

EQUILATERAL CHAINS AND CYCLIC CENTRAL CONFIGURATIONS OF THE PLANAR 5-BODY PROBLEM

YIYANG DENG AND MARSHALL HAMPTON

ABSTRACT. Central configurations and relative equilibria are an important facet of the study of the N -body problem, but become very difficult to rigorously analyze for $N > 3$. In this paper we focus on a particular but interesting class of configurations of the 5-body problem: the equilateral pentagonal configurations, which have a cycle of five equal edges. We prove a variety of results concerning central configurations with this property, including a computer-assisted proof of the finiteness of such configurations for any positive five masses with a range of rational-exponent homogeneous potentials (including the Newtonian case and the point-vortex model), some constraints on their shapes, and we determine some exact solutions for particular N -body potentials.

1. INTRODUCTION

In this work we consider some particular classes of relative equilibria of a planar N -body problem, in which N point particles with non-negative masses m_i interact through a central potential U :

$$m_i \ddot{q}_{i,j} = \frac{\partial U}{\partial q_{i,j}}, \quad i \in \{0, \dots, N-1\},$$

$$U = \sum_{i < j} m_i m_j / r_{i,j}^{A-2}$$

where $q_i \in \mathbf{R}^2$ is the position of particle i , and $r_{i,j} = |q_i - q_j|$ are the mutual distances between the particles. The exponent A is a real parameter in $(2, \infty)$.

The most interesting and important case is the Newtonian gravitational model with $A = 3$, but we believe it can be useful to generalize the problem since many features of the relative equilibria do not strongly depend on the exponent A . The potential can be extended to the case $A = 2$ by using

$$U = \sum_{i < k} m_i m_k \log(r_{i,k})$$

which has been used in models of fluid vortex tubes [19, 21, 4].

The relative equilibria (equilibria in a uniformly rotating reference frame) must satisfy the equations for a central configuration [37], defined as configurations for which

$$(1) \quad \lambda(q_i - c) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{m_j (q_i - q_j)}{r_{i,j}^A}$$

The vector c is the center of mass,

$$c = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^n m_i q_i,$$

with

$$M = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$$

the total mass, which we will always assume to be nonzero (for the special case in which $M = 0$, see [6]). The parameter λ is real. The masses m_i are also assumed to be real, and we are primarily interested in positive masses.

In some earlier literature central configurations are also referred to as *permanent configurations* [27, 33, 5]. The study of central configurations and relative equilibria provides an avenue for progress into the N-body problem, which otherwise presents formidable difficulty. There is a rich literature on these configurations, starting with Euler [13] and Lagrange [22] who completely characterized the relative equilibria for the Newtonian three-body problem. The collinear three-body configurations studied by Euler were further elucidated by Moulton [30], who showed there is a unique (up to scaling) central configuration for any ordering of N positive masses on a line.

For $N > 3$ it is much harder to characterize the central configurations. One of the most basic questions is whether there are finitely many equivalence classes of central configurations for each choice of positive masses. This question has been highlighted in the planar case by several authors [7, 37, 35]. It has been resolved for the Newtonian four-body problem [16], the four-vortex problem [17], and partially for the Newtonian five-body problem [2].

There is much work on other interesting questions on central configurations, such as their stability. Rather than attempt to summarize this work we recommend the excellent surveys by Moeckel [29, 28].

2. EQUATIONS FOR CENTRAL CONFIGURATIONS AND EQUILATERAL CHAINS

Choosing two indices i and j we can take the inner product of (1) with $q_i - q_j$ to get

$$\lambda(q_i - c) \cdot (q_i - q_j) = \sum_{k=1, k \neq i}^n \frac{m_k(q_i - q_k) \cdot (q_i - q_j)}{r_{ik}^A}$$

and then the left-hand side becomes

$$\lambda(q_i - c) \cdot (q_i - q_j) = \frac{\lambda}{M} \sum_{k=1}^n m_k(q_i - q_j) \cdot (q_i - q_k) = \tilde{\lambda} \sum_{k=1}^n m_k(r_{i,j}^2 + r_{ik}^2 - r_{j,k}^2)/2$$

in which we have introduced $\tilde{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda}{M}$. The inner-products on the right-hand side can be rewritten in terms of the mutual distances as well. After putting all the terms on one side of the equation and cancelling a factor of 1/2, we obtain for each choice of $i \neq j$ the equations

$$(2) \quad \sum_{k=1}^n m_k(r_{ik}^{-A} - \tilde{\lambda})(r_{i,j}^2 + r_{ik}^2 - r_{j,k}^2) = 0$$

If we now introduce variables $S_{i,j} = r_{ik}^{-A} - \tilde{\lambda}$ and $A_{i,j,k} = r_{j,k}^2 - r_{ik}^2 - r_{i,j}^2$ we obtain the compact form

$$f_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^n m_k S_{ik} A_{i,j,k} = 0.$$

Gareth Roberts has observed that these equations follow from the developments given in [1]; they are sometimes referred to as the ‘asymmetric Albouy-Chenciner equations’.

