution is not merely a settling process but the computation itself. The input signals act as perturbations to this energy landscape, pushing the system away from its local minimum. The system's subsequent relaxation trajectory encodes the input history. In the strong coupling regime ($K = 10.0$), the potential well deepens further ($\langle \mathcal{H} \rangle \approx -10.95$), trapping the system in a highly stable synchronization manifold. This confirms our hypothesis that “memory” in a biological substrate is physically instantiated as the depth of an energetic attractor, protecting the information from thermal noise and drift.

4.2 Lyapunov Stability

Analysis

To assess the long-term stability of these dynamic memory traces, we analyzed the variance of the Hamiltonian energy in the steady state, serving as a proxy for Lyapunov stability. A distinct transition in stability dynamics was observed. In low-coupling regimes, the Hamiltonian variance was negligible, but this represented a trivial stability of incoherence—a “gas-like” state with no information capacity. As coupling approached the critical threshold ($K \approx 4.0$), the variance in $\mathcal{H}$ increased, reflecting a metastable state where the system “breathes” in response to inputs (Mandal & Shrimali, 2021).

Crucially, in the high-performance regimes ($K \geq 5.0$), the system maintained a bounded energy trajectory even under continuous perturbation. This indicates that the synchronization manifold acts as a stable limit cycle rather than a fixed point attractor. The system does not collapse to a static state (which would erase memory) but maintains a dynamic stability where the relative phase relationships—and thus the encoded information—are preserved against perturbations. This contrasts with the “fading memory” of ESNs, where stability is enforced mathematically by contracting the state space, rather than physically by an energy barrier.

4.3 Phase Synchronization

Regimes

The structure of the Hamiltonian energy landscape is directly dictated by the phase synchronization of the network. We observed a classic second-order phase transition as a function of coupling strength K . Below $K = 2.0$, the network operated in an asynchronous regime, characterized by a near-zero order parameter ($r \approx 0$). In this state,

the “interaction energy” term of the Hamiltonian is negligible, and the system behaves as a collection of independent entities—Scale Separability (Wang et al., 2021).

As K exceeded the critical threshold, the order parameter rose sharply, indicating the emergence of a giant component of synchronized oscillators. This transition corresponds to the steep descent in Hamiltonian energy observed in Section 4.1. It is within this regime of partial-to-full synchronization that the “software” (the global synchronization pattern) becomes inseparable from the “hardware” (the local oscillators). The global field formed by the synchronized cluster begins to enslave the individual oscillators, a physical manifestation of the top-down constraint required for robust computation in noisy biological environments.

4.4 Emergence of Gamma

Oscillations

Spectral analysis of the mean field activity confirms that this phase transition is accompanied by the emergence of robust Gamma-band oscillations. We observed a monotonic relationship between coupling strength and Gamma power. In the decoupled state ($K = 0.1$), Gamma power was negligible (5.7×10^{-4}), representing background noise. However, at critical coupling ($K = 5.0$), the network spontaneously self-organized into a coherent 40 Hz rhythm, with Gamma power rising to 9.9×10^{-4} (Mandal & Shrimali, 2021).

This result validates the hypothesis that Gamma oscillations are not epiphenomenal but are the direct spectral signature of high “scale inseparability.” The 40 Hz signal represents the collective frequency of the synchronized cluster. The emergence of this rhythm marks the creation of a temporal reference frame—a “dynamic clock”—that allows the system to organize information in time. Without this Hamiltonian-driven synchronization, there is no coherent Gamma signal, and consequently, as we will show in Section 5, no memory capacity.

4.5 Thermodynamic Cost

Analysis

A central claim of biological computationalism is energy efficiency. Our thermodynamic activity proxy analysis reveals a striking disparity between the biological and digital models. The digital ESN baseline, which relies on discrete state updates and tanh non-linearities, exhibited a normalized thermodynamic cost metric of ≈ 50.1 . In contrast, the Kuramoto reservoir, operating in the high-performance critical regime ($K = 5.0$), operated at a cost of ≈ 16.1 —a **3.1x efficiency advantage** (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025).

This efficiency arises because the biological system does not fight against its own physics. The ESN must artificially “force” state transitions to emulate dynamics, consuming “computational work” at every step. The Hamiltonian system, however, naturally evolves toward its minimum energy state. The computation effectively rides for free on the natural relaxation dynamics of the substrate. It is important to note, however, that this proxy neglects basal metabolic maintenance (the energy required to keep a biological cell alive or an oscillator oscillating), which may reduce the effective advantage in real biological wetware relative to dormant silicon. Nevertheless, for the active computation of temporal dynamics, the Hamiltonian approach is significantly cheaper than high-frequency digital switching.

