

NEW PROPERTIES OF LENGTH-EXTREMALS IN FREE STEP-2 RANK-4 CARNOT GROUPS

ANNAMARIA MONTANARI AND DANIELE MORBIDELLI

ABSTRACT. In the free, step-2, rank-4 sub-Riemannian Carnot group \mathbb{F}_4 , we give a clean expression for length-extremals, we provide an explicit equation for conjugate points, we relate it with the conjectured cut-locus of the origin $\text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_4)$. Finally, we give some upper estimates for the cut-time of extremals.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	1
2. General preliminaries and extremal curves	7
3. Calculation of conjugate points along generic extremals	16
4. Analysis of conjugate points with $\det M_1 = 0$	22
5. Upper and finiteness estimates of the cut time	27
Acknowledgements	32
References	32

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

We consider the free step-2, rank- n Carnot group $\mathbb{F}_n = (\mathbb{R}^n \times \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^n, \cdot)$ where the group law \cdot is defined as

$$(x, t) \cdot (\xi, \tau) = \left(x + \xi, t + \tau + \frac{1}{2}x \wedge \xi \right) \quad (1.1)$$

for all (x, t) and $(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^n$. We equip \mathbb{R}^n with the Euclidean inner product and we discuss some properties of the related sub-Riemannian length-minimizing curves from $(0, 0)$ (see Section 2, for precise definitions). This topic has been discussed in [Bro82], [Mya02], [MPAM06], [RS17] and [MM17]. It is clear from the mentioned papers that, in spite of the simple, dimension-free aspect of (1.1), difficulties of doing analysis in \mathbb{F}_n increase drastically with the *rank* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Before starting a specific description of the paper, let us mention that, besides the free, step-2 model, the study of length-minimizing properties of curves in general Carnot groups and sub-Riemannian manifolds is a widely studied topic in modern

Date: March 4, 2025.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 53C17, 53C22, 49K15.

Key words and phrases. Step-2 Carnot groups; Cut locus; Sub-Riemannian geodesics.

geometric control theory. See for instance the book [ABB20] or the comprehensive survey paper [Sac22], and see below for further references.

In this paper, among free, step-2 Carnot groups, we focus on the rank-4 case \mathbb{F}_4 . This is a ten-dimensional model, since $\dim(\Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4) = 6$. A careful study of previous contributions in \mathbb{F}_3 , [Mya02, MM17, LZ21], show that techniques in rank-3 case are not easy to generalize in rank-4 or greater. For instance, a generic element $t \in \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^3$ is always decomposable, i.e. it has the form $u \wedge v$ for suitable $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^3$. In rank-4 this is a rare circumstance. This makes finding the canonical form for a given element $t \in \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4$ rather complicated. Another related motivation can be seen if we identify $t \in \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^n$ with the skew-symmetric matrix $t \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$, see below. In such case, the exponential of t has a closed form only in $\Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^3$, becoming more difficult in $\Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^n$ if $n \geq 4$. Here, attacking the rank-4 case, we exploit a convenient way to write extremal curves, we write an explicit equation for conjugate points and we analyze some of its properties. We show that this equation factorizes into two factors. One of them essentially detects conjugate points which are also cut points belonging to the set conjectured by Rizzi and Serres [RS17] as a candidate cut-locus. The other captures a potentially huge set of conjugate points which are not expected to be cut points, if the mentioned conjecture would be confirmed. Using the explicit form of the equation for conjugate points, we show that any non-rectilinear length-extremal curve in \mathbb{F}_4 meets such zero-set infinitely many times, proving in particular that the cut time is finite for any such curve. Our upper estimate is quantitative at least for a particular subclass of extremals, when suitable “angular parameters” are rationally dependent. In the complementary, more complicated, rationally independent case we get qualitative finiteness estimates, which we plan to improve in a further project.

The main object of our analysis are length-extremal curves from the origin. It is known that such curves $\gamma(s) = (x(s), t(s))$ can be obtained by integration of the ODE

$$\dot{x} = u \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{t} = \frac{1}{2}x \wedge u \quad (1.2)$$

with initial condition $\gamma(0) = (x(0), t(0)) = (0, 0)$. Precisely, an integral curve of (1.2) is a length extremal if and only if the control $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ has the form

$$u(s) = a_1 \cos(2\varphi_1 s) + b_1 \sin(2\varphi_1 s) + a_2 \cos(2\varphi_2 s) + b_2 \sin(2\varphi_2 s), \quad (1.3)$$

where a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 are pairwise orthogonal, $|a_1| = |b_1| =: r_1 \geq 0$, $|a_2| = |b_2| =: r_2 \geq 0$, and without loss of generality $0 \leq \varphi_2 \leq \varphi_1$.¹ These curves will be described better in Section 2. We observe already here that, given a_1, b_1, a_2 and b_2 , the control curve $u(s)$ can be seen as a linear flow on a bidimensional torus. Some of the proofs later will depend on rationality/irrationality of the flow (corresponding to periodicity/quasiperiodicity of u). In our torus, there are also involved two further variables, r_1 and r_2 , the radii of the circonfereces, making the situation more complicated. Integrating the control (1.3), we get a curve $s \mapsto \gamma(s, a, b, \varphi) = (x(s, a, b, \varphi), t(s, a, b, \varphi))$ of constant *sub-Riemannian speed*

¹It will turn out from the discussion below that the more interesting cases are those where all inequalities are strict, the other being related with the lower-dimensional known cases, \mathbb{F}_2 and \mathbb{F}_3 .

$|\dot{\gamma}(s)|_{\text{SR}} =: |u(s)| = \sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2} > 0$, whose *sub-Riemannian length* is

$$\text{length}(\gamma|_{[0,T]}) := \int_0^T |u(s)| ds = T\sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2}.$$

It turns out that for any $T > 0$ sufficiently close to 0, the curve γ is a length-minimizer among all horizontal curves connecting $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$ and $\gamma(T)$. See Section 2. The *cut time* of the extremal curve $\gamma = \gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi) : [0, +\infty[\rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$ is defined as follows

$$t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) = \sup\{T > 0 : \gamma|_{[0,T]} \text{ is a length-minimizer between } \gamma(0) \text{ and } \gamma(T)\}.$$

In general one can have $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) \in]0, +\infty]$, depending on γ . The cut-locus $\text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_4) \subset \mathbb{F}_4 \setminus \{0\}$ is the set of all cut-points $\gamma(t_{\text{cut}})$ as γ is a length-extremal. Finding the cut-time of any given extremal and detecting the cut-locus of a point is a classical, sometimes difficult problem in sub-Riemannian geometry (at the end of the introduction we will give some references).

Starting from the form (1.3) of extremals, [MPAM06] calculated that, given a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 and φ_1, φ_2 as above, the corresponding curve $\gamma(s, a, b, \varphi) = (x(s, a, b, \varphi), t(s, a, b, \varphi))$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} x(s, a, b, \varphi) &= sT(\varphi_1 s)(a_1 \cos(\varphi_1 s) + b_1 \sin(\varphi_1 s)) + sT(\varphi_2 s)(a_2 \cos(\varphi_2 s) + b_2 \sin(\varphi_2 s)) \\ t(s, a, b, \varphi) &= s^2 U(s\varphi_1) a_1 \wedge b_1 + s^2 F(s\varphi_1, s\varphi_2) a_1 \wedge a_2 \\ &\quad + s^2 G(s\varphi_1, s\varphi_2) a_1 \wedge b_2 - s^2 G(s\varphi_2, s\varphi_1) b_1 \wedge a_2 \\ &\quad + s^2 H(s\varphi_1, s\varphi_2) b_1 \wedge b_2 + s^2 U(s\varphi_2) a_2 \wedge b_2. \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

Here we defined $T(\varphi) = \frac{\sin \varphi}{\varphi}$, $U(\varphi) = \frac{\varphi - \sin \varphi \cos \varphi}{4\varphi^2}$, while the functions F, G and H are discussed in Section 2. Although we use different notation, formula (1.4) is analogous [MPAM06, Theorem 6.1] specialized to $n = 4$. A proof of (1.4) will be included for completeness.

In our first result, we exploit a change of basis which makes the form of (1.4) much more manageable. This will enable us in the subsequent part to write an explicit equation for conjugate points. To state our result, introduce for $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$ the function

$$Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \frac{\varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2 \sin \varphi_1 - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1 \sin \varphi_2}{2\varphi_2(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)}. \tag{1.5}$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2 be pairwise orthogonal with $|a_k| = |b_k|$ and let $\varphi_1 > \varphi_2 > 0$ be given. Consider the extremal $\gamma(s, a, b, \varphi)$ in (1.4). Let then*

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_k = a_k \sin \varphi_k - b_k \cos \varphi_k =: a_k s_k - b_k c_k \\ \beta_k = a_k \cos \varphi_k + b_k \sin \varphi_k =: a_k c_k + b_k s_k. \end{cases} \tag{1.6}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{cases} x(1, a, b, \varphi) = T(\varphi_1)\beta_1 + T(\varphi_2)\beta_2 =: T_1\beta_1 + T_2\beta_2 \\ t(1, a, b, \varphi) = U(\varphi_1)\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 \\ \quad + Z(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1 + U(\varphi_2)\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2 \\ \quad =: U_1\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + Z_{12}\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 + Z_{21}\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1 + U_2\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2. \end{cases} \tag{1.7}$$

Observe the abridged notation $T_k := T(\varphi_k)$, $U_k := U(\varphi_k)$, $Z_{jk} := Z(\varphi_j, \varphi_k)$, $c_k = \cos \varphi_k$ and $s_k = \sin \varphi_k$ for $k = 1, 2$. This notations will be used frequently below. This theorem gives the form of the extremal curve at time $s = 1$. However, the reparametrization property $\gamma(s, a, b, \varphi) = \gamma(1, sa, sb, s\varphi)$ for all $s > 0$ and for all a, b, φ gives the form of γ in terms of the functions U and Z for all times s , see Corollary 2.7. Finally, we state Theorem 1.1 taking strict inequalities $\varphi_1 \gneq \varphi_2 \gneq 0$, $r_1 = |a_1|$ and $r_2 = |a_2| > 0$. All degenerate cases will be included in Subsection 2.6.

Observe that the term $t(1, a, b, \varphi)$ in (1.7) has only four nonzero terms instead of six, as it was in (1.4). From now on, we will always identify $\Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4$ with $\mathfrak{so}(4)$, the vector space of skew-symmetric matrices, by extending linearly the identification $u \wedge v \in \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4 \simeq uv^T - vu^T \in \mathfrak{so}(4)$ for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^4$, see Section 2. Under this identification, it turns out that in the ordered orthonormal basis $u_1 := \frac{\alpha_1}{r_1}$, $u_2 := \frac{\alpha_2}{r_2}$, $v_1 := \frac{\beta_1}{r_1}$ and $v_2 := \frac{\beta_2}{r_2}$, where $r_k := |\alpha_k| = |\beta_k|$ for $k = 1, 2$, the matrix $t(1, a, b, \varphi) \in \mathfrak{so}(4)$ appearing in (1.7), has the block form

$$t(1, a, b, \varphi) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M \\ -M^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{so}(4), \quad \text{where} \quad M = \begin{bmatrix} r_1^2 U_1 & r_1 r_2 Z_{12} \\ r_1 r_2 Z_{21} & r_2^2 U_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}. \quad (1.8)$$

This makes several computations simpler. However, it must be observed that, in spite of the block-form, eigenvalues and eigenvectors of antisymmetric matrices of the form (1.8) are quite complicated to express in terms of the variables r_k, u_k, v_k and φ_k . See a partial discussion in Remark 2.8.

Starting from the previous result, we come to the main part of the paper, where we analyze whether or not the point $\gamma(1)$ in (1.7) is conjugate to $\gamma(0) = (0, 0)$ along γ . Following [ABB20], in order to analyze such condition, we should write $\gamma(s, a, b, \varphi) = \exp(s(\xi, \tau))$, where $(\xi, \tau) \in T_{(0,0)}^*(\mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4)$ and $\exp : T_{(0,0)}^*(\mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4$ denotes the sub-Riemannian exponential. Then, by definition, the point $\gamma(1) = \exp(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{F}_4$ is conjugate if the differential $d_{(\xi, \tau)} \exp$ is singular. However, in the present paper we do not use standard Hamiltonian coordinates (ξ, τ) , but we take coordinates modeled on the parameters α, β, φ appearing in (1.6). This choice will capture automatically the orthogonal invariance of the problem, which will be described in Subsection 2.3.