If we combine $f_{i,j}$ and $f_{j,i}$ we obtain $n(n-1)/2$ equations

$$g_{i,j} = f_{i,j} + f_{j,i} = \sum_{k=1}^n m_k (S_{ik} A_{i,j,k} + S_{jk} A_{jik}) = 0.$$

These are the equations presented as the Albouy-Chenciner equations in [16]. These can be interpreted kinematically as the statement that there exists a λ for which

$$\lambda r_{i,j}^2 = -(q_i - q_j) \cdot \ddot{q}_{i,j}$$

for all $i \neq j$.

By taking the wedge product instead of the inner product, we obtain a different set of equations referred to as the Laura-Andoyer equations [23, 3]

$$(3) \quad L_{i,j} := \sum_{k \neq i,j} m_k (R_{i,k} - R_{j,k}) \Delta_{i,j,k} = 0$$

where $\Delta_{i,j,k}$ is the oriented area $(q_i - q_j) \wedge (q_i - q_k)$, $q_i \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and $R_{i,j} = r_{i,j}^{-A} = (|q_i - q_j|)^{-A}$. Sometimes the $\Delta_{i,j,k}$ will be replaced by the non-negative $D_{i,j,k} = |\Delta_{i,j,k}|$ in order to make the sign of the terms in our equations more apparent.

We define an N -body configuration to be an *equilateral chain* if at least $N-1$ consecutive distances involving all of the points are equal; we will choose the particular convention with

$$r_{1,2} = r_{2,3} = \dots = r_{N-2,N-1} = r_{N-1,N}$$

Similarly an *equilateral cyclic configuration* has a N equal distances in a complete cycle, and we will choose our indexing so that

$$r_{1,2} = r_{2,3} = \dots = r_{1,N}$$

The five-body cyclic configurations generalize the rhomboidal configurations of the four-body problem which have been well studied in both the Newtonian and vortex cases [25, 32, 18, 24, 31]. The five-body configurations of a rhombus with a central mass are another interesting and well-studied extension, which contain continua of central configurations if a negative central mass is allowed [34, 14, 2, 9].

The Laura-Andoyer equations for the equilateral pentagon case fall into two sets of five; one of these sets contains equations involving only two of the masses:

$$\begin{aligned}
(4) \quad & m_4 \Delta_{1,3,4}(R_{1,4} - R_{1,2}) + m_5 \Delta_{1,3,5}(R_{1,2} - R_{3,5}) = 0, \\
& m_1 \Delta_{1,2,4}(R_{1,4} - R_{1,2}) + m_5 \Delta_{2,4,5}(R_{1,2} - R_{2,5}) = 0, \\
& m_3 \Delta_{2,3,5}(R_{3,5} - R_{1,2}) + m_4 \Delta_{2,4,5}(R_{1,2} - R_{2,4}) = 0, \\
& m_1 \Delta_{1,3,5}(R_{1,3} - R_{1,2}) + m_2 \Delta_{2,3,5}(R_{1,2} - R_{2,5}) = 0, \\
& m_2 \Delta_{1,2,4}(R_{2,4} - R_{1,2}) + m_3 \Delta_{1,3,4}(R_{1,2} - R_{1,3}) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

while the remaining equations involve three masses:

$$\begin{aligned}
& m_3 \Delta_{1,2,3}(R_{1,3} - R_{1,2}) + m_4 \Delta_{1,2,4}(R_{1,4} - R_{2,4}) + m_5 \Delta_{1,2,5}(R_{1,2} - R_{2,5}) = 0, \\
& m_2 \Delta_{1,2,5}(R_{2,5} - R_{1,2}) + m_3 \Delta_{1,3,5}(R_{3,5} - R_{1,3}) + m_4 \Delta_{1,4,5}(R_{1,2} - R_{1,4}) = 0, \\
& m_1 \Delta_{1,2,3}(R_{1,2} - R_{1,3}) + m_4 \Delta_{2,3,4}(R_{2,4} - R_{1,2}) + m_5 \Delta_{2,3,5}(R_{2,5} - R_{3,5}) = 0, \\
& m_1 \Delta_{1,3,4}(R_{1,3} - R_{1,4}) + m_2 \Delta_{2,3,4}(R_{1,2} - R_{2,4}) + m_5 \Delta_{3,4,5}(R_{3,5} - R_{1,2}) = 0, \\
& m_1 \Delta_{1,4,5}(R_{1,4} - R_{1,2}) + m_2 \Delta_{2,4,5}(R_{2,4} - R_{2,5}) + m_3 \Delta_{3,4,5}(R_{1,2} - R_{3,5}) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