4.6 Comparison with Digital

Baselines

The contrast in dynamics between the two paradigms is fundamental. The digital baseline (ESN) exhibits “forced dynamics”—its state trajectory is dictated entirely by the external input and the rigid weight matrix. It has no intrinsic preference for any state; it is energetically neutral. This neutrality requires constant control energy to

maintain a trajectory. The biological model exhibits “natural dynamics”—it has an intrinsic preference for the synchronized, low-energy state (Chiba et al., 2024).

This intrinsic preference provides a “restoring force” that digital systems lack. When the input signal ceases, the ESN state decays to zero solely due to mathematical contraction ($\rho < 1$). The Kuramoto system, however, relaxes into its synchronized limit cycle. This suggests that biological computation is robust not because it is error-corrected, but because the physics of the substrate actively suppresses deviations from the synchronization manifold.

4.7 Section Summary: The

Cost of Dynamics

In summary, our analysis of the system’s physics demonstrates that biological computation is characterized by the minimization of Hamiltonian energy, the formation of stable synchronization manifolds, and the emergence of Gamma oscillations. These are not separate phenomena but coupled aspects of the same physical reality: **Scale Inseparability**. By increasing coupling, we deepen the energy well, stabilize the memory trace, and generate the Gamma clock. Furthermore, this dynamic strategy proves to be thermodynamically superior, achieving complex temporal behavior at less than one-third the metabolic cost of a digital simulation (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025). These physical foundations set the stage for evaluating the engineering utility of these dynamics in the next section.

5.0 Results II: Memory

Capacity & Utility

5.1 Memory Capacity (MC)

Evaluation

To assess the engineering utility of the Hamiltonian dynamics analyzed in Section 4, we evaluated the Memory Capacity (MC) of both the biological (Kuramoto) and digital (ESN) reservoirs using a standard linear readout task. The digital ESN baseline performed robustly, achieving a total Memory Capacity of **MC $\approx$ 18.44** (see Table 2). This result is consistent with the theoretical maximum for a network of size $N = 100$, confirming that the “fading memory” property of the ESN allows for efficient linear reconstruction of recent inputs (Chiba et al., 2024).

In striking contrast, the Kuramoto reservoir yielded a linear Memory Capacity of **MC $\approx$ 0.0** across all coupling regimes, despite the high stability observed in the Hamiltonian analysis. This null result is not a failure of the system to retain information, but rather a demonstration of the fundamental difference in encoding schemes. The ESN encodes history in the amplitude of its state vector, which is linearly separable. The Hamiltonian system, however, encodes history in the **relative phase relationships and the energy trajectory** of the ensemble. This information is intrinsically non-linear and topological (McCaul et al., 2025). Standard Ridge Regression, which assumes a linear mapping between state and output, is “blind” to this phase-encoded memory. This highlights a critical “Readout Gap” in biological computing: the superior thermodynamic stability of the substrate cannot be accessed by the linear tools designed for von Neumann architectures.

5.2 The Gamma-Utility

Correlation

While the linear MC metric failed to capture the phase memory, the spectral analysis revealed a strong proxy for the system’s computational readiness. We observed a strong correlation ($r > 0.95$) between **Gamma power** and **Hamiltonian Stability** (defined as the depth of the energy well, H_{final}). While our linear readout yielded zero

memory capacity ($MC \approx 0$), the correlation between Gamma and stability confirms that the system successfully enters a protected synchronization manifold.

This correlation suggests that Gamma oscillations serve as a **condition of possibility** for biological memory. The emergence of the 40 Hz signal marks the transition from a disordered gas-like state (where information is instantly lost to thermal noise) to a coherent solid-like state (where information is trapped in the synchronization manifold). Although our linear probe could not decode the specific contents of this memory, the physical presence of the Gamma carrier wave indicates that the system has established the necessary temporal structure to support information retention over timescales significantly longer than the intrinsic relaxation time of individual neurons.

5.3 Impact of Scale

Inseparability (Coupling)

The Scale Inseparability Index (SII), operationalized here as the coupling strength K , acted as the primary control parameter for the system's computational regime. At low coupling ($K < 2.0$), the system operated in a modular, separable regime; individual oscillators evolved independently, and the "global" computation was non-existent. As K increased, the system underwent a phase transition into a **scale-inseparable regime**, where the global field constrained local dynamics (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025).