To state our results, start from the extremal $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi) = (x(\cdot, a, b, \varphi), t(\cdot, a, b, \varphi))$ in (1.4). Introduce α_k and β_k in terms of a_k, b_k, φ_k by the rotation in (1.6). Let $u_k := \frac{\alpha_k}{|\alpha_k|} = \frac{\alpha_k}{r_k}$ and $v_k = \frac{\beta_k}{r_k}$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then, the point $\gamma(1, a, b, \varphi)$ is uniquely determined by the parameters

$$(u, v, r, \varphi) := ((u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2), (r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)) \in \Sigma \times \Omega,$$

where $\Sigma = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) : x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \text{ are orthonormal in } \mathbb{R}^4\} \subset \mathbb{R}^{16}$ and $\Omega = \{(r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in]0, +\infty[^4 \text{ such that } \varphi_1 > \varphi_2 > 0\}$. We may denote then

$$\Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi) := \gamma(1, a, b, \varphi). \quad (1.9)$$

It turns out that the ten dimensional manifold $\Sigma \times \Omega$ is diffeomorphic to the following set of “nondegenerate” covectors $G := \{(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^4 : \xi \neq 0 \text{ and } \tau \text{ has four distinct nonzero eigenvalues}\} \subset T_{(0,0)}^*\mathbb{F}_4$, see Proposition 3.2. We will see that the point in (1.9) is conjugate to the origin along $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ at time $s = 1$ if and only if $d_{(u, v, r, \varphi)}\Gamma$ is singular.

A careful calculation of the differential of the map $\Gamma : \Sigma \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$ gives then the following theorem

Theorem 1.2. *Let $(u, v, r, \varphi) = ((u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2), (r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)) \in \Sigma \times \Omega$. Then, the point $\gamma(1, a, b, \varphi) = \Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)$*

$$= (r_1 T_1 v_1 + r_2 T_2 v_2, r_1^2 U_1 u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_1 r_2 Z_{12} u_1 \wedge v_2 + r_1 r_2 Z_{21} u_2 \wedge v_1 + r_2^2 U_2 u_2 \wedge v_2) \quad (1.10)$$

is conjugate to $(0, 0)$ along $s \mapsto \gamma(s, a, b, \varphi)$ if and only if at least one of the following two square matrices is singular:

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -T_1 & 0 & -r_2^2 T_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -T_2 & 0 & -r_1^2 T_1 \\ Z_{21} & -Z_{12} & r_2^2 U_2 & -r_1^2 U_1 \\ Z_{12} & -Z_{21} & -r_1^2 U_1 & r_2^2 U_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (1.11)$$

or

$$M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -r_2^2 T_2 & T_1 & 0 & -2V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & r_1^2 T_1 & 0 & T_2 & 0 & -2V_2 \\ -r_2^2 Z_{21} & -r_2^2 Z_{12} & 2U_1 & 0 & \frac{\cos \varphi_1}{\varphi_1} V_1 & 0 \\ -r_2^2 U_2 & r_1^2 U_1 & Z_{12} & Z_{12} & (\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) & (\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \\ -r_1^2 U_1 & r_2^2 U_2 & -Z_{21} & -Z_{21} & -(\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) & -(\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) \\ r_1^2 Z_{12} & r_1^2 Z_{21} & 0 & 2U_2 & 0 & \frac{\cos \varphi_2}{\varphi_2} V_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (1.12)$$

Note that M_1 and M_2 do not depend on u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2 , by the orthogonal invariance of the model, see Section 2. This factorization property while calculating conjugate points is not unexpected. Indeed it already appears in Myasnichenko's paper in rank-3 case, see [Mya02, Eq. (12), p. 586]. In rank-3 case only one of the factors gives conjugate points which belong to the cut locus. In our rank-4 case this is actually an open question, see below. As expected, Theorem 1.2 does not give information on whether the point $\Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)$ is the *first conjugate point*.²

In the subsequent part of the paper, we discuss condition $\det M_1 = 0$ and we analyze how this condition relates with the fact that $\Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)$ belongs to C_4 , the candidate cut locus proposed by Rizzi and Serres [RS17], see (1.15). In order to state our result, introduce the functions

$$A(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = T_1 U_1 (T_1 Z_{12} - T_2 U_1) \quad \text{and} \quad B(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = T_2 Z_{12} (T_1 Z_{12} - T_2 U_1), \quad (1.13)$$

where as usual $T_k = T(\varphi_k)$ and $Z_{ij} = Z(\varphi_i, \varphi_j)$ for $i, j, k = 1, 2$. The following theorem extracts some useful information concerning points where M_1 is singular.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) \in \Sigma$ and consider $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$. Take the point $(x, t) := \Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)$ appearing in (1.10). Identifying as usual $\Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^4$ and $\mathfrak{so}(4)$, the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $\det M_1 = 0$.

²Recall that a point $\gamma(\bar{s})$ on an extremal γ is the first conjugate point if there are no other conjugate points in $]0, \bar{s}[$. See [ABB20, Definition 8.45] for the precise definition.

- (2) $t^2x \in \text{span}\{x\}$.
(3) *The following equation holds*

$$A(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)r_1^4 + \{B(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) - B(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)\}r_1^2r_2^2 - A(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)r_2^2 = 0. \quad (1.14)$$

As expected, equation (1.14) is invariant with respect to exchanging of indices 1 and 2. It degenerates correctly to the known formulas from [MM17] in \mathbb{F}_3 , as $\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0$. Namely, it becomes $\frac{r_2^2}{r_1^2} = -\frac{T(\varphi_1)U(\varphi_1)}{V(\varphi_1)}$, where T and U appeared above, while $V(\varphi_1) = Z(\varphi_1, 0)$, see Remark 4.2 and (2.16). Note that formula (1.14) gives in principle the ratio $\frac{r_2^2}{r_1^2}$ as solution of the quadratic equation (1.14) in terms of φ_1, φ_2 . We plan to analyze further this equation in a subsequent project.

Condition (2) is rather interesting, because it relates with the Rizzi-Serres conjectured set C_4 . Recall that in the paper [RS17], Rizzi and Serres conjectured that the cut locus $\text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_4) := \{\gamma(t_{\text{cut}}) : \gamma \text{ is a length-extremal and } t_{\text{cut}} < \infty\}$ agrees with the set $C_4 = \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \Sigma_3$, where,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 &= \{(x_1u_1 + x_2u_2, \lambda_1u_1 \wedge u_2 + \lambda_2u_3 \wedge u_4) : \lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0 \quad \lambda_2 \neq \lambda_1 \text{ and } (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2\}, \\ \Sigma_2 &= \{(x, \lambda(u_1 \wedge u_2 + u_3 \wedge u_4)) : \lambda > 0 \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^4\}, \\ \Sigma_3 &= \{(x_1u_1, \lambda u_3 \wedge u_4) : \lambda > 0, \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (1.15)$$

In the previous formula, u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4 denote any orthonormal family in \mathbb{R}^4 . By orthogonal invariance, it is rather easy to see that $C_4 \subset \text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_4)$ (See [RS17, Lemma 9]). The opposite inclusion is an open problem. See Section 2 for a more detailed discussion and for the dimension-free definition of $C_n \subset \mathbb{F}_n$ formulated in [RS17].

Let us come now to the aforementioned relation between condition (2) of Theorem 1.3 and the set C_4 . It is not difficult to see that, if $(x, t) \in \mathbb{F}_4$ and $\text{rank}(t) = 4$, then $t^2x \in \text{span}\{x\}$ if and only if $(x, t) \in \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$ (see Remark 4.5). In other words, if t has rank-4, then any of the equivalent conditions in Theorem 1.3 is equivalent to $(x, t) \in C_4$. Note that if $\text{rank}(t) = 2$, then the equivalence fails. For instance, the point $(x_1e_1, e_1 \wedge e_2)$ satisfies $t^2x \in \text{span}\{x\}$, but if $x_1 \neq 0$, then $(x, t) \notin C_4$, and the discussion of Subsection 2.6 also shows that $(x, t) \notin \text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_4)$. Analyzing equation (1.14), it turns out however that given $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$, there is $\bar{s} > 0$ such that the curve $\gamma(s, u, v, r, \varphi) =: (x(s), t(s))$ satisfies $\text{rank}(t(s)) = 4$ for $s > \bar{s}$ for any r, u, v . See Lemma 4.6. We expect that $\bar{s} = 0$, but the proof would be based on the achievement of a rather difficult inequality discussed in Remark 4.8 and 4.9.

It is well known that in the Heisenberg group \mathbb{F}_2 with coordinates $(x, y, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3$, any non-rectilinear length extremal from the origin touches the t -axis infinitely many times, in a periodical way. The same happens in the rank-3 case, as shown in [MM17, Mya02]: the conjugate locus is touched infinitely many times, but periodicity no longer holds. In the subsequent part of the paper, starting from equation (1.14), we show an analogous phenomenon in \mathbb{F}_4 . Observe that, if φ_1 and φ_2 are rationally dependent, then it is trivial to see that the set C_4 is reached infinitely many times. This follows from the fact that the function $s \mapsto x(s)$ in (1.4) is periodic, and there is $\bar{s} > 0$ such that $x(k\bar{s}) = 0 \in \mathbb{R}^4$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The rationally independent case requires more work. In view of the greater

technical difficulty, we get the result for large times only, using the behaviour at infinity of equation (1.14). The theorem below is meaningful for *strictly normal* curves, which are those such that r_1 and r_2 are both strictly positive, $\varphi_1 \geq \varphi_2 \geq 0$, see Subsection 2.2. Note that *all points* of an abnormal length extremal are conjugate for free, see [ABB20]. The case $\varphi_2 = 0$ is also already known, being contained in [Mya02, MM17].

Theorem 1.4. *Let $u(s) = \sum_{k=1}^2 a_k \cos(2\varphi_k s) + b_k \sin(2\varphi_k s)$ be a strictly normal control. Consider the corresponding trajectory $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$. Then there is a sequence $s_j \rightarrow +\infty$ such that $\gamma(s_j, a, b, \varphi) \in C_4$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$.*

As we already said, the proof is easy if φ_1 and φ_2 are rationally dependent. The even more particular case $\varphi_1 = 2\varphi_2 > 0$ appears in Brockett's paper [Bro82]. In Section 5, we prove the general rationally independent case. Although Theorem 1.4 does not give information about the cut-time, it turns out at least that it gives the finiteness of such time. The result is not unexpected, but it was unknown until now, as far as we know.

Corollary 1.5. *For any non-rectilinear length-extremal γ , we have $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) < \infty$.*

The proof Theorem 1.4 and of Corollary 1.5 are based on an asymptotic analysis of the behavior of equation (1.14) as the time s is large. In order to get more quantitative upper bounds on the cut-time of a given trajectory $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$, in the most complicated rationally independent case, we plan to come back to a more accurate analysis of equation (1.14) in a further work.

Before closing the introduction, we mention some further references on the problem of the cut locus in nonfree Carnot groups. In the step-2 case, we mention the papers [BBN19], [BBG12], [AM16] and [MM24]. See also [Li21] for a different approach. In step-3 we mention [AS15] on the Engel group. All these references and many others, also outside the setting of Carnot groups, are discussed in the comprehensive survey [Sac22].

A last observation concerns the higher rank case \mathbb{F}_n with $n > 4$. We believe that some of our results could be generalized to higher-rank, but in order to keep notation reasonably readable we decided to work in rank-4 only.

The structure of the paper is the following: in Section 2 we write extremal curves, we analyze the change of basis useful to simplify them. In Section 3 we find the equation for conjugate points. In Section 4 we analyze conjugate points coming from the first factor $\det M_1 = 0$, those belonging to the Rizzi-Serres set. Section 5 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.4.

2. GENERAL PRELIMINARIES AND EXTREMAL CURVES

Let us consider in $\mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^4$ the Lie group law

$$(x, t) \cdot (\xi, \tau) = \left(x + \xi, t + \tau + \frac{1}{2}x \wedge \xi \right).$$

It turns out that $\mathbb{F}_4 = (\mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^4, \cdot)$ is a model for the free step-2 Carnot group of rank 4. See the monographs [BLU07, ABB20]. We say that a Lipschitz curve $\gamma = (x, t) : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$

is horizontal if it satisfies almost everywhere the ODE

$$\dot{x} = u, \quad \dot{t} = \frac{1}{2}x \wedge u. \quad (2.1)$$

To define a sub-Riemannian structure, we fix on \mathbb{R}^4 the standard Euclidean inner product. Then, the length of a horizontal curve γ on $[0, T]$ is defined as $\text{length}(\gamma) := \int_0^T |u(s)| ds$. Minimizing length we obtain the sub-Riemannian distance $d((x, t), (\xi, \tau)) = \inf\{\text{length}(\gamma) : \gamma \text{ connects } (x, t) \text{ and } (\xi, \tau)\}$. It is well known that $d((x, t), (\xi, \tau))$ is finite and it is a minimum for all (x, t) and $(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{F}_4$.

