

## **Higher order rigidity and higher order derivative tests**

- with Holmes-Cerfon and Theran

## Rigidity

- we will study  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  bar and joint frameworks in  $R^d$ .
- $\mathbf{p}$  is a configuration of  $n$  points in  $R^d$ ,  $G$  is a graph with  $n$  vertices (draw 4 chain)
- rigid: i cannot move the points without changing the euclidean length of at least one edge (draw rigid prism)
- we pin out Euclidean isometries for simplicity.
- otherwise flexible (draw two examples)

## Motivation

- we want sufficiency tests for rigidity
- ● show figures.
- we also want natural notion of “how rigid” a rigid framework is.
- we will explore this using critical point derivative tests of an energy function.

**$(j, k)$  flex for  $(G, \mathbf{p})!$**

- Let  $\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{q})$  be the map from a configuration  $\mathbf{q}$  to the vector of squared edge lengths.

- •  $m_{uv}(\mathbf{q}) := \|\mathbf{q}_u - \mathbf{q}_v\|^2.$

- a  $(j, k)$  flex ( $j \leq k$ ) is an analytic trajectory

$$\mathbf{p}(t) := \mathbf{p} + \mathbf{p}^{(j)}t^j + \dots\mathbf{p}^{(k)}t^k + \dots$$

with  $\mathbf{p}^{(j)} \neq 0$ , such that for  $i \in [1..k]$ , we have

$$\frac{d^i}{dt^i}\mathbf{m}(\mathbf{p}(t))|_0 = 0$$

- def is based off ideas explored by Sabitov, Stachel and Nawratil

- a  $(1, 1)$  flex is aka a non-trivial infinitesimal flex

- a  $(1, 2)$  flex is aka a non-trivial second order flex

- analyticity: if  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  is flexible, then there exists a  $j$  so that for any  $k$  there is a  $(j, k)$  flex.

## Known stuff

- thm 1: If  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  has no  $(1, 1)$  flex , then it is rigid. (inf rig)
- thm 2: If  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  has no  $(1, 2)$  flex, then it is rigid. [C80]  
(2or)
- can we continue these theorems?
- No, there exists a cusp mechanism that is not rigid, it has a  $(2, \infty)$  flex, but it has no  $(1, 3)$  flex! [CS94]

## single inf flex

- when the space of infinitesimal flex coefficients  $\mathbf{p}'$  is one dimensional, things get better, due to V. Alexandrov.
- thm 3: Suppose  $\dim \text{InfFlex} = 1$ , if there is a  $k$  so that  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  has no  $(1, k)$  flex then it is rigid. [A01]
- proofs of 2 and 3 are kind of magical.
- we reprove thms 2 and 3 using an energy and critical point analysis.

## energy

- Koiter 45/67, Solerno 92, Garcia et al 05. CW96
- given  $(G, \mathbf{p})$ , with squared edge lengths  $d_{ij}^2$ , we create a stiff bar energy

$$E(\mathbf{q}) := \sum_{ij \in G} E_{ij}(m_{ij}(\mathbf{q}))$$

- Each  $E_{ij}$  is analytic. with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dl} E_{ij} |_{d_{ij}^2} &= 0 \\ \frac{d^2}{dl^2} E_{ij} |_{d_{ij}^2} &> 0 \end{aligned}$$

- The edges want to be at their lengths in  $\mathbf{p}$ .
- $\mathbf{p}$  is a critical point and local min of  $E$ .
- $(G, \mathbf{p})$  is rigid iff  $\mathbf{p}$  is a strict local min of  $E$ .
- will study this critical point using derivative tests.

## energy and growth!

• suppose that  $\mathbf{p}$  is an slm of  $E$ . we can quantify the speed of growth as we leave  $\mathbf{p}$ . Let  $s > 0$  be a rational number.

• We say that  $E$  grows *always- $s$ -quickly* if there is some  $c > 0$  and a ball  $B$  around  $\mathbf{p}$ , so that for all  $\mathbf{q}$  in  $B$ , we have

$$E(\mathbf{q}) - E(\mathbf{p}) \geq c|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{p}|^s$$

- lower bound on growth
- smaller  $s$  means faster growth

• We say that  $E$  grows *sometimes- $s$ -slowly* if there exists an analytic trajectory at  $\mathbf{p}$ ,  $\mathbf{p}(t)$ , and a  $c > 0$  and an  $\epsilon$  so that for  $t \in [0, \epsilon]$

$$E(\mathbf{p}(t)) - E(\mathbf{p}) \leq c|\mathbf{p}(t) - \mathbf{p}|^s$$

- upper bound on the above lower bound



...

- We say that  $E$  grows *s-tightly* if it grows sometimes-s-slowly and always-s-quickly.
- thm [B-N et al 96]: For  $E$  analytic, at an slm, there exists a tight value for  $s$ .
- need not be integer, even if  $E$  is a polynomial.