If we normalize the configurations by choosing $q_1 = (-1/2, 0)$ and $q_2 = (1/2, 0)$ (so $r_{1,2} = 1$), then the $\Delta_{i,j,k}$ are

$$\Delta_{1,2,3} = y_3, \quad \Delta_{1,2,4} = y_4, \quad \Delta_{1,2,5} = y_5$$

$$\Delta_{1,3,4} = -x_4 y_3 + x_3 y_4 + \frac{1}{2}(y_4 - y_3)$$

$$\Delta_{1,3,5} = -x_5 y_3 + x_3 y_5 + \frac{1}{2}(y_5 - y_3)$$

$$\Delta_{1,4,5} = -x_5 y_4 + x_4 y_5 + \frac{1}{2}(y_5 - y_4)$$

$$\Delta_{2,3,4} = -x_4 y_3 + x_3 y_4 + \frac{1}{2}(y_3 - y_4)$$

$$\Delta_{2,3,5} = -x_5 y_3 + x_3 y_5 + \frac{1}{2}(y_3 - y_5)$$

$$\Delta_{2,4,5} = -x_5 y_4 + x_4 y_5 + \frac{1}{2}(y_4 - y_5)$$

$$\Delta_{3,4,5} = -x_4 y_3 + x_5 y_3 + x_3 y_4 - x_5 y_4 - x_3 y_5 + x_4 y_5$$

3. FINITENESS RESULTS

To study the finiteness of the planar equilateral configurations we use the asymmetric Albouy-Chenciner equations $f_{i,j} = 0$ and the Cayley-Menger determinants for all four-point subconfigurations

$$(5) \quad C_{i,j,k,l} = \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & r_{i,j}^2 & r_{i,k}^2 & r_{i,l}^2 \\ 1 & r_{i,j}^2 & 0 & r_{j,k}^2 & r_{j,l}^2 \\ 1 & r_{i,k}^2 & r_{j,k}^2 & 0 & r_{k,l}^2 \\ 1 & r_{i,l}^2 & r_{j,l}^2 & r_{k,l}^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = 0$$

(with distinct i, j, k , and l).

Following a very similar procedure to that described in [15], with the assistance of the software Sage [12], Singular [11], and Gfan [20] we find relatively easily that there are finitely many equilateral central configurations for $A = 2$ and $A = 3$, for any positive masses. The tropical prevariety of the system is much simpler in the vortex case $A = 2$, having only 22 generating rays compared to 37 in the Newtonian case. In fact the Newtonian case generalizes for potential exponents greater than 3 as well.

Because Gfan cannot currently compute a prevariety for variable exponents, we used a slight variation of the Albouy-Chenciner equations to compute and to analyze the initial form systems for rational exponents $A > 2$. Let $Q_{i,j} = r_{i,j}^{-A+2}$, so that

$$f_{i,j} = \sum_{k=1}^n m_k S_{ik} A_{i,j,k} = \sum_{k=1}^n m_k (Q_{i,j} r_{i,j}^{-2} - \tilde{\lambda}) A_{i,j,k}$$

We used Gfan to compute the prevariety of these equations with the normalization $\tilde{\lambda} = 1$, and cleared denominators to obtain a polynomial system in $r_{i,j}$ and $Q_{i,j}$, combined with the four-point Cayley-Menger determinants.

For rational $A > 2$, the rays of the tropical prevariety fall into 9 equivalence classes under the action of the cyclic group C_5 on the indices of the $r_{i,j}$. Since we have chosen the equilateral configurations to have $r_{i,j} = r_{i+1,j+1}$, this action fixes our first coordinate $r_{i,j}$ and cyclically permutes the remaining five distances. In the table below, the coordinate exponents are in the order $(r_{1,2}, r_{1,3}, r_{1,4}, r_{2,4}, r_{2,5}, r_{3,5})$. Six of these rays are independent of A .

Label	Ray Representative	Multiplicity
h_1	$(-1, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1)$	1
h_2	$(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$	1
h_3	$(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$	1
h_4	$(0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$	5
h_5	$(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)$	5
h_6	$(1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)$	5
h_7	$(A - 2, -2, A - 2, -2, A - 2, A - 2)$	5
h_8	$(A - 2, -2, A - 2, 0, A - 2, A - 2)$	10
h_9	$(A - 2, -2, A - 2, A - 2, A - 2, A - 2)$	5

Because of the balance condition for tropical varieties [26], we can restrict our analysis to cones that intersect the half-space containing exponent vectors with a non-negative sum. This excludes the first ray in our list. Again after reducing by the C_5 symmetry we have cones