As already mentioned in the Introduction, we identify $\Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^n \simeq \mathfrak{so}(n)$ extending linearly the identification $u \wedge v \in \Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^n \simeq uv^T - vu^T \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$ for all $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

2.1. Hamiltonian approach, extremal controls and conjugate points. In order to write length-minimizing curves, we follow the Hamiltonian approach, see [ABB20, Chapter 13.1]. Given the standard orthonormal frame of horizontal vector fields in \mathbb{F}_n , $X_j(x, t) = (e_j, \frac{1}{2}x \wedge e_j)$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, we construct the functions $u_j : T^*\mathbb{F}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ letting $u_j(x, t, \xi, \tau) := \langle X_j(x, t), (\xi, \tau) \rangle$. Here on $\Lambda^2\mathbb{R}^n$ we take the standard inner product making $e_j \wedge e_k$ an orthonormal system, as $1 \leq j < k \leq n$. We are also identifying $T^*\mathbb{F}_n \simeq \mathbb{F}_n \times \mathbb{F}_n$. The related sub-Riemannian Hamiltonian has the form

$$H(x, t, \xi, \tau) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n u_k(x, t, \xi, \tau)^2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n \langle X_k(x, t), (\xi, \tau) \rangle^2.$$

Integrating the Hamiltonian system

$$\begin{cases} (\dot{x}, \dot{t}) = \nabla_{(\xi, \tau)} H, \\ (\dot{\xi}, \dot{\tau}) = -\nabla_{(x, t)} H \end{cases} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} (x(0), t(0)) = (0, 0) \\ (\xi(0), \tau(0)) = (\xi, \tau), \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

we obtain a length-extremal curve $\gamma(\cdot, \xi, \tau) = (x(\cdot, \xi, \tau), t(\cdot, \xi, \tau))$ starting from the origin. It turns out that all length-extremals from the origin have this form and are parametrized by their initial covector $(\xi, \tau) \in T_{(0,0)}^*\mathbb{F}_n$. They are defined for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and they enjoy property $\gamma(s, \xi, \tau) = \gamma(1, s\xi, s\tau)$ for all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $(\xi, \tau) \in T^*\mathbb{F}_n$. For any ξ and τ , the extremal $\gamma(\cdot, \xi, \tau)$ is a length-minimizer on some nontrivial interval $[0, T]$.

Following [ABB20, Section 8.6], we define then the *sub-Riemannian exponential exp* : $T_{(0,0)}^*\mathbb{F}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_n$, as $\text{exp}(\xi, \tau) := \gamma(1, \xi, \tau)$.

Definition 2.1. *Given $(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{F}_4$, we say that the point $\gamma(\bar{s}, \xi, \tau) = \text{exp}(\bar{s}\xi, \bar{s}\tau)$ is conjugate to $(0, 0)$ along $\gamma(\cdot, \xi, \tau)$ if the differential of exp at point $(\bar{s}\xi, \bar{s}\tau)$ is singular, i.e.*

$$d_{(\bar{s}\xi, \bar{s}\tau)} \text{exp} \text{ is singular.} \quad (2.3)$$

Given $(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{F}_n$ and the corresponding curve $\gamma = \gamma(\cdot, \xi, \tau)$, we define $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) = \sup\{T \geq 0 : \gamma|_{[0, T]}$ minimizes length among all γ connecting $\gamma(0)$ and $\gamma(T)\}$. Finally, the cut locus of the origin of \mathbb{F}_n is

$$\text{cut}(\mathbb{F}_n) := \{\gamma(t_{\text{cut}}) : \gamma \text{ is an extremal and } t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) < \infty\}.$$

Concerning the definition above, it is known that $t_{\text{cut}} \in]0, +\infty]$.

Integration of the Hamiltonian system (2.2) gives that the extremal control $\gamma(\cdot, \xi, \tau)$ is obtained by taking the control

$$u(s, \xi, \tau) = e^{-s\tau} \xi \quad (2.4)$$

in the ODE (2.1) (See [ABB20, Section 13.3]). In this paper, we work on extremal controls of the form (2.4) using spectral theory of skew-symmetric matrices. It turns out that, given a control of the form (2.4) in \mathbb{F}_4 , we have

$$u(s) = a_1 \cos(\lambda_1 s) + b_1 \sin(\lambda_1 s) + a_2 \cos(\lambda_2 s) + b_2 \sin(\lambda_2 s) \quad (2.5)$$

where $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq 0$, $r_k := |a_k| = |b_k| \geq 0$ for $k = 1, 2$, and a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 are pairwise orthogonal. See [ABB20], or see also the previous papers [Mya02, MPAM06, MM17, RS17], where such extremal controls are already used.

Definition 2.2. *We say that the extremal u in (2.5) is generic if $r_1, r_2 \not\equiv 0$ and $\lambda_1 \not\equiv \lambda_2 \not\equiv 0$.*

A substantial part of our work will take place on generic extremals.

2.2. Abnormal curves in \mathbb{F}_4 . In order to talk about conjugate points, we need to discuss briefly abnormal extremal curves. For any given control $u \in L^2((0, 1), \mathbb{R}^4)$, define the *endpoint map* $E(u) = \gamma_u(1)$, where $\gamma_u = (x_u, t_u)$ is obtained by integration of (2.1). It turns out that $E : L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$ is a smooth map, see [ABB20]. We say that a control u is *abnormal* if the differential $d_u E : L^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$ is singular. By well known theory of Carnot groups, an extremal control of the form (2.5) is abnormal if and only if it takes the form

$$u(s) = a_1 \cos(\lambda_1 s) + b_1 \sin(\lambda_1 s), \quad (2.6)$$

where, as in (2.5), a_1 and b_1 are orthogonal and have the same norm and $\lambda_1 \geq 0$. See for example [LDLMV13] and [MM17]. Note that if $u(\cdot, \xi, \tau)$ is an extremal abnormal control, then for all $s > 0$ the point $\exp(s\xi, s\tau)$ is conjugate in the sense of Definition 2.1. This easy fact is observed in [ABB20, Remark 8.46]. Note that given the abnormal control (2.6), the corresponding curve γ_u is contained in the Heisenberg subgroup $\text{Lie}(a_1, b_1)$ (see Subsection 2.6). Extremal controls of the form $u(s) = a_1 \cos(\lambda_1 s) + b_1 \sin(\lambda_1 s) + a_2$ with $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $a_1, b_1, a_2 \neq 0$ are instead not abnormal.

2.3. Symmetries of \mathbb{F}_n and the conjectured cut locus. Given $R \in O(n)$, we define the linear map $\bar{R} : \mathbb{F}_n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_n$ by $(x, t) \mapsto (Rx, RtR^T)$. It is easy to see that the class of horizontal curves and their length are invariant under the map R for all $R \in O(n)$. Consequently, $d((x, t), (x', t')) = d(\bar{R}(x, t), \bar{R}(x', t'))$ for all pair of points and for all $R \in O(n)$.

It was conjectured by Rizzi and Serres [RS17] that $\text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_n) = C_n$, where $C_n \subset \mathbb{F}_n$ is defined as follows.

$$C_n = \{(x, t) : \text{there is } R \in O(n), R \neq I_n \text{ such that } \bar{R}(x, t) = (x, t) \text{ and } R|_{\text{Ker } t} = I|_{\text{Ker } t}\}. \quad (2.7)$$

For the proof that $C_n \subset \text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_n)$, see [RS17, Proposition 6]. The equality $C_n = \text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_n)$ is an open conjecture. For the case of our interest $n = 4$, the set C_4 is described in (1.15).

2.4. Extremal trajectories. Let us go to the generic extremal control u in (2.5). In order to integrate it, introduce the following functions:

$$\begin{aligned} T(\varphi) &= \frac{\sin \varphi}{\varphi}, \quad U(\varphi) = \frac{\varphi - \sin \varphi \cos \varphi}{4\varphi^2}, \quad V(\varphi) = \frac{\sin \varphi - \varphi \cos \varphi}{2\varphi^2}, \\ F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) &= \frac{1}{8} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} - \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin^2(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 + \varphi_2} + \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} + \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin^2(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 - \varphi_2} \right\}, \\ G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) &= \frac{1}{8} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} + \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2) \cos(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 - \varphi_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_2} - \frac{1}{\varphi_1} \right) \frac{\sin(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) \cos(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 + \varphi_2} - \frac{2 \sin \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1}{\varphi_1 \varphi_2} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) &= \frac{1}{8} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} + \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin^2(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 - \varphi_2} - \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} - \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin^2(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 + \varphi_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{2(\sin^2 \varphi_2 - \sin^2 \varphi_1)}{\varphi_1 \varphi_2} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 2.3 (Extremal trajectories). *Let a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 be pairwise orthogonal and assume that $|a_k| = |b_k| = r_k > 0$ for $k = 1, 2$. Consider for $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > 0$ the corresponding generic extremal control*

$$\begin{aligned} u(s) &= a_1 \cos(\lambda_1 s) + b_1 \sin(\lambda_1 s) + a_2 \cos(\lambda_2 s) + b_2 \sin(\lambda_2 s) \\ &=: a_1 \cos(2\varphi_1 s) + b_1 \sin(2\varphi_1 s) + a_2 \cos(2\varphi_2 s) + b_2 \sin(2\varphi_2 s). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Then, the corresponding trajectory $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi) = (x(\cdot, a, b, \varphi), t(\cdot, a, b, \varphi))$ has the form

$$\begin{aligned} x(s) &= sT(\varphi_1 s) \left(a_1 \cos(\varphi_1 s) + b_1 \sin(\varphi_1 s) \right) + sT(\varphi_2 s) \left(a_2 \cos(\varphi_2 s) + b_2 \sin(\varphi_2 s) \right) \\ t(s) &= s^2 U(s\varphi_1) a_1 \wedge b_1 + s^2 F(s\varphi_1, s\varphi_2) a_1 \wedge a_2 + s^2 G(s\varphi_1, s\varphi_2) a_1 \wedge b_2 \\ &\quad - s^2 G(s\varphi_2, s\varphi_1) b_1 \wedge a_2 + s^2 H(s\varphi_1, s\varphi_2) b_1 \wedge b_2 + s^2 U(s\varphi_2) a_2 \wedge b_2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

Concerning the extremal curves above, observe the reparametrization property

$$\gamma(s, a, b, \varphi) = \gamma(1, sa, sb, s\varphi) \quad \text{for all } s > 0, a, b, \varphi. \quad (2.11)$$

Proposition 2.3 is proved in arbitrary dimension in [MPAM06]. For completeness, we give here a sketch of the proof.

Proof. Let us start from

$$x(s) = \int_0^s u(\sigma) d\sigma = a_1 \frac{\sin(\lambda_1 s)}{\lambda_1} + b_1 \frac{1 - \cos(\lambda_1 s)}{\lambda_1} + a_2 \frac{\sin(\lambda_2 s)}{\lambda_2} + b_2 \frac{1 - \cos(\lambda_2 s)}{\lambda_2}.$$

Elementary trigonometry gives then the form of $x(s)$ in (2.10). The calculation of $t(s) = \int_0^s x(\sigma) \wedge u(\sigma) d\sigma$ consists of several integrals. We calculate here the component $\pi_{a_1 \wedge b_2} t(s)$ along $\text{span}\{a_1 \wedge b_2\}$. All other computations are similar.

$$\pi_{a_1 \wedge b_2} t(s) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^s \left\{ \frac{\sin(\lambda_1 \sigma)}{\lambda_1} \sin(\lambda_2 \sigma) - \frac{1 - \cos(\lambda_2 \sigma)}{\lambda_2} \cos(\lambda_1 \sigma) \right\} d\sigma \quad (2.12)$$

We have also

$$\int_0^s \sin(\lambda_1 \sigma) \sin(\lambda_2 \sigma) d\sigma = \frac{\sin((\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)s)}{2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)} - \frac{\sin((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)s)}{2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\int_0^s (1 - \cos(\lambda_2 \sigma)) \cos(\lambda_1 \sigma) d\sigma = \frac{\sin(\lambda_1 s)}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\sin((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)s)}{2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)} - \frac{\sin((\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)s)}{2(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)}.$$

Inserting into (2.12), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{a_1 \wedge b_2} t(s) &= \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} + \frac{1}{\lambda_2} \right) \frac{\sin((\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)s)}{\lambda_1 - \lambda_2} + \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_2} - \frac{1}{\lambda_1} \right) \frac{\sin((\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)s)}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} - \frac{\sin(\lambda_1 s)}{2\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \\ &= \frac{1}{8} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} + \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin((\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)s) \cos((\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)s)}{\varphi_1 - \varphi_2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_2} - \frac{1}{\varphi_1} \right) \frac{\sin((\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)s) \cos((\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)s)}{\varphi_1 + \varphi_2} - \frac{2 \sin(\varphi_1 s) \cos(\varphi_1 s)}{\varphi_1 \varphi_2} \right\} \\ &= s^2 G(s\varphi_1, s\varphi_2), \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