## order of rigidity

- the following def seems natural
- Let  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  be a framework and let  $E$  be a stiff bar energy for  $(G, \mathbf{p})$ . Suppose that  $E$  grows  $s$ -tightly for some (rational) value of  $s$ . Then we say that the *rigidity order* of  $(G, \mathbf{p}, E)$  is  $s/2$ .
- the  $1/2$  is for convenience

## M and E derivs!

- ME lemma (generalizing Solerno): Let  $E$  be any stiff bar-energy for  $(G, \mathbf{p})$ . A trajectory  $\mathbf{p}(t)$  satisfies for  $i \in [1..2k + 1]$

$$\frac{d^i}{dt^i} E(\mathbf{p}(t))|_0 = 0$$

iff for  $i \in [1..k]$

$$\frac{d^i}{dt^i} \mathbf{m}(\mathbf{p}(t))|_0 = 0$$

- proof: taylor series and chain rule
- this connects flex-based and energy-based analysis
- and shows that all stiff bar energies are equivalent

## flexes and E growth

- easy Lemma: Let  $E$  be any stiff bar-energy for  $(G, \mathbf{p})$ . Suppose that there EXISTS a  $(j, k)$  flex for  $(G, \mathbf{p})$ . Then  $E$  grows sometimes- $s$ -slowly where  $s = \frac{2k+2}{j}$ .
- a flex provides some slowly energy growing trajectory!
  
- easy thm: the order of rigidity equals the maximal value of  $\frac{k+1}{j}$  over all  $(j, k)$  flexes.

## **previous definitions**

- in agreement with notions from Garcia and also Tachi
- definition is quite different than Nawratil.

## revist the theorems

- NONEXISTENCE of flexes of specific orders does not typically give us info about always-growth.
- but using derivative tests (discussed next) in some cases can.
- thm 1+: If  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  has no  $(1, 1)$  flex, then its order of rigidity is 1.
- thm 2+: Else, if  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  has no  $(1, 2)$  flex, then its order of rigidity is 2.
- thm 3+: Suppose  $\dim \text{InfFlex} = 1$ . If there exists some  $k$  such that  $(G, \mathbf{p})$  has a  $(1, k - 1)$  flex but no  $(1, k)$  flex, then its order of rigidity is  $k$ .

## Part II, derivative tests

- let  $f(x, y)$  be any sufficiently smooth bivariate function, with a critical point at the origin, and with  $f(0, 0) = 0$ .
- wish to determine sIm, wIm sdl, wIM, sIM, using Taylor expansion of  $f$

## 2dt I

- second derivative test (for slm).
- write multivariate second order approximation (at the origin)  $f = f_2 + hot$ .
- •  $f_2$  must be homogeneous, as we are at a critical point.
- if  $f_2$  has a slm at the origin (Hessian is PD), then  $f_2$  grows always 2 quickly.
- in a small enough ball, the h.o.t. are dominated. certifies slm and certifies always 2-quick growth
- But if  $f_2$  has a wlm at the origin (Hessian is only PSD), then the h.o.t. can have an influence, so the test is indeterminate.



## naive 4dt

- what to do next is surprisingly subtle.
- use fourth order approximation  $f = f_4 + h.o.t.$
- In multivariate setting,  $f_4$  need not be homogeneous
- suppose  $f_4$  has a slm at the origin
- this does not mean that  $f_4$  grows always 4 quickly.
- so h.o.t. can still dominate and  $f_4$  will give the wrong answer!

## example

- Let  $f(x, y) = (x - y^2)^2 + x^2y^2 - y^6$ .
- we have  $f_2(x, y) = x^2$ . (wlm, zero on y axis)
- take  $f_4(x, y) = (x - y^2)^2 + x^2y^2$ .
- this has slm: first term is positive except on the parabola  $x = y^2$ . Second term is positive except on axes.
- but  $f_4$  grows sometimes 6-slowly.
  - let  $x(t) = t^2$  and  $y(t) = t$ .
  - then  $g(t) := f(x(t), y(t)) = t^6$ . (and radius grows with first order in  $t$ ).
- so h.o.t. can be relevant
- in fact  $f$  has a saddle at the origin!
- Q: can you use 4th or higher partial derivatives of  $f(x, y)$  or t-derivatives of  $f(x(t), y(t))$  for some set of trajectories  $(x(t), y(t))$ , to classify a critical point?

## old thm new thm and lost thm

- thm [ancient]: there exists an efficient general multivariate 2nd derivative test
  - it can certify always 2-growth
- thm [GHT]: there exists a general multivariate 4th derivative test
  - it can certify always 4-growth
  - no efficiency claim
- thm [Cushing '75] when the Hessian has nullity one, then there exists an efficient  $2k$ th derivative test for any  $k$ .
  - it can certify always  $2k$ -growth
  - for  $f$  analytic, the sequence of tests will eventually halt for slm, sdl, and slM.
- feel free to talk about the details later

## back to rigidity

- [thm folklore] If there is no  $(1, 1)$  flex then the 2dt will certify an slm of  $E$ .
- [thm GHT] If there is no  $(1, 2)$  flex then our 4dt will certify an slm of  $E$ .
- [thm GHT] When  $\dim InfFlex = 1$ , if there is no  $(1, k)$  flex, then Cushing's 2kdt will certifying an slm of  $E$ .
- QED 123.

## complexity

- in general determining rigid/flexible is NP-HARD
- in general ruling out a  $(1, 1)$  flex can be done using linear algebra
- in general ruling out a  $(1, 2)$  flex has no known efficient algorithm
- But when  $\dim \text{InfFlex} = 1$ , then for any  $k$ , ruling out a  $(1, k)$  flex can be done by solving linear systems!
- only one choice for  $\mathbf{p}'$ . Fix it and then search for  $\mathbf{p}''$  using a lin sys. (Essentially) only once choice for  $\mathbf{p}''$ . ...

**examples**

## prestress

- all stiff bar energies are interchangeable.
- if one allows for energies that are not bar-like then things get more complicated
- but one can try to analyze the order of growth of  $(G, \mathbf{p}, E)$ .
- this leads to the notion of (first order) prestress rigidity of  $(G, \mathbf{p})$ , as well as a notion of higher order prestress rigidity.