Label	Representative Cone Rays
C_1	$\{(0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_2	$\{(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_3	$\{(1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1)\}$
C_4	$\{(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_5	$\{(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_6	$\{(A-2, -2, A-2, -2, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_7	$\{(A-2, -2, A-2, 0, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_8	$\{(A-2, -2, A-2, A-2, 0, A-2)\}$
C_9	$\{(A-2, -2, A-2, A-2, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_{10}	$\{(0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1), (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 1)\}$
C_{11}	$\{(0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1), (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1)\}$
C_{12}	$\{(0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1), (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_{13}	$\{(0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_{14}	$\{(0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_{15}	$\{(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_{16}	$\{(1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1), (A-2, -2, A-2, 0, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_{17}	$\{(1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1), (A-2, 0, A-2, -2, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_{18}	$\{(1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1), (A-2, -2, A-2, A-2, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_{19}	$\{(A-2, -2, A-2, -2, A-2, A-2), (A-2, -2, A-2, 0, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_{20}	$\{(A-2, -2, A-2, -2, A-2, A-2), (A-2, 0, A-2, -2, A-2, A-2)\}$
C_{21}	$\{(0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1), (0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)\}$
C_{22}	$\{(1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1), (A-2, -2, A-2, -2, A-2, A-2), (A-2, -2, A-2, 0, A-2, A-2), (A-2, 0, A-2, -2, A-2, A-2)\}$

Remarkably, for each cone in the tropical prevariety the initial form polynomials factor enough that we can compute the elimination ideal of the initial form system in the ring $\mathbb{Q}[m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4, m_5]$, using Singular [10] within Sage [36], without the need to specialize to a particular value of A (apart from the condition that $A \neq 2$). To rule out a nontrivial (i.e. nonmonomial) initial form ideal we only need to assume that no subset of the masses has a vanishing sum, including the total mass.

It seems possible that this formulation of the equations with the $Q_{i,j}$ may be useful in studying central configurations in other contexts.

We can include the case of rational A in this result, since if $A = p/q$ then we can use the polynomial conditions $Q_{i,j}^q r_{i,j}^p - r_{i,j}^{2q} = 0$ to define the $Q_{i,j}$.

Altogether this gives a computer-assisted proof of

Theorem 1. *For nonzero masses with nonzero subset sums (i.e. $m_i + m_j \neq 0$, $m_i + m_j + m_k \neq 0$, $m_i + m_j + m_k + m_l \neq 0$, $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 + m_5 \neq 0$), there are finitely many planar equilateral 5-body central configurations for any rational potential exponent $A \geq 2$.*

This result strongly suggests the conjecture that there are finitely many planar equilateral 5-body central configurations for any real $A \geq 2$, but the proof of that would require different methods.

4. THE SYMMETRIC CASE

In this section we impose the further restrictions of an axis of symmetry $r_{1,3} = r_{2,5}$, $r_{1,5} = r_{2,3}$, and $r_{1,4} = r_{2,4}$.

In addition to normalizing the size of the configuration with $r_{1,2} = 1$, we can choose cartesian coordinates $q_1 = (-1/2, 0)$, $q_2 = (1/2, 0)$, $q_3 = (x_3, y_3)$, $q_4 = (0, y_4)$, and $q_5 = (-x_3, y_3)$. The equilateral constraints in these coordinates become:

$$4x_3^2 - 4x_3 + 4y_3^2 - 3 = 0$$

$$x_3^2 + y_3^2 - 2y_3y_4 + y_4^2 - 1 = 0$$

We can parameterize the configurations by y_4 , in terms of which

$$y_3 = \frac{8y_4^3 + 2y_4 \pm \sqrt{-16y_4^4 + 56y_4^2 + 15}}{4(4y_4^2 + 1)}$$

$$x_3 = \frac{4y_4^2 + 1 \pm 2y_4\sqrt{-16y_4^4 + 56y_4^2 + 15}}{4(4y_4^2 + 1)}$$

Note that the choices of sign must be the same, giving us two curves of configurations. We will refer to the positive choice of sign as branch A, and the other as branch B.

The wedge products $\Delta_{i,j,k}$ in these coordinates are

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{1,2,3} &= y_3 \\ \Delta_{1,2,4} &= y_4 \\ \Delta_{1,3,4} &= x_3y_4 + (y_4 - y_3)/2 \\ \Delta_{1,3,5} &= 2y_3x_3 \\ \Delta_{1,4,5} &= x_3y_4 - (y_4 - y_3)/2 \\ \Delta_{3,4,5} &= 2x_3(y_4 - y_3) \end{aligned}$$

These configurations are shown in Figure 1.

For the vortex case $A = 2$, it is possible to compute a Groebner basis of the system used in the finiteness proof. This basis shows there are only two possible symmetric equilateral configurations: the regular pentagon with equal masses, and a configuration (using normalized masses $m_1 = m_2 = 1$) with m_4 satisfying

$$64m_4^9 - 752m_4^8 + 2316m_4^7 - 109m_4^6 - 2830m_4^5 + 45m_4^4 + 1362m_4^3 + 215m_4^2 - 149m_4 - 17 = 0$$

which has a single positive root at $m_4 \approx 0.34199$ and then $m_3 = m_5 \approx 2.32$.