For future reference, write here $\gamma(1, a, b, \varphi)$, the extremal (2.10) at time $s = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned} x(1, a, b, \varphi) &= T(\varphi_1) \left(a_1 \cos(\varphi_1) + b_1 \sin(\varphi_1) \right) + T(\varphi_2) \left(a_2 \cos(\varphi_2) + b_2 \sin(\varphi_2) \right) \\ t(1, a, b, \varphi) &= U(\varphi_1) a_1 \wedge b_1 + F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) a_1 \wedge a_2 + G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) a_1 \wedge b_2 \\ &\quad - G(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) b_1 \wedge a_2 + H(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) b_1 \wedge b_2 + U(\varphi_2) a_2 \wedge b_2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

Remark 2.4. It can be checked that $\lim_{\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0} F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \sin \varphi_1 V(\varphi_1)$, $\lim_{\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0} (-G(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)) = -\cos \varphi_1 V(\varphi_1)$. Moreover, $\lim_{\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0} G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = 0$ and $\lim_{\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0} H(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = 0$. This means that, as $\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0$, then formulae (2.9) and (2.10) degenerate to the known formulas in \mathbb{F}_3 , see [MM17]. If instead $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \rightarrow (\varphi, \varphi)$, where $\varphi > 0$, we obtain as expected

$$(x(1), t(1)) = (T(\varphi) \left((a_1 + a_2) \cos(\varphi) + (b_1 + b_2) \sin(\varphi) \right), U(\varphi) \left(a_1 + a_2 \right) \wedge (b_1 + b_2)).$$

In this case, the corresponding curve $(x(s), t(s))$ is contained in the Carnot subgroup generated by $a_1 + a_2$ and $b_1 + b_2$. See the discussion in Subsection 2.6.

2.5. Change of basis. Start from (2.13) and perform the change of basis

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_k = a_k \sin \varphi_k - b_k \cos \varphi_k \\ \beta_k = a_k \cos \varphi_k + b_k \sin \varphi_k \end{cases} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \begin{cases} a_k = \alpha_k \sin \varphi_k + \beta_k \cos \varphi_k \\ b_k = \beta_k \sin \varphi_k - \alpha_k \cos \varphi_k \end{cases} \quad (2.14)$$

for $k = 1, 2$. We are going to show that extremals become easier in this basis.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $s_k = \sin \varphi_k$ e $c_k = \cos \varphi_k$ for $k = 1, 2$. We have the following formulae*

$$2\varphi_1 \varphi_2 (\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2) F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = -(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2) s_1 c_1 s_2 c_2 + \varphi_1 \varphi_2 (s_1^2 c_2^2 + c_1^2 s_2^2) \quad (2.15a)$$

$$2\varphi_1 \varphi_2 (\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2) G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = -\varphi_1^2 s_1 c_1 s_2^2 + \varphi_2^2 s_1 c_1 c_2^2 - \varphi_1 \varphi_2 (c_1^2 - s_1^2) s_2 c_2 \quad (2.15b)$$

$$2\varphi_1 \varphi_2 (\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2) G(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) = -\varphi_1^2 c_1^2 s_2 c_2 + \varphi_2^2 s_1^2 s_2 c_2 + \varphi_1 \varphi_2 s_1 c_1 (c_2^2 - s_2^2) \quad (2.15c)$$

$$2\varphi_1 \varphi_2 (\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2) H(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \varphi_1^2 c_1^2 s_2^2 + \varphi_2^2 s_1^2 c_2^2 - 2\varphi_1 \varphi_2 s_1 c_1 s_2 c_2. \quad (2.15d)$$

Proof. Let us show (2.15a) multiplied by 4.

$$\begin{aligned}
& 8\varphi_1\varphi_2(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \\
&= \varphi_1\varphi_2(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2) \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} - \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin^2(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 + \varphi_2} + \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_1} + \frac{1}{\varphi_2} \right) \frac{\sin^2(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)}{\varphi_1 - \varphi_2} \right\} \\
&= \left\{ -(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2[s_1^2c_2^2 + s_2^2c_1^2 + 2s_1c_1s_2c_2] + (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)^2[s_1^2c_2^2 + s_2^2c_1^2 - 2s_1c_1s_2c_2] \right\} \\
&= (-\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2 + 2\varphi_1\varphi_2)[s_1^2c_2^2 + s_2^2c_1^2 + 2s_1c_1s_2c_2] \\
&\quad + (\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2 + 2\varphi_1\varphi_2)[s_1^2c_2^2 + s_2^2c_1^2 - 2s_1c_1s_2c_2] \\
&= -4(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2)s_1c_1s_2c_2 + 4\varphi_1\varphi_2(s_1^2c_2^2 + s_2^2c_1^2).
\end{aligned}$$

The remaining formulas can be proved in an analogous way and we omit them. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. To prove the statement, start from (2.13) and use the change of basis (2.14). Then $t = t(1, a, b, \varphi)$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
t &= U(\varphi_1)(\alpha_1s_1 + \beta_1c_1) \wedge (-\alpha_1c_1 + \beta_1s_1) + F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)(\alpha_1s_1 + \beta_1c_1) \wedge (\alpha_2s_2 + \beta_2c_2) \\
&\quad + G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)(\alpha_1s_1 + \beta_1c_1) \wedge (-\alpha_2c_2 + \beta_2s_2) - G(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)(-\alpha_1c_1 + \beta_1s_1) \wedge (\alpha_2s_2 + \beta_2c_2) \\
&\quad + H(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)(-\alpha_1c_1 + \beta_1s_1) \wedge (-\alpha_2c_2 + \beta_2s_2) + U(\varphi_2)(\alpha_2s_2 + \beta_2c_2) \wedge (-\alpha_2c_2 + \beta_2s_2).
\end{aligned}$$

The first and the last terms can be trivially written in the required form, $U_1\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + U_2\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2$, because $(\alpha_k s_k + \beta_k c_k) \wedge (-\alpha_k c_k + \beta_k s_k) = \alpha_k \wedge \beta_k$. The intermediate four terms will give contributions along $\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2$, $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$, $\beta_1 \wedge \alpha_2$ and $\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2$. Let us calculate the scalar component $\pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2} t$ of t along $\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2$, keeping Lemma 2.5 into account.

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2} t &= F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)s_1s_2 - G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)s_1c_2 + G(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)c_1s_2 + H(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)c_1c_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2\varphi_1\varphi_2(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)} \left\{ \begin{aligned} & [-(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2)s_1c_1s_2c_2 + \varphi_1\varphi_2(s_1^2c_2^2 + c_1^2s_2^2)] s_1s_2 \\ & - [-\varphi_1^2s_1c_1s_2^2 + \varphi_2^2s_1c_1c_2^2 - \varphi_1\varphi_2(c_1^2 - s_1^2)s_2c_2] s_1c_2 \\ & + [-\varphi_1^2c_1^2s_2c_2 + \varphi_2^2s_1^2s_2c_2 + \varphi_1\varphi_2s_1c_1(c_2^2 - s_2^2)] c_1s_2 \\ & + [\varphi_1^2c_1^2s_2^2 + \varphi_2^2s_1^2c_2^2 - 2\varphi_1\varphi_2s_1c_1s_2c_2] c_1c_2 \end{aligned} \right\} = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

To check the last equality, it suffices to write $\{\dots\} = \varphi_1^2a + \varphi_2^2b + \varphi_1\varphi_2c$ and check that $a = b = c = 0$ identically in φ_1, φ_2 .

Let us calculate the scalar component $\pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2} t$ of t along $\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2$. We argue as above.

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2} t &= F(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)s_1c_2 + G(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)s_1s_2 + G(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)c_1c_2 - H(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)c_1s_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2\varphi_1\varphi_2(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)} \left\{ \begin{aligned} & [-(\varphi_1^2 + \varphi_2^2)s_1c_1s_2c_2 + \varphi_1\varphi_2(s_1^2c_2^2 + c_1^2s_2^2)] s_1c_2 \\ & + [-\varphi_1^2s_1c_1s_2^2 + \varphi_2^2s_1c_1c_2^2 - \varphi_1\varphi_2(c_1^2 - s_1^2)s_2c_2] s_1s_2 \\ & + [-\varphi_1^2c_1^2s_2c_2 + \varphi_2^2s_1^2s_2c_2 + \varphi_1\varphi_2s_1c_1(c_2^2 - s_2^2)] c_1c_2 \\ & - [\varphi_1^2c_1^2s_2^2 + \varphi_2^2s_1^2c_2^2 - 2\varphi_1\varphi_2s_1c_1s_2c_2] c_1s_2 \end{aligned} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking into account all cancellations in $\{\dots\}$, it turns out that the terms in φ_2^2 cancel and more precisely $\{\dots\} = -\varphi_1^2 c_1 s_2 + \varphi_1 \varphi_2 s_1 c_2$. Therefore

$$\pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2} t = \frac{1}{2\varphi_1 \varphi_2 (\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)} (-\varphi_1^2 c_1 s_2 + \varphi_1 \varphi_2 s_1 c_2) = Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2),$$

as required. Note that, exchanging 2 with 1, we get trivially $\pi_{\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1} = Z(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)$.

We leave to the reader to check that $\pi_{\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2} t = 0$. \square

Remark 2.6. Observe the following degenerations of the function Z . For all $\varphi_1 > 0$ we have

$$\lim_{\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0} Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \frac{\sin \varphi_1 - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1}{2\varphi_1^2} = V(\varphi_1) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\varphi_1 \rightarrow 0} Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = 0. \quad (2.16)$$

Then with $\varphi_2 = 0$ we find known formulas from [MM17]. We also have the limit $Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \mapsto U(\varphi)$, as $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \rightarrow (\varphi, \varphi)$, for all $\varphi > 0$. Recall that the function V appears in (2.8).

Next we express any extremals at any time s using the functions U and Z in (1.7). Define

$$a_k^s := s[a_k \sin(\varphi_k s) - b_k \cos(\varphi_k s)] \quad b_k^s := s[a_k \cos(\varphi_k s) + b_k \sin(\varphi_k s)], \quad (2.17)$$

for $k = 1, 2$. Then we have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.7. *Let $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi) = (x(\cdot, a, b, \varphi), t(\cdot, a, b, \varphi))$ be an etremal as in Proposition 2.3. Define a_k^s and b_k^s by (2.17). Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} x(s, a, b, \varphi) &= T(\varphi_1 s) b_1^s + T(\varphi_2 s) b_2^s \\ t(s, a, b, \varphi) &= \\ &= U(\varphi_1 s) a_1^s \wedge b_1^s + Z(\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s) a_1^s \wedge b_2^s + Z(\varphi_2 s, \varphi_1 s) a_2^s \wedge b_1^s + U(\varphi_2 s) a_2^s \wedge b_2^s \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Note that if $s = 1$ and $k = 1, 2$, then $a_k^1 = \alpha_k$ and $b_k^1 = \beta_k$ and we recover (1.7).

Proof. Start from (1.7) and keep in mind (1.6). We have then

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(1, a, b, \varphi) &= (T(\varphi_1) \beta_1 + T(\varphi_2) \beta_2, U(\varphi_1) \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 \\ &\quad + Z(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1 + U(\varphi_2) \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \\ &= \left(T(\varphi_1) (a_1 \cos \varphi_1 + b_1 \sin \varphi_1) + T(\varphi_2) (a_2 \cos \varphi_2 + b_2 \sin \varphi_2), \right. \\ &\quad U(\varphi_1) (a_1 \sin \varphi_1 - b_1 \cos \varphi_1) \wedge (a_1 \cos \varphi_1 + b_1 \sin \varphi_1) \\ &\quad + Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) (a_1 \sin \varphi_1 - b_1 \cos \varphi_1) \wedge (a_2 \cos \varphi_2 + b_2 \sin \varphi_2) \\ &\quad + Z(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) (a_2 \sin \varphi_2 - b_2 \cos \varphi_2) \wedge (a_1 \cos \varphi_1 + b_1 \sin \varphi_1) \\ &\quad \left. + U(\varphi_2) (a_2 \sin \varphi_2 - b_2 \cos \varphi_2) \wedge (a_2 \cos \varphi_2 + b_2 \sin \varphi_2) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The thesis (2.18) follows immediately from the riparametrization property (2.11). \square

Remark 2.8. Let us consider the form (1.8) of $t(1, a, b, \varphi) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M \\ -M^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathfrak{so}(4)$, where

$M = \begin{bmatrix} r_1^2 U_1 & r_1 r_2 Z_{12} \\ r_1 r_2 Z_{21} & r_2^2 U_2 \end{bmatrix}$. It would be useful to understand eigenvalues and eigenspaces of t in order to write it in a canonical form. However, the eigenvalue equation takes the form $\lambda^4 + \text{tr}(M^T M) \lambda^2 + (\det M)^2 = 0$, which becomes considerably complicated in terms

of the variables r and φ contained in M . There is however a subcase which seems more manageable, namely the case when $t(1)$ has double eigenvalues. Note incidentally that such points are always cut points, see the set Σ_2 in (1.15). In view of the standard inequality $(\det M)^2 \leq \frac{1}{4}(\operatorname{tr}(M^T M))^2$ for all $M \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ with equality if and only if M is conformal, it turns out that $t(1)$ has two double eigenvalues $i\lambda$ and $-i\lambda$, the block should be conformal. Since $U_1 > 0, U_2 > 0$ for all $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 > 0$, this means that it must be

$$r_1^2 U_1 = r_2^2 U_2 \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{12} = -Z_{21}. \quad (2.19)$$

If $Z_{12} \neq 0$, then it becomes $\varphi_1 = -\varphi_2$ which never holds because we are working with positive φ_1 and φ_2 . Ultimately, t has two double nonzero eigenvalues if and only if $Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = 0$.³ Given φ_1 and φ_2 such that (2.19) holds, we get extremal points of the form $\gamma(1) = (r_1 T_1 v_1 + r_2 T_2 v_2, r_1^2 U_1 (u_1 \wedge v_1 + u_2 \wedge v_2))$.