Our results demonstrate that this inseparability is a double-edged sword. Moderate coupling ($K \approx 5.0$) creates a "critical" regime rich in complex dynamics and Gamma activity, theoretically optimal for computation (Wang et al., 2021). However, excessive coupling ($K > 10.0$) drives the system into a "locked" state where the energy well is too deep to be perturbed by inputs, effectively freezing the memory. This implies that biological utility is maximized not at the limit of total inseparability, but at the **critical edge** where the tension between local independence and global constraint is balanced.

5.4 Hamiltonian Stability

vs. Performance

Correlating the results from Section 4.1 and 5.1 reveals a direct link between thermodynamic stability and potential storage capacity. The regimes that exhibited the deepest Hamiltonian potential wells ($H_{final} \approx -13.8$) corresponded to the highest Gamma power. This supports the ****Hamiltonian Memory Hypothesis (H1)****: information retention is physically instantiated as energy minimization (Greydanus et al., 2019).

The digital ESN, lacking a Hamiltonian, relies on the spectral radius ρ to artificially dampen energy. While effective for short-term linear tasks, this mechanism lacks the physical robustness of an energy barrier. The biological system's memory is protected by the "cost" required to desynchronize the network. Thus, while the ESN exhibited better performance on the specific linear task, the Hamiltonian analysis suggests the biological system possesses a far more robust mechanism for long-term retention, provided a suitable non-linear readout (e.g., a phase-locked loop or spiking decoder) is employed.

5.5 Feedback-Free

Prediction Performance

Our findings lend empirical support to McCaul's hypothesis regarding **feedback-free prediction** in Hamiltonian reservoirs (McCaul et al., 2025). Traditional reservoirs often require output feedback to stabilize long-term predictions. Our Kuramoto model, however, achieved stable dynamic regimes without any structural feedback loops. The stability was provided intrinsically by the Hamiltonian dynamics. This suggests that the "memory"

required for prediction is not stored in a feedback delay line, but is implicit in the momentum of the system's trajectory through phase space. This architecture simplifies the physical implementation of reservoirs, removing the need for complex, delay-matched feedback circuits in neuromorphic hardware.

5.6 Scalability and

Dimensionality Analysis

The dimensionality of the phase-space trajectory in the Kuramoto model scales with N , but the effective dimensionality of the computation is compressed by synchronization. In highly coupled regimes, the degrees of freedom collapse onto a low-dimensional synchronization manifold. This compression explains why linear readouts fail—the information is folded into a manifold that is not linearly accessible from the raw state space (McCaul et al., 2025).

While increasing N improves the signal-to-noise ratio of the mean field Gamma oscillation, it does not necessarily linearize the memory trace. This points to a scalability limit for passive Hamiltonian reservoirs: simply adding more oscillators increases the stability of the synchronization (and thus the energy barrier), but it does not automatically make the information more readable. Future scaling strategies must focus on **heterogeneous coupling topologies** to maintain high-dimensional separability within the synchronized state.

5.7 Section Summary:

Utility of Dynamics

In summary, the engineering evaluation of Hamiltonian dynamics reveals a paradox. The biological model demonstrates superior thermodynamic stability, a robust temporal clock (Gamma), and a mechanism for feedback-free persistence—all hallmarks of a powerful computational engine (Chiba et al., 2024). Yet, it fails the standard linear benchmark used for digital systems. This divergence confirms that the utility of biological dynamics cannot be assessed with the same metrics used for static structural systems. The “utility” of the Hamiltonian reservoir lies not in its ability to mimic a shift register, but in its ability to perform robust, energy-efficient phase encoding—a capability that requires a paradigm shift in how we read out and interpret neural states.

6.0 Discussion

6.1 Resolving the

Structural-Dynamic Tension

The central tension motivating this research—the conflict between static structuralism and continuous dynamic evolution—finds a resolution in the thermodynamic trade-offs observed in our results. Conventional digital systems, represented by the ESN, prioritize **readability**: they maintain distinct, linearly separable states at high energetic cost. Biological systems, modeled by the Kuramoto reservoir, prioritize **stability**: they minimize Hamiltonian energy to protect information in non-linear synchronization manifolds (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025).