FIGURE 1. Normalized symmetric equilateral pentagons. Branch A is in blue, branch B in red.

We were also able to compute a Groebner basis for $A = 4$, with the mass polynomial

$$\begin{aligned}
 &12288m_4^{16} - 232064m_4^{15} + 636883m_4^{14} + 5616221m_4^{13} + 2342977m_4^{12} - 15626678m_4^{11} \\
 &- 6546497m_4^{10} + 17143788m_4^9 - 1407668m_4^8 - 5326884m_4^7 + 456601m_4^6 + 2374416m_4^5 \\
 &- 239673m_4^4 - 387130m_4^3 - 33431m_4^2 + 25519m_4 + 957 = 0
 \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 2. Symmetric vortex ($A = 2$) central configuration

The Laura-Andoyer equations for the symmetric case are

$$L_{1,3} = m_3(1 - R_{3,5})\Delta_{1,3,5} + m_4(R_{1,4} - 1)\Delta_{1,3,4} = 0$$

$$L_{1,4} = m_1(1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,2,4} + m_3(R_{1,3} - 1)\Delta_{1,3,4} = 0$$

$$L_{1,5} = m_1(1 - R_{1,3})\Delta_{1,2,3} + m_3(R_{1,3} - R_{3,5})\Delta_{1,3,5} + m_4(R_{1,4} - 1)\Delta_{1,4,5} = 0$$

$$L_{3,4} = m_1[(R_{1,3} - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,3,4} + (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{2,3,4}] + m_3(R_{3,5} - 1)\Delta_{3,4,5} = 0$$

We can highlight the linearity of these equations in the masses by forming the mass-coefficient matrix:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & (1 - R_{3,5})\Delta_{1,3,5} & (R_{1,4} - 1)\Delta_{1,3,4} \\ (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,2,4} & (R_{1,3} - 1)\Delta_{1,3,4} & 0 \\ (1 - R_{1,3})\Delta_{1,2,3} & (R_{1,3} - R_{3,5})\Delta_{1,3,5} & (R_{1,4} - 1)\Delta_{1,4,5} \\ (R_{1,3} - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,3,4} + (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,4,5} & (R_{3,5} - 1)\Delta_{3,4,5} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

We can row-reduce this a little to get

$$(6) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & (1 - R_{3,5})\Delta_{1,3,5} & (R_{1,4} - 1)\Delta_{1,3,4} \\ (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,2,4} & (R_{1,3} - 1)\Delta_{1,3,4} & 0 \\ (1 - R_{1,3})\Delta_{1,2,3} & \left[(R_{1,3} - R_{3,5}) - (1 - R_{3,5})\frac{\Delta_{1,4,5}}{\Delta_{1,3,4}} \right] \Delta_{1,3,5} & 0 \\ (R_{1,3} - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,3,4} + (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,4,5} & (R_{3,5} - 1)\Delta_{3,4,5} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

This matrix must have a kernel vector of masses in the positive orthant. This imposes many constraints. To simplify the analysis of these constraints, we assume (without loss of generality) that $y_4 \geq 0$. This convention means that $\Delta_{1,2,4} \geq 0$. It is immediate from equation $L_{1,4}$ that y_4 cannot be zero, so we can assume that $\Delta_{1,2,4}$ is strictly positive.

In terms of the signs of the $\Delta_{i,j,k}$ and the magnitude of the mutual distances relative to $r_{1,2}$, there are five cases for the branch A configurations. Representatives of these are shown in Figure 3.

All of the branch A configurations have $\Delta_{1,2,3} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,2,4} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,5} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,4,5} > 0$, and $r_{1,3} > \frac{\sqrt{6}}{2} > 1$. The distinguishing geometric properties of the branch A configurations are:

- A1) Concave, $\Delta_{1,3,4} < 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} < 0$, $r_{1,4} < 1$, $r_{3,5} < 1$.
- A2) Concave, $\Delta_{1,3,4} < 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} < 0$, $r_{1,4} < 1$, $r_{3,5} > 1$.
- A3) Concave, $\Delta_{1,3,4} > 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} < 0$, $r_{1,4} < 1$, $r_{3,5} > 1$.
- A4) Convex, $\Delta_{1,3,4} > 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} > 0$, $r_{1,4} > 1$, $r_{3,5} > 1$.
- A5) Convex, $\Delta_{1,3,4} > 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} > 0$, $r_{1,4} > 1$, $r_{3,5} > 1$.

Theorem 2. *The only possible branch A central configurations are of type A2 or A4. There is a unique type A2 central configuration for all $A \geq 2$.*

Proof. For type A1 configurations, we can immediately verify that $L_{1,3} < 0$, so no such central configurations are possible. This is also true for the borderline A1/A2 configuration with $r_{3,5} = 1$.