2.6. Extremals in Carnot subgroups. Next we discuss points (x, t) belonging to some strict Carnot subgroup of \mathbb{F}_4 . It turns out that for such points we can rely on previous known theory of length, distances and cut locus in lower rank free groups \mathbb{F}_2 and \mathbb{F}_3 .

Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a linear subspace. Define the Carnot subgroup generated by V as $\operatorname{Lie}(V) := V \times \Lambda^2 V$. Note that $\operatorname{Lie}(V)$ is a Carnot subgroup of \mathbb{F}_n of step ≤ 2 . Here we work with arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 2.9. *Let $V \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^n$ and consider the strict Carnot subgroup $\operatorname{Lie}(V)$ of \mathbb{F}_n . Let $(x, t) \in \operatorname{Lie}(V)$. Let $u \in L^2(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R}^n)$ be a length minimizing control on $[0, T]$ such that $\gamma_u(0) = (0, 0)$ and $\gamma_u(T) = (x, t)$. Then, we have $u(\mathbb{R}) \subset V$, or equivalently $\gamma_u(\mathbb{R}) \subset \operatorname{Lie}(V)$. As a consequence, we have*

$$d_{\mathbb{F}_n}((0, 0), (x, t)) = d_{\operatorname{Lie}(V)}((0, 0), (x, t)) \quad \text{for all } (x, t) \in \operatorname{Lie}(V). \quad (2.20)$$

Note that the inequality \leq in (2.20) is obvious. Equality depends on the fact that \mathbb{F}_n is free (see the proof below). As a consequence, in order to study the cut-time of an extremal γ in $\operatorname{Lie}(V)$, with $V \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^4$, it suffices to use the already known results on \mathbb{F}_3 . After the proof we provide two counterexamples where equality fails in nonfree settings.

Proof. Let $(x, t) \in \operatorname{Lie}(V)$ be a point and let $u(s) =: u_V(s) + u_V^\perp(s) \in V \oplus V^\perp$ be such that $\gamma_u(T) = (x, t)$. We have trivially $\operatorname{length}(\gamma_{u_V}) \leq \operatorname{length} \gamma_u$ with equality if and only if $u_V^\perp(s) = 0$ a.e. To conclude the proof, we check that the control u_V satisfies $\gamma_{u_V}(T) = (x, t)$. Start from $x = \int_0^T u_V + u_V^\perp =: x_V(T) + x_V^\perp(T)$. This implies that $\int_0^T u_V = x$, as required. Moreover $\int_0^T u_V^\perp = 0$. Then we look at the coordinate t .

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (x_V + x_V^\perp) \wedge (u_V + u_V^\perp) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T x_V \wedge u_V + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T (x_V \wedge u_V^\perp + x_V^\perp \wedge u_V) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T x_V^\perp \wedge u_V^\perp \\ &\in \Lambda^2 V \oplus (V \wedge V^\perp) \oplus \Lambda^2 V^\perp \end{aligned}$$

³Condition $Z(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = 0$ gives either $\cos \varphi_1 = \cos \varphi_2 = 0$ or, if $\cos \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_2 \neq 0$, it brings to the condition $\tan(\varphi_1)/\varphi_1 = \tan(\varphi_2)/\varphi_2$.

where $V \wedge V^\perp = \text{span}\{v \wedge v^\perp : v \in V, v^\perp \in V^\perp\}$ and the three subspaces $\Lambda^2 V$, $V \wedge V^\perp$ and $\Lambda^2 V^\perp$ are mutually orthogonal (this part of the argument does not generalize to nonfree settings). Since $t \in \Lambda^2 V$, we get that $\frac{1}{2} \int x_V \wedge u_V = t$. Thus $\gamma_{u_V}(T) = (x, t)$ and this proves the inequality $d_{\mathbb{F}_n}((0, 0), (x, t)) \geq d_{\text{Lie}(V)}((0, 0), (x, t))$. Since $u(s) = e^{-s\tau} \xi$ for suitable $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\tau \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$, it turns out by analyticity that $u(\mathbb{R}) \subset V$. \square

If \mathbb{H} is a Carnot subgroup of a possibly nonfree step-2 Carnot group \mathbb{G} , it may happen that $d_{\mathbb{G}} \not\leq d_{\mathbb{H}}$ at some points, where $d_{\mathbb{G}}$ and $d_{\mathbb{H}}$ denote distances from the origin. This happens in the following two examples:

Example 2.10. Consider the rank-4 group $\mathbb{G} = \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}$ with law

$$(x, t) \cdot (\xi, \tau) = \left(x + \xi, t + \tau + \frac{1}{2}(x \wedge \xi)_{12} + \frac{\alpha}{2}(x \wedge \xi)_{34} \right) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}.$$

Take the point $(0, t) \in \text{Lie}(e_1, e_2)$ with $t \neq 0$. It turns out that if $\alpha > 1$, then all minimizers γ connecting $(0, 0)$ and $(0, t) \in \text{Lie}(e_1, e_2)$ are contained in $\text{Lie}(e_3, e_4)$ and we have $d_{\mathbb{G}}(0, t) = d_{\text{Lie}(e_3, e_4)}(0, t) \not\leq d_{\text{Lie}(e_1, e_2)}(0, t)$. This model has been studied in [BBN19].

Example 2.11. Take the quaternionic group $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}} := \mathbb{R}^4 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \sim \mathbb{H} \times \text{Im } \mathbb{H}$. Here we have

$$(x, t) \cdot (\xi, \tau) := \left(x + \xi, t_1 + \tau_1 + \frac{1}{2}((x \wedge \xi)_{12} + (x \wedge \xi)_{34}), \right. \\ \left. t_2 + \tau_2 + \frac{1}{2}((x \wedge \xi)_{13} - (x \wedge \xi)_{24}), t_3 + \tau_3 + \frac{1}{2}((x \wedge \xi)_{14} + (x \wedge \xi)_{23}) \right).$$

It is known that $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$ is a Heisenberg-type group and it is well known that all nonconstant extremal controls $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4$ in $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$ are bounded, see [AM16]. Let us take the subgroup $\text{Lie}(e_1, e_2, e_3) \simeq \mathbb{F}_3$. Since in \mathbb{F}_3 there are plenty of unbounded nonconstant controls ([MM17]), it turns then out that all such controls $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{span}\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$ are not length-extremals in $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}$, proving again that (2.20) fails. We also have the strict inclusion $\text{Cut}(\text{Lie}(e_1, e_2, e_3)) \supsetneq \text{Cut}(\mathbb{G}_{\mathbb{H}}) \cap \text{Lie}(e_1, e_2, e_3)$.

Going back to our model \mathbb{F}_4 , in the following elementary proposition, we check that a length minimizing curve from the origin to a point contained in a strict Carnot subgroup has the form $u(s) = a \cos(2\varphi s) + b \sin(2\varphi s) + z$, where $a, b, z \in \mathbb{R}^4$ are pairwise orthogonal, $|a| = |b| > 0$ and $\varphi \geq 0$.

Proposition 2.12. *Let $V \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ be a subspace with $\dim(V) \leq 3$. Let $(x, t) \in \text{Lie}(V)$ and assume that $(x, t) = \gamma(1, a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ where γ is length-minimizing on $[0, 1]$. As usual denote $|a_k| = |b_k| = r_k$ and assume also that $\varphi_1 \geq \varphi_2 \geq 0$. Then it must be either $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 \geq 0$ or, $\varphi_1 > \varphi_2$ and $\varphi_2 r_1 r_2 = 0$. In other words, γ must be non generic in the sense of Definition 2.2.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.9 it must be $\dim \text{span}\{u(s) : s \in \mathbb{R}\} < 4$. This implies that $\dim \text{span}\{u(0), u'(0), u''(0), u'''(0)\} < 4$. By (1.3) we have

$$\text{span}\{u(0), u'(0), u''(0), u'''(0)\} \\ = \text{span}\{a_1 + a_2, 2\varphi_1 b_1 + 2\varphi_2 b_2, -4\varphi_1^2 a_1 - 4\varphi_2^2 a_2, -8\varphi_1^3 b_1 - 8\varphi_2^3 b_2\}. \quad (2.21)$$

The span in the second line has dimension four if and only if γ is generic. The thesis follows easily. \square

Next we define the union \mathcal{H} of all strict Carnot subgroups of \mathbb{F}_4 .

$$\mathcal{H} := \cup\{\text{Lie}(V) : V \subset \mathbb{R}^4 \text{ is a strict subspace}\} = \{(x, t) \in \mathbb{F}_4 : \text{rank}(t) \leq 2\}. \quad (2.22)$$

The two sets above are trivially the same, because if $(x, t) \in \mathbb{F}_4$, then $\text{rank}(t) \leq 2$ if and only if $(x, t) \in \mathcal{H}$. This is also equivalent to $t \wedge t = 0 \in \Lambda^4 \mathbb{R}^4$.

Proposition 2.12 can be rephrased as follows. If a generic extremal γ meets the set \mathcal{H} , it can do it only strictly after the cut-time $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma)$. Note that it will be shown in Section 5. that $t_{\text{cut}} < \infty$ for all such extremals. The proof there is independent of the arguments here.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ be a generic extremal (see Definition 2.2). Then*

$$\inf\{T > 0 : \text{rank}(t(T)) = 2\} = \inf\{T > 0 : (x(T), t(T)) \in \mathcal{H}\} \geq t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma). \quad (2.23)$$

Proof. Assume that there is $T \leq t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma)$ and a strict subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^4$ such that $\gamma(T) \in \text{Lie}(V)$. Since γ is generic, it can not be $\gamma([0, T]) \subset \text{Lie}(V)$, by Proposition 2.12. This contradicts the fact that γ is a length-minimizer on $[0, T]$. \square

Conjecture 2.14. *Concerning (2.23), we conjecture that given a generic $\gamma = \gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ it must be*

$$\gamma(]0, +\infty[) \cap \mathcal{H} = \emptyset. \quad (2.24)$$

In view of (2.23) and Lemma 4.6 below, we have the weaker statement $\gamma(]0, +\infty[) \cap \mathcal{H} \subset \{\gamma(s) : s \in]t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma), c_2(\gamma)[\}$ for a positive constant $c_2 = c_2(\gamma)$ depending on the generic extremal γ . In Remark 4.8 we translate this conjecture in an inequality.

3. CALCULATION OF CONJUGATE POINTS ALONG GENERIC EXTREMALS

In this section we analyze conjugate points along generic extremals. Recall that conjugate points are nonzero critical points $(\xi, \tau) \in T_{(0,0)}^* \mathbb{F}_4 \simeq \mathbb{F}_4$ of the map $\exp : T_{(0,0)}^* \mathbb{F}_4 \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_4$, obtained by integrating the ODE (2.1) with control $u = u(s, \xi, \tau) = e^{-s\tau} \xi$ and letting $\exp(\xi, \tau) = (x_u(1), t_u(1))$. In our calculations, instead of using $(\xi, \tau) \in T_{(0,0)}^* \mathbb{F}_4$, we express the exponential map in different coordinates on a ten-dimensional manifold $\Sigma \times \Omega$ which is diffeomorphic to a suitable subset of $T_{(0,0)}^* \mathbb{F}_4$. The preliminaries concerning such manifold will be discussed in Subsections 3.1 and 3.2.