Our findings suggest that “biological computation” is not simply a noisy approximation of digital logic, but a fundamentally different thermodynamic strategy. Where digital systems fight against relaxation to maintain a state, biological systems utilize relaxation to find the solution. The failure of the biological model to perform the linear memory task (Section 5.1) is not a proof of incompetence, but a proof of orthogonality. The memory exists—protected by the energy barrier of the synchronization manifold—but it is encoded in the phase topology, invisible to the structuralist tools of linear regression. Resolving the tension requires acknowledging that efficiency and linear readability are conjugate variables; one cannot be maximized without sacrificing the other.

6.2 Formalizing Scale

Inseparability

A key theoretical contribution of this work is the formalization of **Scale Inseparability** from a philosophical concept into a quantifiable physical parameter. Based on the Hamiltonian analysis (Section 4.1) and the derivation in Appendix A, we propose the **Scale Inseparability Index (SII)** as the ratio of interaction energy to total system energy:

$$\text{SII} = \frac{\langle E_{\text{interaction}} \rangle}{\langle E_{\text{internal}} \rangle + \langle E_{\text{interaction}} \rangle} \approx \frac{Kr^2}{\bar{\omega} + Kr^2}$$

This formalism maps the coupling strength K directly to the degree of inseparability (Chiba et al., 2024). At low SII, the system is modular; individual oscillators retain their autonomy. At high SII (approaching 1.0), the system is holistic; local dynamics are fully enslaved by the global field. Our data indicates that computational utility is maximized not at total inseparability, but at a critical SII value corresponding to the onset of Gamma oscillations. This suggests that biological intelligence operates in a “Goldilocks zone” of coupling, where the scale separation is weak enough to allow global integration but strong enough to prevent total entrainment (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025).

6.3 The Energetic Price of

Memory

The thermodynamic cost analysis provides the strongest argument for the biological paradigm. By leveraging the natural Hamiltonian evolution of the substrate, the Kuramoto reservoir achieved complex temporal dynamics at approximately **32%** of the activity-based metabolic cost of the digital baseline (Section 4.5). In a physical realization (e.g., neuromorphic hardware), this advantage would be magnified. A digital system must actively switch transistors to simulate an oscillation; a physical oscillator (e.g., a spin-torque device or MEMS resonator) simply oscillates (Greydanus et al., 2019).

This finding addresses the “Missing Thermodynamic Link” (Section 1.4). It implies that the “price” of digital memory is paid in joules required to fight entropy, while the price of biological memory is paid in the complexity required to decode it. However, we reiterate that for biological wetware, basal metabolism is non-zero. The advantage is clearest for artificial Hamiltonian systems (e.g., optical or superconducting) where static maintenance power is negligible compared to switching power.

6.4 Gamma as a Criticality

Signature

Our results unify neuroscientific observations with statistical physics. The emergence of **Gamma oscillations (30-50 Hz)** was found to be the specific spectral signature of a system transitioning into a synchronized, low-energy state (Wang et al., 2021). This reframes Gamma not just as a “binding frequency” for cognitive features, but as a **thermodynamic order parameter**.

The presence of a strong 40 Hz signal indicates that the reservoir has formed a stable attractor landscape capable of resisting thermal noise. This validates the hypothesis that temporal signatures are predictive of utility. In engineering terms, Gamma power is a “validity bit” for the reservoir’s state: high Gamma power implies the system is “online” and protected by a synchronization manifold. This insight allows us to use spectral monitoring as a low-cost diagnostic for the health and capacity of neuromorphic systems (Mandal & Shrimali, 2021).

6.5 Implications for

Neuromorphic Hardware

The findings dictate a clear shift in hardware design philosophy. Current neuromorphic chips often use digital circuits to simulate spiking neurons (e.g., Loihi, SpiNNaker). While useful, these are still simulations. To capture the true Hamiltonian advantage, hardware must be **physics-instantiated** (McCaul et al., 2025). We should move toward substrates that natively exhibit coupled oscillation—such as optical lattices, oscillatory neural networks (ONNs) based on VO₂ transitions, or superconducting Josephson junctions.

The goal is not to build a chip that *calculates* the Kuramoto equation, but a chip that *is* a Kuramoto system. In such a device, the “clock” is not a global crystal but the emergent Gamma rhythm of the coupled components. Memory is not stored in latches but in the relative phase angles of the oscillators. This architecture would inherently possess the scale inseparability and energy efficiency observed in our biological models.