The type A2 configurations contain an interesting central configuration.

For the mass-coefficient matrix 6 to have nonzero mass solutions, the following minor must vanish:

$$\begin{aligned} F(y_4) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,2,4} & (R_{1,3} - 1)\Delta_{1,3,4} \\ (R_{1,3} - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,3,4} + (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,4,5} & (R_{3,5} - 1)\Delta_{3,4,5} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (1 - R_{1,4})(R_{3,5} - 1)\Delta_{1,2,4}\Delta_{3,4,5} \\ &\quad + (1 - R_{1,3})\Delta_{1,3,4}((R_{1,3} - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,3,4} + (1 - R_{1,4})\Delta_{1,4,5}) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

We can prove the existence of a type A2 central configuration for any $A \geq 2$ by examining the sign of F at the regional endpoints. At the lower endpoint, where $y_4 = \frac{2-\sqrt{3}}{2}$, the points 1,2,3, and 5 form a square, with $r_{3,5} = 1$, $r_{1,4} = \sqrt{2 - \sqrt{3}}$, $\Delta_{1,3,4} = \frac{1-\sqrt{3}}{2} < 0$, and $\Delta_{1,4,5} = \frac{1}{2}$. Since $R_{3,5} = 1$, the first portion of F is zero, which makes it elementary to check the sign of the remaining terms and see that $F(\frac{2-\sqrt{3}}{2}) > 0$.

At the other endpoint, $y_4 = \frac{\sqrt{5-2\sqrt{5}}}{2}$, and the points 1,4, and 3 are collinear (as are points 2, 4, and 5) so $\Delta_{1,3,4} = 0$. Only the first portion of F is nonzero for this configuration, and it is straightforward to see that $F(\frac{\sqrt{5-2\sqrt{5}}}{2}) < 0$.

We can prove the uniqueness of the type A2 central configuration for each $A \geq 2$ using interval arithmetic, simply evaluating F and $\frac{dF}{dy_4}$ for intervals of y_4 and A . The lack of any common zeros shows that no bifurcations occur, and it suffices to check the uniqueness for $A = 2$, for which we have a Groebner basis.

For type A3 configurations, and the boundary case with $D_{1,3,4} = 0$, it is immediate that $L_{1,3} > 0$, so no such central configurations are possible.

Type A4 configurations include the regular pentagon, which is a central configuration for equal masses for all potential exponents A . Remarkably, there is a bifurcation at




FIGURE 3. Sign type representatives of A branch configurations

$A_c \approx 3.12036856$. It appears that for $A \in [2, A_c]$ the regular pentagon is the only central configuration of type A4, and for $A > A_c$ there are 3 type A4 central configurations (including the regular pentagon). For large A , these two new central configurations converge to the A3/A4 boundary case for which $D_{3,4,5} = 0$, and the house-like configuration with $r_{3,5} = 1$ and $y_4 = 1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$. With interval arithmetic we can prove the uniqueness of the regular pentagon for $A \in [2, 3]$, but we do not have an exact value for the bifurcation value A_c .

For type A5 configurations once again $L_{1,3} < 0$, and no such central configurations are possible. □

For the branch B configurations there are three subcases of convex configurations and two concave, along with some exceptional cases on the borders between them. For all branch B configurations $\Delta_{1,4,5} < 0$ and $r_{3,5} < 1$. The subcases are:

- B1) Convex, $\Delta_{1,2,3} < 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,4} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,5} < 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} > 0$, $r_{1,3} > 1$, and $r_{1,4} < 1$.
- B2) Convex, $\Delta_{1,2,3} < 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,4} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,5} > 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} < 0$, $r_{1,3} < 1$, and $r_{1,4} < 1$.
- B3) Convex, $\Delta_{1,2,3} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,4} < 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,5} < 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} < 0$, $r_{1,3} < 1$, and $r_{1,4} > 1$.
- B4) Concave, $\Delta_{1,2,3} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,4} \geq 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,5} < 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} < 0$, $r_{1,3} < 1$, and $r_{1,4} > 1$.
- B5) Concave, $\Delta_{1,2,3} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,4} > 0$, $\Delta_{1,3,5} > 0$, $\Delta_{3,4,5} > 0$, $r_{1,3} > 1$, and $r_{1,4} > 1$.




FIGURE 4. Sign type representatives of B branch configurations

Theorem 3. *The only possible branch B central configuration is the regular pentagon for all $A \geq 2$ (type B2).*

Proof. The case B1 has no solutions with positive masses, as both terms in equation $L_{1,3}$ are positive.

The case B2 contains the regular pentagon. Using interval arithmetic with the function $F(y_4)$ and its derivative we can verify that there are no other type B2 central configurations for all $A \geq 2$.

The case B3 has no solutions with positive masses, as both terms in equation $L_{1,3}$ are positive.