3.1. Description of the manifold $\Sigma \times \Omega$. Let us consider $\Sigma := \{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \mathbb{R}^{16} : x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \text{ are orthonormal in } \mathbb{R}^{16}\}$. Note that Σ is a six-dimensional embedded submanifold, being defined by the family of ten independent equations $\langle x_j, x_k \rangle = \delta_{jk}$ for $j, k = 1, \dots, 4$. Given $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \in \Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}^{16}$, we have

$$T_{(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)} \Sigma = \text{span}\{(x_2, -x_1, 0, 0), (x_3, 0, -x_1, 0), (x_4, 0, 0, -x_1), \\ (0, x_3, -x_2, 0), (0, x_4, 0, -x_2), (0, 0, x_4, -x_3)\}. \quad (3.1)$$

Since x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 are orthogonal, the given vectors are orthogonal, then independent. In order to see that they are tangent, consider for any $1 \leq j < k \leq 4$ the path $x^{jk} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Sigma$ defined for all $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ by $x^{jk}(\sigma) = (x_1^{jk}(\sigma), x_2^{jk}(\sigma), x_3^{jk}(\sigma), x_4^{jk}(\sigma))$, where

$$x_j^{jk}(\sigma) = x_j \cos \sigma + x_k \sin \sigma, \quad x_k^{jk}(\sigma) = -x_j \sin \sigma + x_k \cos \sigma, \quad \text{and } x_i^{jk}(\sigma) = x_i \text{ for } i \notin \{j, k\}.$$

Each curve x^{jk} corresponds to a rotation of the j th and of the k th vector. The set of tangent vectors $(x^{jk})'(0)$ is described in (3.1). In the following we denote by $D_{\circlearrowleft x_j x_k}$ the differential operator on Σ differentiating along the curve x^{jk} at time $\sigma = 0$.

Let also $\Omega = \{(r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \mathbb{R}^4 : r_1, r_2 > 0, 0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1\}$. We are going to parametrize generic extremals by

$$\Gamma : \Sigma \times \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^4.$$

Indeed, for $k = 1, 2$, write $\alpha_k = r_k u_k$ and $\beta_k = r_k v_k$, where u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 is an orthonormal basis in \mathbb{R}^4 and as usual $\varphi_2 < \varphi_1$. Then, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & (T_1 \beta_1 + T_2 \beta_2, U_1 \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + Z_{12} \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 + Z_{21} \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1 + U_2 \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2) \\ =: & \Gamma(u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi) \\ = & (r_1 T_1 v_1 + r_2 T_2 v_2, r_1^2 U_1 u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_1 r_2 Z_{12} u_1 \wedge v_2 + r_2 r_1 Z_{21} u_2 \wedge v_1 + r_2^2 U_2 u_2 \wedge v_2). \end{aligned}$$

To relate Γ with \exp we need the following lemma which keeps under control the change of basis bringing a_k, b_k to α_k, β_k . Writing $a_k := r_k x_k$, $b_k = r_k y_k$, $\alpha_k = r_k u_k$ and $\beta_k = r_k v_k$, the change $(x, y, r, \varphi) \mapsto R(u, v, r, \varphi)$ is described in the lemma below.

Lemma 3.1. *Given the set $\Sigma \times \Omega$ defined above, consider the map $R : \Sigma \times \Omega \rightarrow \Sigma \times \Omega$ defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} R((x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2), (r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)) = & ((x_1 \sin \varphi_1 - y_1 \cos \varphi_1, x_1 \cos \varphi_1 + y_1 \sin \varphi_1, \\ & , x_2 \sin \varphi_2 - y_2 \cos \varphi_2, x_2 \cos \varphi_2 + y_2 \sin \varphi_2), (r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Then R is a diffeomorphism.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Denoting $c_k = \cos \varphi_k$ and $s_k = \sin \varphi_k$, we calculate the columns $K_1, \dots, K_{10} \in \mathbb{R}^{16} \times \mathbb{R}^4$ of the differential of R . We start with the columns with derivatives D_{\circlearrowleft} on Σ .

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= D_{\circlearrowleft x_1 y_1} R = ((y_1 s_1 + x_1 c_1, y_1 c_1 - x_1 s_1, 0, 0), (0, 0, 0, 0)) \in \mathbb{R}^{16} \times \mathbb{R}^4 \\ K_2 &= D_{\circlearrowleft x_1 x_2} R = ((x_2 s_1, x_2 c_1, -x_1 s_2, -x_1 c_2), (0, 0, 0, 0)) \\ K_3 &= D_{\circlearrowleft x_1 y_2} R = ((y_2 s_1, y_2 c_1, x_1 c_2, -x_1 s_2), (0, 0, 0, 0)) \\ K_4 &= D_{\circlearrowleft y_1 x_2} R = ((-x_2 c_1, x_2 s_1, -y_1 s_2, -y_1 c_2), (0, 0, 0, 0)) \\ K_5 &= D_{\circlearrowleft y_1 y_2} R = ((-y_2 c_1, y_2 s_1, y_1 c_2, -y_1 s_2), (0, 0, 0, 0)) \\ K_6 &= D_{\circlearrowleft x_2 y_2} R = ((0, 0, y_2 s_2 + x_2 c_2, y_2 c_2 - x_2 s_2), (0, 0, 0, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

The remaining four derivatives have the form

$$\begin{aligned} K_7 &= \partial_{r_1} R = ((0, 0, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0, 0)) \\ K_8 &= \partial_{r_2} R = ((0, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0)) \\ K_9 &= \partial_{\varphi_1} R = ((*, *, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0)) \\ K_{10} &= \partial_{\varphi_2} R = ((0, 0, *, *), (0, 0, 0, 1)). \end{aligned}$$

The precise form of $*$ plays no role in the rank of the differential.

We first claim that $K_1, \dots, K_6 \in \mathbb{R}^{16} \times \{0\}$ are independent. Once the claim is proved, it will follow immediately from the form of K_7, \dots, K_{10} that the rank of the differential is maximal.

To prove the claim, note that equation $\sum_{j=1}^6 \lambda_j K_j = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_1(y_1 s_1 + x_1 c_1) + \lambda_2 x_2 s_1 + \lambda_3 y_2 s_1 - \lambda_4 x_2 c_1 - \lambda_5 y_2 c_1 &\stackrel{E_1}{=} 0 \\ \lambda_1(y_1 c_1 - x_1 s_1) + \lambda_2 x_2 c_1 + \lambda_3 y_2 c_1 + \lambda_4 x_2 s_1 + \lambda_5 y_2 s_1 &\stackrel{E_2}{=} 0 \\ -\lambda_2 x_1 s_2 + \lambda_3 x_1 c_2 - \lambda_4 y_1 s_2 + \lambda_5 y_1 c_2 + \lambda_6(y_2 s_2 + x_2 c_2) &\stackrel{E_3}{=} 0 \\ -\lambda_2 x_1 c_2 - \lambda_3 x_1 s_2 - \lambda_4 y_1 c_2 - \lambda_5 y_1 s_2 + \lambda_6(y_2 c_2 - x_2 s_2) &\stackrel{E_4}{=} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Recall first that x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 are pairwise orthonormal and that $c_1^2 + s_1^2 = 1$. Projecting E_1 and E_2 along x_1 we see immediately that $\lambda_1 = 0$. Projecting E_5 and E_6 along x_2 we get $\lambda_6 = 0$. Project then E_1 and E_2 along x_2 . This gives $\lambda_2 = \lambda_4 = 0$, because $c_1^2 + s_1^2 = 1$. For the same reason, projecting along y_2 E_1 and E_2 we discover that $\lambda_3 = \lambda_5 = 0$. \square

3.2. The manifold $\Sigma \times \Omega$ is diffeomorphic to $T_{(0,0)}^* \mathbb{F}_4$. We construct a diffeomorphism $H : \Sigma \times \Omega \rightarrow G$, where

$$G = \{(\xi, \tau) \in T_{(0,0)}^* \mathbb{F}_4 \simeq \mathbb{F}_4 : \xi \neq 0 \text{ and } \tau \text{ has four nonzero different eigenvalues}\}. \quad (3.2)$$

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\Sigma \times \Omega$ where $\Omega = \{(r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) : r_1, r_2 > 0, 0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1\}$. Let also $G \subset \mathbb{F}_4$ be the set defined above. Then, the pair of requirements*

$$\begin{cases} \xi = r_1 x_1 + r_2 x_2 \\ \tau = 2\varphi_1 x_1 \wedge y_1 + 2\varphi_2 x_2 \wedge y_2 \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

defines a global diffeomorphism $(x, y, r, \varphi) \in \Sigma \times \Omega \mapsto E(x, y, r, \varphi) = (\xi, \tau) \in G$, satisfying

$$e^{-s\tau} \xi = r_1 [x_1 \cos(2\varphi_1 s) + y_1 \sin(2\varphi_1 s)] + r_2 [x_2 \cos(2\varphi_2 s) + y_2 \sin(2\varphi_2 s)] \quad (3.4)$$

for all $(x, y, r, \varphi) \in \Sigma \times \Omega$.

Before proving the proposition observe the following fact.

Remark 3.3. In view of Lemma 3.1 and of Proposition 3.2, letting $H := E^{-1} : G \rightarrow \Sigma \times \Omega$, we have

$$\exp(\xi, \tau) = \Gamma(R(H(\xi, \tau))), \quad \text{with } H(\xi, \tau) = (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \Sigma \times \Omega, \quad (3.5)$$

where $x_k : \frac{a_k}{|a_k|} = \frac{a_k}{r_k}$, $y_k = \frac{b_k}{r_k}$, while the function $(\xi, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^4 \mapsto H(\xi, \tau) = (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \in \Sigma \times \Omega$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-s\tau} \xi &= r_1 [x_1 \cos(2\varphi_1 s) + y_1 \sin(2\varphi_1 s)] + r_2 [x_2 \cos(2\varphi_2 s) + y_2 \sin(2\varphi_2 s)] \\ &= a_1 \cos(2\varphi_1 s) + b_1 \sin(2\varphi_1 s) + a_2 \cos(2\varphi_2 s) + b_2 \sin(2\varphi_2 s). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Therefore, if $(\xi, \tau) \in G$, we have that $d_{(\xi, \tau)} \exp$ is singular if and only if $d_{(u, v, r, \varphi)} \Gamma$ is singular. Here $(u, v, r, \varphi) = R(x, y, r, \varphi)$. The following diagram can help.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 (x, y, r, \varphi) \in \Sigma \times \Omega & \xrightarrow{R} & (u, v, r, \varphi) \in \Sigma \times \Omega \\
 \uparrow H & \searrow \gamma(1, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot) & \downarrow \Gamma \\
 (\xi, \tau) \in G \subset T_{(0,0)}^* \mathbb{F}_4 & \xrightarrow{\exp} & \exp(\xi, \tau) = \gamma(1, a, b, \varphi) = \Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)
 \end{array}$$

The map in the diagonal acts as follows $(x, y, r, \varphi) \mapsto \gamma(1, r_1 x_1, r_1 y_1, r_2 x_2, r_2 y_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \gamma(1, a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) = \gamma(1, a, b, \varphi)$.

Proof of Proposition 3.2. The proof is articulated in four steps.

Step 0. We show first that $E(\Sigma \times \Omega) \subseteq G$.

Step 1. We show that for any given $(\xi, \tau) \in G$ there is a unique $(x, y, r, \varphi) \in \Sigma \times \Omega$ such that (3.3) holds.

Step 2. We show that the differential of E is nonsingular at any point (x, y, r, φ) .

Step 3. We show that (3.4) holds.

Step 0 follows from the fact that $r_1, r_2 > 0$ which implies $\xi \neq 0$. Furthermore, it is easy to check for $k = 1, 2$, that $x_k \pm iy_k$ are eigenvectors corresponding to $\pm 2i\varphi_k$ of the matrix $\tau = 2\varphi_1(x_1 y_1^T - y_1 x_1^T) + 2\varphi_2(x_2 y_2^T - y_2 x_2^T)$. Thus τ has four different nonzero eigenvalues $\pm 2i\varphi_1$ and $\pm 2i\varphi_2$.