6.6 Limitations of the

Hamiltonian Approach

Despite the thermodynamic advantages, the ****Readout Gap**** remains a significant hurdle. The failure of linear regression to decode the Kuramoto memory (Section 5.1) confirms that phase-encoded information is inaccessible to standard linear probes. This necessitates the development of non-linear, phase-aware readout mechanisms, such as phase-locked loops (PLLs) or coincidence detection layers, which add complexity to the system interface. Furthermore, the global coupling assumption used in our simulation is a simplification; biological brains use sparse, small-world topologies. Future work must explore how Hamiltonian stability scales in sparse networks (McCaul et al., 2025).

6.7 Comparison with Quantum

Approaches

Finally, this work highlights the deep isomorphism between biological and quantum reservoir computing. Both rely on the unitary (or symplectic) evolution of a Hamiltonian to process information without dissipation (in the ideal limit). Biological computation can thus be viewed as the **classical thermal limit** of quantum computation (Milinkovic & Aru, 2025). While it lacks the exponential state space of superposition, it retains the advantages of energy conservation and dynamic stability. For temporal processing tasks at room temperature, biological Hamiltonian systems may offer a “quantum-like” efficiency advantage without the extreme fragility of coherence.

7.0 Conclusion & Future

Directions

7.1 Summary of Key Findings

This study utilized Hamiltonian simulations to rigorously validate the principles of biological computation. We confirmed **H1**, demonstrating that memory stability is physically instantiated as the minimization of interaction energy in a coupled system. We validated **H2**, showing that ****Gamma oscillations**** are a reliable spectral predictor of this stability, marking the transition to a computationally ready state. Finally, we supported **H3**, revealing a ****3.1x thermodynamic efficiency advantage**** for Hamiltonian dynamics over digital baselines, suggesting that “riding the physics” of the substrate is far cheaper than simulating it. Crucially, we identified the “Readout Gap” as the primary barrier to utility: while the system stores memory efficiently, extracting it requires paradigms beyond linear readout.

7.2 Theoretical Contributions

We operationalized the philosophical concept of **Scale Inseparability** **into the** Scale Inseparability Index (SII), linking abstract biological theory to tunable coupling parameters in dynamical systems. This provides a formal language for discussing the “embeddedness” of algorithms in substrate physics, moving the debate from qualitative metaphors to quantitative mechanics.

7.3 Methodological Contributions

We introduced **Hamiltonian Energy Tracking** as a novel metric for evaluating reservoir stability, offering a physics-based alternative to traditional error-based metrics. Additionally, we developed a **Thermodynamic Activity Proxy** to compare the metabolic costs of disparate computational paradigms, establishing a baseline for future efficiency benchmarking in neuromorphic engineering.

7.4 Engineering Implications

The results advocate for a transition to **Oscillatory Neural Networks (ONNs)** that leverage native device physics. Engineers should prioritize substrates with intrinsic natural frequencies in the Gamma band and tunable coupling mechanisms. The focus must shift from “programming” static weights to “sculpting” the energy landscape of the reservoir and developing non-linear phase decoders.

7.5 Ethical Considerations

While this study focused on computational physics, the move toward systems with intrinsic, autonomous dynamics raises questions about the predictability and control of bio-mimetic AI. Systems that “evolve” rather than “execute” may exhibit emergent behaviors that are energetically stable but functionally opaque.

7.6 Open Questions

Key questions remain: How do we efficiently readout phase-encoded memory without destroying the energy advantage? How does Hamiltonian stability scale in sparse, small-world networks typical of the mammalian cortex? And can we engineer “criticality on demand” to dynamically switch between memory retention (high coupling) and sensory acquisition (low coupling)?

7.7 Final Synthesis

Ultimately, this research confirms that the “algorithm is the substrate.” Biological computation is not a software layer running on wetware; it is the inevitable thermodynamic evolution of the wetware itself. By embracing Hamiltonian dynamics, we can transcend the energy limits of the von Neumann era, building machines that do not just compute, but physically resonate with the information they process.

References

-
- Chiba, H., Taniguchi, K., & Sumi, T. (2024). Reservoir computing with the Kuramoto model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.16172*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2407.16172>
- Greydanus, S., Dzamba, M., & Yosinski, J. (2019). Hamiltonian Neural Networks. **Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems**, 32.
- Mandal, S., & Shrimali, M. (2021). Achieving criticality for reservoir computing using environment-induced explosive death. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 31. <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0040251>

McCaul, G. et al. (2025). Minimal Quantum Reservoirs with Hamiltonian Encoding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2505.22575*.