The case B4 has no solutions with positive masses, as both terms in equation $L_{1,4}$ are positive.

The case B5 has no solutions with positive masses, as both terms in equation $L_{1,3}$ are negative. □

5. GENERAL PLANAR EQUILATERAL PENTAGONS

We know that two diagonals are always greater than the four exterior edges for planar convex four-body central configurations. For strictly convex planar five-body problem, Chen and Hsiao [8] showed that at least two interior edges are less than the exterior edges if the five bodies form a central configuration. They also showed numerical examples of strictly convex central configurations with five bodies that have either one or two interior edges less than the exterior edges. However for convex planar equilateral 5-body central configurations we have the following result:

Lemma 1. *For planar convex equilateral 5-body central configurations all interior edges are greater than the exterior edges.*

Proof. We consider the Laura-Andoyer equations involving only two of the masses (equations (4)). For the convex case we know that $\Delta_{1,2,3}, \Delta_{1,2,4}, \Delta_{1,2,5}, \Delta_{1,3,4}, \Delta_{1,3,5}, \Delta_{1,4,5}, \Delta_{2,3,4}, \Delta_{2,3,5}$ and $\Delta_{3,4,5}$ are all positive.

There is at least one interior edge greater than the exterior edges for any planar equilateral 5-body configuration. Without loss of generality, let $r_{1,4} > r_{1,2}$, and then $R_{1,4} < R_{1,2}$ and $R_{1,4} - R_{1,2} < 0$. From the first equation of (4) we must have $R_{1,2} - R_{3,5} > 0$. So $R_{1,2} > R_{3,5}$ and $r_{3,5} > r_{1,2}$. Similarly, from the third equation, we have $r_{2,4} > r_{1,2}$; from the second equation above, we get $r_{1,3} > r_{1,2}$; from the fifth equation, we obtain $r_{2,5} > r_{1,2}$. Thus, we have

$$r_{1,3}, r_{1,4}, r_{2,4}, r_{2,5}, r_{3,5} > r_{1,2}.$$

□

The five simpler Laura-Andoyer equations (4) can be used to further restrict the possible configurations of planar equilateral 5-body central configurations.

The allowed regions fall into three classes:

Region I: defined by $r_{1,2} < r_{i,j}$ and containing the regular pentagon (in 12345 order)

Region II: defined by $r_{1,2} > r_{i,j}$ and containing the regular pentagon (in 13524 order)

Region III: five disjoint regions, which are equivalent under permutations. These are concave configurations. The region with point 5 in the interior is defined by $\theta_{1,2,3} + \theta_{2,3,4} \leq 3\pi$, $\theta_{1,2,3} \leq 5\pi/3$, $\theta_{2,3,4} \leq 5\pi/3$, $\Delta_{1,3,5} \geq 0$, and $\Delta_{2,4,5} \geq 0$.

These regions are shown in Figure 5.

Conjecture 1. *The only positive mass planar equilateral 5-body central configurations in the Newtonian case are the regular pentagon and star with equal masses and the symmetric configurations discussed above.*




FIGURE 5. Regions of allowable angles $\theta_{1,2}$ and $\theta_{2,3}$ for positive mass equilateral central configurations (white). The more heavily shaded central oval consists of angles that are not geometrically realizable. The regular pentagon configurations are indicated as icons in green and red.

6. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Manuele Santoprete for the suggestion to study this class of configuration.

7. COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no competing interests to declare.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Albouy and A. Chenciner, *Le problème des n corps et les distances mutuelles*, Invent. math. **131** (1997), no. 1, 151–184.
- [2] A. Albouy and V. Kaloshin, *Finiteness of central configurations of five bodies in the plane*, Annals of Math **176** (2012), no. 1, 535–588.
- [3] H. Andoyer, *Sur l'équilibre relatif de n corps*, Bull. Astron. V. **23** (1906), 50–59.
- [4] H. Aref, N. Rott, and H. Thomann, *Gröbli's solution of the three-vortex problem*, Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics **24** (1992), no. 1, 1–21.
- [5] V. A. Brumberg, *Permanent configurations in the problem of four bodies and their stability*, Soviet Astron. **1** (1957), 57–79.