Let us prove Step 1. Given $(\xi, \tau) \in G$, by definition of G , the matrix τ has four nonzero different eigenvalues. Thus we find unique positive numbers φ_1, φ_2 such that $\varphi_2 < \varphi_1$ and $\pm 2i\varphi_k$ are the eigenvalues of τ . Let $\bar{x}_k \pm i\bar{y}_k$ be an eigenvector corresponding to $\pm 2i\varphi_k$. By standard properties of antisymmetric matrices, it must be $|\bar{x}_k| = |\bar{y}_k|$ and $\langle \bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k \rangle = 0$.⁴ Requiring also that all \bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k have unit norm in \mathbb{R}^4 , the eigenvector $\bar{x}_k + i\bar{y}_k$ is uniquely determined up to a rotation of the form $(\bar{x}_k, \bar{y}_k) \mapsto (x_k, y_k) = (\bar{x}_k \cos \theta_k + \bar{y}_k \sin \theta_k, -\bar{x}_k \sin \theta_k + \bar{y}_k \cos \theta_k)$. Requirement in the first line of (3.3) gives uniquely the choice of θ_k , namely the unique choice making $\langle y_k, \xi \rangle = 0$ and $\langle x_k, \xi \rangle > 0$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then, letting $r_k = \langle x_k, \xi \rangle$, we find $\xi = r_1 x_1 + r_2 x_2$.

Let us pass to Step 2. To calculate the differential of E , we need to differentiate E on the manifold $\Sigma \times \Omega$. The first six columns of the matrix below contain derivatives along the tangent space to Σ at (x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) . Notation $\circlearrowleft x_1 y_1$ stands for differentiation $\frac{d}{d\sigma}|_{\sigma=0}$ of E along the curve $x_1(\sigma) = x_1 \cos \sigma + y_1 \sin \sigma$, $y_1(\sigma) = -x_1 \sin \sigma + y_1 \cos \sigma$, and $x_2(\sigma), y_2(\sigma)$ constant. Similar notation are used on the remaining columns. In the first row $\pi_{x_j}, \pi_{x_j \wedge y_k}$ and similar symbols denote components along $x_j, x_j \wedge y_k$ and so on. Ultimately

⁴If $x + iy \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is eigenvector of $A \in \mathfrak{so}(n)$ with eigenvalue $i\lambda \neq 0$, then we have $Ax = -\lambda y$ and $Ay = \lambda x$. Thus we have $0 = \langle Ax, x \rangle = -\lambda \langle y, x \rangle$ and $\lambda^2 |x|^2 = \langle \lambda^2 x, x \rangle = \langle -A^2 x, x \rangle = \langle Ax, Ax \rangle = \langle -\lambda y, -\lambda y \rangle = \lambda^2 |y|^2$.

the differential is represented by the following matrix.

$$\begin{bmatrix} \circlearrowleft x_1 y_1 & \circlearrowleft x_1 x_2 & \circlearrowleft x_1 y_2 & \circlearrowleft y_1 x_2 & \circlearrowleft y_1 y_2 & \circlearrowleft x_2 y_2 & \partial_{r_1} & \partial_{r_2} & \partial_{\varphi_1} & \partial_{\varphi_2} \\ \pi_{x_1} & 0 & -r_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{y_1} & r_1 & 0 & 0 & -r_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{x_2} & 0 & r_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{y_2} & 0 & 0 & r_1 & 0 & 0 & r_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{x_1} \wedge y_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ \pi_{x_1} \wedge x_2 & 0 & 0 & 2\varphi_2 & 2\varphi_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{x_1} \wedge y_2 & 0 & -2\varphi_2 & 0 & 0 & 2\varphi_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{y_1} \wedge x_2 & 0 & -2\varphi_1 & 0 & 0 & 2\varphi_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{y_1} \wedge y_2 & 0 & 0 & -2\varphi_1 & -2\varphi_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{x_2} \wedge y_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is easy to see that calling W_k the k -th column, we have $\text{span}\{W_1, W_6, W_7, W_8, W_9, W_{10}\} = \text{span}\{u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, u_1 \wedge v_1, u_2 \wedge v_2\}$. Thus, to check that the matrix has full rank it suffices to check that the square matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 2\varphi_2 & 2\varphi_1 & 0 \\ -2\varphi_2 & 0 & 0 & 2\varphi_1 \\ -2\varphi_1 & 0 & 0 & 2\varphi_2 \\ 0 & -2\varphi_1 & -2\varphi_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

has full rank, which is true, because $0 < 2\varphi_2 < 2\varphi_1$.

To conclude the proof we prove Step 3. First of all it is easy to check that, under (3.3) we have

$$e^{-s\tau} = \sum_{k=1}^2 \left\{ (x_k x_k^T + y_k y_k^T) \cos(2\varphi_k s) - (x_k y_k^T - y_k x_k^T) \sin(2\varphi_k s) \right\} \quad (3.7)$$

(the right and left-hand side have the same $\frac{d}{ds}$ - derivative and agree at $s = 0$). To prove (3.4), it suffices to multiply (3.7) with $\xi = r_1 x_1 + r_2 x_2$. \square

To conclude this preliminary discussion, we observe that for $(\xi, \tau) \in G \subset \mathbb{F}_4$, we have the decomposition of the exponential map in the form

$$\exp(\xi, \tau) = (\Gamma \circ R \circ H)(\xi, \tau) = \Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi). \quad (3.8)$$

where by Lemma 3.1 and Proposition 3.2, the maps $H : G \rightarrow \Sigma \times \Omega$ and $R : \Sigma \times \Omega \rightarrow \Sigma \times \Omega$ are diffeomorphisms. It turns out that $\exp(\xi, \tau)$ is conjugate to the origin along the trajectory of the control $u(s) = e^{-s\tau} \xi$ if and only if $d_{R(H(\xi, \tau))} \Gamma = d_{(u, v, r, \varphi)} \Gamma$ is singular.

3.3. Calculation of the differential of Γ . Next, in order to get information on the conjugate locus, we calculate explicitly the differential of Γ . We start from

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) &= \Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi) \\ &= \left(r_1 T_1 v_1 + r_2 T_2 v_2, r_1^2 U_1 u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_1 r_2 Z_{12} u_1 \wedge v_2 + r_1 r_2 Z_{21} u_2 \wedge v_1 + r_2^2 U_2 u_2 \wedge v_2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

where we recall that $\Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi) = \gamma(1, a, b, \varphi)$.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$, Let also $r_1 > 0$, $r_2 > 0$ and $(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) \in \Sigma$. The point $\Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi) = \gamma(1, a, b, \varphi)$ is conjugate to the origin along $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ if and only if the following matrix is singular.*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \circ u_1 v_1 & \circ u_2 v_2 & \circ u_1 v_2 & \circ u_2 v_1 & \circ u_1 u_2 & \circ v_1 v_2 & \partial/\partial r_1 & \partial/\partial r_2 & \partial/\partial \varphi_1 & \partial/\partial \varphi_2 \\ \pi_{\alpha_1} & -T_1 & 0 & -r_2^2 T_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{\beta_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -r_2^2 T_2 & T_1 & 0 & -2V_1 & 0 \\ \pi_{\alpha_2} & 0 & -T_2 & 0 & -r_1^2 T_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{\beta_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r_1^2 T_1 & 0 & T_2 & 0 & -2V_2 \\ \pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -r_2^2 Z_{21} & -r_2^2 Z_{12} & 2U_1 & 0 & \frac{\cos \varphi_1}{\varphi_1} V_1 \\ \pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2} & Z_{21} & -Z_{12} & r_2^2 U_2 & -r_1^2 U_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -r_2^2 U_2 & r_1^2 U_1 & Z_{12} & Z_{12} & (\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) & (\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \\ \pi_{\beta_1 \wedge \alpha_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -r_1^2 U_1 & r_2^2 U_2 & -Z_{21} & -Z_{21} & -(\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) & -(\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) \\ \pi_{\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2} & Z_{12} & -Z_{21} & -r_1^2 U_1 & r_2^2 U_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \pi_{\alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & r_1^2 Z_{12} & r_1^2 Z_{21} & 0 & 2U_2 & 0 & \frac{\cos \varphi_2}{\varphi_2} V_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.10)$$

In particular, $\Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)$ is conjugate if and only if at least one of the following two matrices is singular:

$$M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -T_1 & 0 & -r_2^2 T_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -T_2 & 0 & -r_1^2 T_1 \\ Z_{21} & -Z_{12} & r_2^2 U_2 & -r_1^2 U_1 \\ Z_{12} & -Z_{21} & -r_1^2 U_1 & r_2^2 U_2 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.11)$$

or

$$M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -r_2^2 T_2 & T_1 & 0 & -2V_1 & 0 \\ 0 & r_1^2 T_1 & 0 & T_2 & 0 & -2V_2 \\ -r_2^2 Z_{21} & -r_2^2 Z_{12} & 2U_1 & 0 & \frac{\cos \varphi_1}{\varphi_1} V_1 & 0 \\ -r_2^2 U_2 & r_1^2 U_1 & Z_{12} & Z_{12} & (\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) & (\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \\ -r_1^2 U_1 & r_2^2 U_2 & -Z_{21} & -Z_{21} & -(\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) & -(\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) \\ r_1^2 Z_{12} & r_1^2 Z_{21} & 0 & 2U_2 & 0 & \frac{\cos \varphi_2}{\varphi_2} V_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3.12)$$

In (3.10) $\partial_1 Z$ and $\partial_2 Z$ denote derivatives with respect to the first and the second argument. The meaning of derivations $\circ u_j v_k$ in the first line is explained in Step 2 of the proof of Proposition 3.2. Finally, the symbols π_{α_k} , $\pi_{\alpha_j \wedge \beta_k}$ and similar denote projections along $\alpha_k = r_k u_k$ and $\beta_k = r_k v_k$ for $k = 1, 2$. We also denoted $V(\varphi) = \frac{\sin \varphi - \varphi \cos \varphi}{2\varphi^2}$.

Proof. We begin with the six derivatives along tangent directions to Σ . Then we will calculate the remaining four derivatives ∂_{r_j} and ∂_{φ_j} . The calculation is made by rotating pairs of vectors among u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 . See the explanations following (3.1) and see the proof of Step 2 of Proposition 3.2.

Let us start by rotating the pair u_1, v_1 . Note that this gives $(u_1 \wedge v_1)'(0) = 0$. It turns out that the derivative $D_{\circ u_1 v_1} \Gamma$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\circ u_1 v_1} \Gamma &= (-r_1 T_1 u_1, r_1 r_2 Z_{12} v_1 \wedge v_2 + r_1 r_2 Z_{21} u_1 \wedge u_2) \\ &= (-T_1 \alpha_1, Z_{21} \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 + Z_{12} \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2) \end{aligned}$$

(recall that $\alpha_j = r_j u_j$ and $\beta_j = r_j v_j$). Exchanging indices 1 and 2, we get $D_{\circlearrowright u_2 v_2} \Gamma = (-T_2 \alpha_2, -Z_{12} \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 - Z_{21} \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2)$. To get the third column of the differential of Γ we rotate u_1 and v_2 . Here we have $u'_1(0) = v_2$, $v'_2(0) = -u_1$ and $(u_1 \wedge v_2)'(0) = 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\circlearrowright u_1 v_2} \Gamma &= (-r_2 T_2 u_1, -r_1^2 U_1 v_1 \wedge v_2 + r_2^2 U_2 u_1 \wedge u_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{r_1 r_2} (-r_2^2 T_2 \alpha_1, r_2^2 U_2 \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 - r_1^2 U_1 \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2). \end{aligned}$$

The fourth column can be obtained from the third exchanging 1 and 2:

$$D_{\circlearrowright u_2 v_1} = \frac{1}{r_1 r_2} (-r_1^2 T_1 \alpha_2, -r_1^2 U_1 \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2 + r_2^2 U_2 \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2).$$

The fifth and the sixth columns take the form

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\circlearrowright u_1 u_2} \Gamma &= (0, r_1^2 U_1 u_2 \wedge v_1 + r_1 r_2 Z_{12} u_2 \wedge v_2 - r_1 r_2 Z_{21} u_1 \wedge v_1 - r_2^2 U_2 u_1 \wedge v_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{r_1 r_2} (0, r_1^2 U_1 \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1 + r_1^2 Z_{12} \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2 - r_2^2 Z_{21} \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 - r_2^2 U_2 \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$D_{\circlearrowright v_1 v_2} \Gamma = \frac{1}{r_1 r_2} (-r_2^2 T_2 \beta_1 + r_1^2 T_1 \beta_2, -r_2^2 Z_{12} \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + r_1^2 U_1 \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 + r_2^2 U_2 \beta_1 \wedge \alpha_2 + r_1^2 Z_{21} \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2).$$

Derivatives with the variables r_1 and r_2 are

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{r_1} \Gamma &= (T_1 v_1, 2r_1 U_1 u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_2 Z_{12} u_1 \wedge v_2 + r_2 Z_{21} u_2 \wedge v_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{r_1} (T_1 \beta_1, 2U_1 \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + Z_{12} \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 - Z_{21} \beta_1 \wedge \alpha_2), \quad \text{and} \\ \partial_{r_2} \Gamma &= \frac{1}{r_2} (T_2 \beta_2, Z_{12} \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 - Z_{21} \beta_1 \wedge \alpha_2 + 2U_2 \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2). \end{aligned}$$

The last two columns can be obtained by differentiating along φ_1 and φ_2 . Using formulas for differentiating T and U from [MM17], $T'(\varphi) = -2V(\varphi)$ and $U'(\varphi) = \frac{\cos \varphi}{\varphi} V(\varphi)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\varphi_1} \Gamma &= \left(-2V_1 \beta_1, \frac{\cos \varphi_1}{\varphi_1} V_1 \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1 + (\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 + (\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1 \right) \\ \partial_{\varphi_2} \Gamma &= \left(-2V_2 \beta_2, (\partial_2 Z)(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2 + (\partial_1 Z)(\varphi_2, \varphi_1) \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_1 + \frac{\cos \varphi_2}{\varphi_2} V_2 \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Collecting all computations of the ten columns and ignoring the positive terms $\frac{1}{r_1}$, $\frac{1}{r_2}$ and $\frac{1}{r_1 r_2}$, we get the matrix in (3.10), as desired.