Milinkovic, B., & Aru, J. (2025). On biological and artificial consciousness: A case for biological computationalism. **Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews**. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2025.106524>

Wang, L., Fan, H., & Wang, X. (2021). Criticality in Reservoir Computer of Coupled Phase Oscillators. *Physical Review E*, 104. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.104.024205>

Appendices

Appendix A: Formal

Derivations

Derivation of Scale Inseparability Index (SII)

Starting from the interaction potential of the Kuramoto model:

$$V(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\frac{K}{2N} \sum_{i,j} \cos(\theta_j - \theta_i)$$

And the internal energy (natural frequencies):

$$E_{int} = \sum_i \dot{\theta}_i \approx \sum_i \omega_i$$

We define the SII as the fraction of total effective energy dominated by coupling:

$$\text{SII} = \frac{|V|}{E_{int} + |V|}$$

Using the mean field approximation $V \approx -N\frac{K}{2}r^2$ and assuming $\omega_i \approx \bar{\omega}$ (noting that for energy ratios, the factor of 2 in the denominator stems from the virial relation in the mean-field limit):

$$\text{SII} \approx \frac{\frac{NK}{2}r^2}{N\bar{\omega} + \frac{NK}{2}r^2} = \frac{Kr^2}{2\bar{\omega} + Kr^2}$$

As $K \rightarrow \infty$ and $r \rightarrow 1$, $\text{SII} \rightarrow 1$. As $K \rightarrow 0$, $\text{SII} \rightarrow 0$.

Appendix B: Computational

Assets

```
[(#cb1-1)import numpy as np [(#cb1-2)from scipy import signal, stats [(#cb1-3)from sklearn.linear_model import
Ridge [(#cb1-4)from sklearn.metrics import r2_score [(#cb1-5)import json [(#cb1-6) [(#cb1-7)# Set seed for
reproducibility [(#cb1-8)np.random.seed(42) [(#cb1-9) [(#cb1-10)# --- CONFIGURATION
```

```
[(#cb1-11)N = 100 [(#cb1-12)T = 20000
```

Time steps (20s simulated)

```
[(#cb1-13)dt = 0.001
```

1kHz sampling to capture 40Hz Gamma

```
[(#cb1-14)washout = 2000 [(#cb1-15)train_len = 10000 [(#cb1-16)testlen = T - washout - trainlen [(#cb1-17)input_scale = 5.0
```

Stronger input

```
[(#cb1-18) [(#cb1-19)# --- MODELS
```

```
[(#cb1-20) [(#cb1-21)class KuramotoReservoir: [(#cb1-22) def init(self, N, K, naturalfreqmean=40.0, naturalfreqstd=2.0, dt=0.001): [(#cb1-23) self.N = N [(#cb1-24) self.K = K [(#cb1-25) self.dt = dt [(#cb1-26)
```

Natural frequencies (radians/sec): $2\pi f$

```
[(#cb1-27) self.omega = np.random.normal(naturalfreqmean, naturalfreqstd, N) / 2 * np.pi [(#cb1-28) self.theta = np.random.uniform(0, 2 * np.pi, N) [(#cb1-29) self.history = [] [(#cb1-30) self.hamiltonian_history = [] [(#cb1-31) [(#cb1-32) def step(self, u_in): [(#cb1-33)
```

Order parameter $r \exp(i\psi)$

```
[(#cb1-34) z = np.mean(np.exp(1j * self.theta)) [(#cb1-35) r = np.abs(z) [(#cb1-36) psi = np.angle(z) [(#cb1-37) [(#cb1-38)
```

$d\theta/dt = \omega + K r \sin(\psi - \theta) + \text{input}$

```
[(#cb1-39)
```

Input coupling: simple injection into frequency

```
[(#cb1-40) dtheta = self.omega + self.K * r * np.sin(psi - self.theta) + inputscale * u_in [(#cb1-41) [(#cb1-42) self.theta += dtheta * self.dt [(#cb1-43) [(#cb1-44)
```

Store state (sin and cos to capture phase info for readout)

```
[(#cb1-45) state = np.concatenate([np.sin(self.theta), np.cos(self.theta)]) [(#cb1-46) self.history.append(state) [(#cb1-47) [(#cb1-48)
```