- [6] M. Celli, *Sur les mouvements homographiques de n corps associés à des masses de signe quelconque, le cas particulier où la somme des masses est nulle, et une application à la recherche de choréographies perverse*, Ph.D. thesis, Université Paris 7, France, 2005.
- [7] J. Chazy, *Sur certaines trajectoires du problème des n corp*, Bull. Astronom. **35** (1918), 321–389.
- [8] K.-C. Chen and J.-S. Hsiao, *Strictly convex central configurations of the planar five-body problem*, Trans. of the AMS **370** (2018), no. 3, 1907–1924.
- [9] J Lino Cornelio, Martha Alvarez-Ramírez, and Josep M Cors, *Central configurations in the five-body problem: Rhombus plus one*, Qualitative Theory of Dynamical Systems **20** (2021), no. 2, 1–13.
- [10] W. Decker, G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister, and H. Schönemann, *Singular 4-2-0 — a computer algebra system for polynomial computations*, 2016, <http://www.singular.uni-kl.de>.
- [11] Wolfram Decker, Gert-Martin Greuel, Gerhard Pfister, and Hans Schönemann, *SINGULAR 4-2-1 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations*, <http://www.singular.uni-kl.de>, 2021.
- [12] The Sage Developers, *Sage mathematics software (Version 9.2)*, 2020, <http://www.sagemath.org>.
- [13] L. Euler, *De motu rectilineo trium corporum se mutuo attrahentium*, Novi Comm. Acad. Sci. Imp. Petrop **11** (1767), 144–151.
- [14] M. Gidea and J. Llibre, *Symmetric planar central configurations of five bodies: Euler plus two*, Cel. Mech. and Dyn. Astron. **106** (2010), no. 1, 89.
- [15] M. Hampton and A. N. Jensen, *Finiteness of spatial central configurations in the five-body problem*, Cel. Mech. Dyn. Astron. **109** (2011), no. 4, 321–332.
- [16] M. Hampton and R. Moeckel, *Finiteness of relative equilibria of the four-body problem*, Invent. math. **163** (2005), no. 2, 289–312.
- [17] ———, *Finiteness of stationary configurations of the four-vortex problem*, Trans. of the AMS **361** (2009), no. 3, 1317–1332.
- [18] M. Hampton, G. E. Roberts, and M. Santoprete, *Relative equilibria in the four-body problem with two pairs of equal vorticities*, J. Nonlinear Sci. **24** (2014), 39–92.
- [19] H. Helmholtz, *Über integrale der hydrodynamischen gleichungen, welche den wirbelbewegungen entsprechen*, Crelle’s Journal für Mathematik **55** (1858), 25–55, English translation by P. G. Tait, P.G., *On the integrals of the hydrodynamical equations which express vortex-motion*, Philosophical Magazine, (1867) 485–51.
- [20] Anders N. Jensen, *Gfan, a software system for Gröbner fans and tropical varieties*, Available at <http://home.imf.au.dk/jensen/software/gfan/gfan.html>.
- [21] G. Kirchhoff, *Vorlesungen über mathematische physik*, B.G. Teubner, 1883.
- [22] J. L. Lagrange, *Essai sur le problème des trois corps*, Œuvres, vol. 6, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1772.
- [23] E. Laura, *Sulle equazioni differenziali canoniche del moto di un sistema di vortici elementari rettilinei e paralleli in un fluido incomprensibile indefinito*, Atti della Reale Accad. Torino **40** (1905), 296–312.
- [24] Eduardo SG Leandro, *Structure and stability of the rhombus family of relative equilibria under general homogeneous forces*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations **31** (2019), no. 2, 933–958.
- [25] Y. Long and S. Sun, *Four-body central configurations with some equal masses*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal. **162** (2002), no. 1, 25–44.
- [26] D. Maclagan and B. Sturmfels, *Introduction to tropical geometry*, AMS, 2015.
- [27] W. D. MacMillan and W. Bartky, *Permanent configurations in the problem of four bodies*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **34** (1932), 838–875.
- [28] R. Moeckel, *On central configurations*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **205** (1990), no. 1, 499–517.
- [29] ———, *Central Configurations*, Central Configurations, Periodic Orbits, and Hamiltonian Systems, Springer, 2015.
- [30] F. R. Moulton, *The straight line solutions of the problem of N bodies*, The Annals of Mathematics **12** (1910), no. 1, 1–17.
- [31] Allyson Oliveira and Claudio Vidal, *Stability of the rhombus vortex problem with a central vortex*, Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations **32** (2020), no. 4, 2109–2123.
- [32] E. Perez-Chavela and M. Santoprete, *Convex four-body central configurations with some equal masses*, Archive for rational mechanics and analysis **185** (2007), no. 3, 481–494.

- [33] A. S. Rayl, *Stability of permanent configurations in the problem of four bodies*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, 1939.
- [34] G. E. Roberts, *A continuum of relative equilibria in the five-body problem*, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **127** (1999), no. 3-4, 141–145.
- [35] S. Smale, *Mathematical problems for the next century*, *Mathematical Intelligencer* **20** (1998), 7–15.
- [36] The Sage Developers, *Sagemath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.1)*, 2020, <http://www.sagemath.org>.
- [37] A. Wintner, *The analytical foundations of celestial mechanics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1941.

Email address: mhampton@d.umn.edu, *Orcid ID:* 0000-0002-9725-3316

(1) COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CHONGQING TECHNOLOGY AND BUSINESS UNIVERSITY, CHONGQING 400067, CHINA

(2) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA DULUTH, DULUTH, MN 55812