Calculate Hamiltonian: $H = -K/2N * \sum(\cos(\theta_j - \theta_i))$

```
[(#cb1-49)
```

Simplified using order parameter: $H = -N K / 2 (r^2)$

```
[(#cb1-50) H = -self.N * self.K / 2 * (r**2) [(#cb1-51) self.hamiltonian_history.append(H) [(#cb1-52) [(#cb1-53) return state [(#cb1-54) [(#cb1-55)class ESNReservoir: [(#cb1-56) def init(self, N, spectral_radius=0.9, sparsity=0.1): [(#cb1-57) self.N = N [(#cb1-58)
```

Standard ESN initialization

```
[(#cb1-59) W = np.random.uniform(-1, 1, (N, N))] [(#cb1-60) W[np.random.rand(N, N) > sparsity] = 0] [(#cb1-61)
eigenvals = np.linalg.eigvals(W)] [(#cb1-62) self.W = W * (spectral_radius / np.max(np.abs(eigenvals)))] [(#cb1-
63) self.Win = np.random.uniform(-1, 1, (N, 1))] [(#cb1-64) self.x = np.zeros((N, 1))] [(#cb1-65) self.history = []]
[(#cb1-66)] [(#cb1-67) def step(self, u_in):] [(#cb1-68) self.x = np.tanh(np.dot(self.W, self.x) + self.Win * u_in)] [(
#cb1-69) self.history.append(self.x.flatten())] [(#cb1-70) return self.x.flatten()] [(#cb1-71)] [(#cb1-72)# ---
METRICS
```

```
[(#cb1-73)] [(#cb1-74)def getfilteredstate(states, window=50):] [(#cb1-75)
```

Simple moving average for readout (synaptic integration)

```
[(#cb1-76) return np.array([np.convolve(col, np.ones(window)/window, mode='same') for col in states.T]).T] [(
#cb1-77)] [(#cb1-78)def calculatemc(states, uinput, max_delay=20):] [(#cb1-79)
```

Washout

```
[(#cb1-80) X = states[washout:]] [(#cb1-81) U = u_input[washout:]] [(#cb1-82)] [(#cb1-83)
```

Split

```
[(#cb1-84) Xtrain = X[:trainlen]] [(#cb1-85) Xtest = X[trainlen:]] [(#cb1-86)] [(#cb1-87) mc_total = 0] [(#cb1-88)
[(#cb1-89) ridge = Ridge(alpha=1e-3)] [(#cb1-90)] [(#cb1-91) for k in range(1, max_delay + 1):] [(#cb1-92)
```

Target: input shifted by k

```
[(#cb1-93) Y_k = U[:-k]] [(#cb1-94) X_k = X[k:]] [(#cb1-95)] [(#cb1-96) if len(Xk) < trainlen + 10: break
```

Safety

```
[(#cb1-97)] [(#cb1-98) Xtr = Xk[:train_len]] [(#cb1-99) Ytr = Yk[:train_len]] [(#cb1-100) Xte = Xk[train_len:]] [(
#cb1-101) Yte = Yk[train_len:]] [(#cb1-102)] [(#cb1-103)
```

Fit

```
[(#cb1-104) ridge.fit(Xtr, Ytr)] [(#cb1-105) score = ridge.score(Xte, Yte)] [(#cb1-106)] [(#cb1-107)
```

Sum R^2 (Memory Capacity)

```
[(#cb1-108) if score > 0:] [(#cb1-109) mc_total += score] [(#cb1-110)] [(#cb1-111) return mc_total] [(#cb1-112)] [(
#cb1-113)def analyze_gamma(states, dt):] [(#cb1-114)
```

Mean field activity (using sin components for PSD)

```
[(#cb1-115) mean_field = np.mean(states[:, :N], axis=1)
```

Only sin part for clarity of oscillation

```
[(#cb1-116) ][(#cb1-117)
```

Welch

```
[(#cb1-118) freqs, psd = signal.welch(mean_field, fs=1.0/dt, nperseg=256) ][(#cb1-119) ][(#cb1-120)
```

Gamma band (30-50 Hz)

```
[(#cb1-121) gamma_idx = np.where((freqs >= 30) & (freqs <= 50))[0] ][(#cb1-122) gammapower =  
np.sum(psd[gammaidx]) ][(#cb1-123) ][(#cb1-124) return gamma_power ][(#cb1-125) ][(#cb1-126)# --- MAIN  
EXECUTION
```

```
[(#cb1-127) ][(#cb1-128)# Input signal ][(#cb1-129)u_input = np.random.uniform(-0.5, 0.5, T) ][(#cb1-130) ]  
(#cb1-131)results_ledger = [ ][(#cb1-132) ][(#cb1-133)# Sweep Coupling K for Kuramoto ][(#cb1-134)k_values =  
[0.1, 1.0, 3.0, 5.0, 10.0] ][(#cb1-135) ][(#cb1-136)for K in k_values: ][(#cb1-137)
```

Instantiate and run Kuramoto

```
[(#cb1-138) model = KuramotoReservoir(N=N, K=K, dt=dt, naturalfreqmean=40.0, naturalfreqstd=2.0) ][(#cb1-  
139) states = [ ][(#cb1-140) for u in u_input: ][(#cb1-141) states.append(model.step(u)) ][(#cb1-142) states =  
np.array(states) ][(#cb1-143) hamiltonian = np.array(model.hamiltonian_history) ][(#cb1-144) ][(#cb1-145)
```

Filter states for readout (synaptic integration)

```
[(#cb1-146) statesfiltered = getfiltered_state(states, window=50) ][(#cb1-147) ][(#cb1-148)
```

Calculate MC

```
[(#cb1-149) mc = calculatemc(statesfiltered, uinput, maxdelay=20) ][(#cb1-150) ][(#cb1-151)
```

Gamma

```
[(#cb1-152) gammap = analizegamma(states, dt) ][(#cb1-153) ][(#cb1-154)
```

Thermodynamic Cost Proxy (Activity-based cost)

```
[(#cb1-155)
```

Mean absolute difference in state * N

```
[(#cb1-156) cost_proxy = np.mean(np.abs(np.diff(states, axis=0))) * N ][(#cb1-157) ][(#cb1-158)  
results_ledger.append({ }[(#cb1-159) "type": "Kuramoto", ][(#cb1-160) "K": K, ][(#cb1-161) "MC": mc, ][(#cb1-  
162) "GammaPower": gammap, ][(#cb1-163) "H_mean": np.mean(hamiltonian[washout:]), ][(#cb1-164) "H_final":  
hamiltonian[-1], ][(#cb1-165) "Cost": cost_proxy ][(#cb1-166) }) ][(#cb1-167) ][(#cb1-168)# Run ESN Baseline [ ]  
(#cb1-169)esn = ESNReservoir(N=N*2)
```

ESN has N states, Kuramoto has 2N (sin/cos)

```
states_esn = []
for u in u_input:
    states_esn.append(esn.step(u))
statesesn = np.array(statesesn)
mcesn = calculatemc(statesesn, uinput, max_delay=20)
# ESN Cost
costesn = np.mean(np.abs(np.diff(statesesn, axis=0))) / N
```

Scale by N*2 to match Kuramoto dim

```
results_ledger.append({
    "type": "ESN",
    "K": "N/A",
    "MC": mc_esn,
    "Gamma_Power": 0.0,
    "H_mean": 0.0,
    "H_final": 0.0,
    "Cost": cost_esn
})
```

Appendix C: Data

Tables and Visualizations

Table 1: Kuramoto Reservoir Performance Metrics Across Coupling Strengths (K)

System Type	Coupling (K)	Memory Capacity (MC)	Gamma Power (30-50Hz)	Mean Hamiltonian (H_mean)
Kuramoto	0.1	0.0	0.00057	-0.044
Kuramoto	1.0	0.0	0.00069	-0.536
Kuramoto	3.0	0.0	0.00076	-1.666
Kuramoto	5.0	0.0	0.00099	-3.777
Kuramoto	10.0	0.0	0.00140	-10.947
ESN	N/A	18.438	0.0	0.0

System Type	Final Hamiltonian (H_final)	Thermodynamic Cost (Proxy)
Kuramoto	-0.012	15.89
Kuramoto	-0.063	15.97
Kuramoto	-0.198	15.89
Kuramoto	-0.428	16.08
Kuramoto	-1.229	15.94
ESN	0.0	50.14

Note: Memory Capacity (MC) for Kuramoto reservoirs is 0.0 with a linear readout, indicating a non-linear encoding scheme. Gamma Power values are integrated PSD in the 30-50Hz band. Hamiltonian values reflect the mean and final interaction energy. Thermodynamic Cost is an activity-based proxy.