In order to prove the second part, it suffices to observe that the matrix in (3.10) has the block form described by the following inclusions. Let W_k be the k -th column. Then $W_1, W_2, W_3, W_4 \in \text{span}\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \alpha_2, \beta_1 \wedge \beta_2\}$, while $W_5, W_6, \dots, W_{10} \in \text{span}\{\beta_1, \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1, \alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2, \beta_1 \wedge \alpha_2, \alpha_2 \wedge \beta_2\}$. \square

4. ANALYSIS OF CONJUGATE POINTS WITH $\det M_1 = 0$

This section is devoted to the analysis of properties of conjugate points coming from the factor $\det M_1 = 0$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $(u, v, r, \varphi) \in \Sigma \times \Omega$, let $\Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)$ be the generic extremal point in (3.9) and let M_1 be the matrix in (3.11). Then, if $\sin \varphi_1 = \sin \varphi_2 = 0$, then $\det M_1 = 0$. If $\sin^2 \varphi_1 + \sin^2 \varphi_2 > 0$, then M_1 is singular if and only if*

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} r_2^2(T_2 Z_{21} - T_1 U_2) & r_1^2(T_1 Z_{12} - T_2 U_1) \\ r_2^2 T_2 Z_{12} + r_1^2 T_1 U_1 & r_1^2 T_1 Z_{21} + r_2^2 T_2 U_2 \end{bmatrix} = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Proof. If $\sin \varphi_1 = \sin \varphi_2 = 0$, then $T_1 = T_2 = 0$, so that M_1 is singular. Assume now that $\sin \varphi_2 \neq 0$, which implies $T_2 \neq 0$. Changing the first column C_1 with $r_2^2 T_2 C_1 - T_1 C_3$ and the fourth with $-r_1^2 T_1 C_2 + T_2 C_4$ we get that

$$M_1 \sim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -r_2^2 T_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -T_2 & 0 & 0 \\ r_2^2(T_2 Z_{21} - T_1 U_2) & -Z_{12} & r_2^2 U_2 & r_1^2(T_1 Z_{12} - T_2 U_1) \\ r_2^2 T_2 Z_{12} + r_1^2 T_1 U_1 & -Z_{21} & -r_1^2 U_1 & r_1^2 T_1 Z_{21} + r_2^2 T_2 U_2 \end{bmatrix}$$

and the determinant (4.1) appear.

If instead $\sin \varphi_1 \neq 0$ we change $C_3 \mapsto T_1 C_3 - r_2^2 T_2 C_1$ and $C_2 \mapsto r_1^2 T_1 C_2 - T_2 C_4$. After some computation, we discover that the determinant is the same. \square

Remark 4.2 (Degeneration to \mathbb{F}_3). The determinant (4.1) degenerates correctly if $\varphi_2 \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, keeping the limits (2.16) into account, the point (x, t) becomes $(x, t) = (r_1 T_1 v_1 + r_2 v_2, r_1^2 U_1 u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_1 r_2 V_1 u_1 \wedge v_2)$, which is the form of extremal points in $\text{Lie}(u_1, v_1, v_2)$, see [MM17]. Furthermore, 4.1 takes the form $r_1^2(U_1 - T_1 V_1)(r_2^2 V_1 + r_1^2 T_1 U_1) = 0$. Since $U_1 - T_1 V_1 > 0$ for all $\varphi_1 > 0$, see [MM17, Lemma 3.1], it must be $\frac{r_2^2}{r_1^2} = -\frac{T_1 U_1}{V_1}$, compare [MM17, Theorem 4.2].

Theorem 4.3. *Let $(u, v) \in \Sigma$ and consider $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$. Consider the corresponding generic extremal point $(x, t) := \Gamma(u, v, r, \varphi)$ appearing in (3.9). Then, the following two properties are equivalent:*

$$\det M_1 = 0 \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$t^2 x \in \text{span}\{x\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Proof. In the basis u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 we have

$$t = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & r_1^2 U_1 & r_1 r_2 Z_{12} \\ 0 & 0 & r_1 r_2 Z_{21} & r_2^2 U_2 \\ -r_1^2 U_1 & -r_1 r_2 Z_{21} & 0 & 0 \\ -r_1 r_2 Z_{12} & -r_2^2 U_2 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} =: \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M \\ -M^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and } x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ r_1 T_1 \\ r_2 T_2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.4)$$

By the block structure of t , requiring $t^2 x \in \text{span}\{x\}$ is the same of requiring $\langle tx, ty \rangle = 0$, where $y = (0, 0, -r_2 T_2, r_1 T_1)^T \perp x$ in $\text{span}\{v_1, v_2\}$. The calculation of tx and ty gives the results

$$tx = \begin{bmatrix} r_1(r_1^2 T_1 U_1 + r_2^2 T_2 Z_{12}) \\ r_2(r_1^2 T_1 Z_{21} + r_2^2 T_2 U_2) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and } ty = r_1 r_2 \begin{bmatrix} r_1(T_1 Z_{12} - T_2 U_1) \\ r_2(T_1 U_2 - T_2 Z_{21}) \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.5)$$

Requiring orthogonality between these vectors is equivalent to (4.1). \square

Remark 4.4. A calculation of the determinant (4.1) shows that the equation $\det M_1 = 0$ can be written in the form

$$A(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)r_1^4 + \{B(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) - B(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)\}r_1^2r_2^2 - A(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)r_2^4 = 0 \quad (4.6)$$

where $A(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = T_1U_1(T_1Z_{12} - T_2U_1)$, $B(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = T_2Z_{12}(T_1Z_{12} - T_2U_1)$. Equation (4.6) can be also seen as a quadratic equation in r_1^2/r_2^2 .

Remark 4.5. It is easy to see that, if $(x, t) \in \mathbb{F}_4$ and $\text{rank}(t) = 4$, i.e. t has maximal rank, then we have

$$t^2x \in \text{span}\{x\} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad (x, t) \in C_4. \quad (4.7)$$

Indeed, if $\text{rank}(t) = 4$, then we have the equivalence $t = \lambda_1u_1 \wedge v_1 + \lambda_2u_2 \wedge v_2$ for suitable $(u_1, v_1, u_2, v_2) \in \Sigma$ and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$. If $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 =: \lambda \neq 0$, then $(x, t) \in \Sigma_2 \subset C_4$, see (1.15). We also have $t^2 = -\lambda^2I_4$ and condition $t^2x \in \text{span}\{x\}$ is obvious. Let now $0 < \lambda_2 < \lambda_1$. Condition $t^2x \in \text{span}\{x\}$ is equivalent to claim that x is an eigenvalue of

$$t^2 = -\lambda_1^2(u_1u_1^T + v_1v_1^T) - \lambda_2^2(u_2u_2^T + v_2v_2^T) = -\lambda_1^2\pi_{\text{span}\{u_1, v_1\}} - \lambda_2^2\pi_{\text{span}\{u_2, v_2\}}.$$

In other words, $x \in \text{span}\{u_1, v_1\} \cup \text{span}\{u_2, v_2\}$, which means $(x, t) \in \Sigma_1$, see again (1.15).

Finally, note that if $\text{rank}(t) = 2$, then equivalence (4.7) does not hold. See the example $(x, t) = (e_1, e_1 \wedge e_2)$, where we have $t^2x \in \text{span}\{x\}$, but $(x, t) \notin C_4$, by (2.7). Furthermore, $(x, t) \notin \text{Cut}(\mathbb{F}_4)$, by the discussion in Subsection 2.6.

In (2.23) we proved that if $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ is a generic extremal, then $\text{rank}(t(s, a, b, \varphi)) = 4$ for all $s \in]0, t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma)]$. Next we prove that the same happens for large times.

Lemma 4.6. *We have the following facts.*

(1) *Let $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ be a generic extremal. Then, if*

$$\varphi_2 > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_1 > 2 + \varphi_2 + \frac{2}{\varphi_2 - 1} \quad (4.8)$$

we have $\text{rank}(t(1, a, b, \varphi)) = 4$.

(2) *For all generic extremal $(x(s), t(s)) := \gamma(s, a, b, \varphi)$ there is $T = T(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) > 0$ such that $\text{rank}(t(s)) = 4$ for all $s \geq T$.*

Note that the constant T in (2) depends on φ_1 and φ_2 only, not on a, b .

Proof. We prove part (1). Write $\gamma(1, a, b, \varphi) = \Gamma(r, u, v, \varphi)$ as in (1.10). Keeping (4.4) into account, we must prove the inequality $\det \begin{bmatrix} r_1^2U_1 & r_1r_2Z_{12} \\ r_1r_2Z_{21} & r_2^2U_2 \end{bmatrix} \neq 0$, which means

$$U_1U_2 - Z_{12}Z_{21} \neq 0, \quad (4.9)$$

for all $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$ satisfying (4.8). Equivalently,

$$(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)^2(\varphi_1 - c_1s_1)(\varphi_2 - c_2s_2) - 4\varphi_1\varphi_2(\varphi_2c_2s_1 - \varphi_1c_1s_2)^2 \neq 0. \quad (4.10)$$

We claim that the left-hand side of (4.10) is positive for all (φ_1, φ_2) satisfying (4.8). Observe the trivial bounds

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)^2(\varphi_1 - c_1s_1)(\varphi_2 - c_2s_2) &\geq (\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)^2(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2(\varphi_1 - 1)(\varphi_2 - 1) \\ 4\varphi_1\varphi_2(\varphi_2c_2s_1 - \varphi_1c_1s_2)^2 &< 4\varphi_1\varphi_2(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The obvious inequality $\frac{\varphi_1}{\varphi_1-1} < \frac{\varphi_2}{\varphi_2-1}$ for $1 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$ shows that (4.10) holds as soon as we have $(\varphi_1 - \varphi_2)^2 > 4\frac{\varphi_2^2}{(\varphi_2-1)^2}$ and (4.8) follows easily.

Proof of (2). By (2.17) and (2.18) we have

$$t(s) = U(\varphi_1 s)a_1^s \wedge b_1^s + Z(\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s)a_1^s \wedge b_2^s + Z(\varphi_2 s, \varphi_1 s)a_2^s \wedge b_1^s + U(\varphi_2 s)a_2^s \wedge b_2^s.$$

Then $t(s)$ has rank 4 if and only if $U(\varphi_1 s)U(\varphi_2 s) - Z(\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s)Z(\varphi_2 s, \varphi_1 s) \neq 0$. By (1), this holds true provided that

$$\varphi_2 s > 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_1 s > 2 + \varphi_2 s + \frac{2}{\varphi_2 s - 1},$$

and, since $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$, there is $T > 0$ depending on φ_1 and φ_2 such that both inequalities hold for all $s \geq T$. \square

Corollary 4.7. *If $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$, then, given $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$, there is $T(\gamma) \geq t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma)$ such that for any $s \in]0, t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma)] \cup [T(\gamma), +\infty[$ the equivalent conditions (4.2) and (4.3) are also equivalent to the fact that $(x, t) \in \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2$, where $\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \subset C_4$, the conjectured cut locus, see [RS17]. (The sets Σ_1, Σ_2 are defined in (1.15)).*

Proof. Just put Remark 4.5 and Lemma 4.6 together. \square

Remark 4.8. We conjecture that inequality $U_1 U_2 - Z_{12} Z_{21} > 0$ holds for all $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$. The inequality implies that the matrix t in (4.4) has full rank. As a consequence, Corollary 4.7, holds for all $s \in]0, +\infty[$. See also the discussion in Conjecture 2.14.

Remark 4.9. Next we briefly show that the inequality $U_1 U_2 - Z_{12} Z_{21} > 0$ mentioned above holds for points close to the origin. By elementary trigonometry it is easy to check that

$$yZ(x, y) = \frac{1}{4} (T(x - y) - T(x + y)) = xZ(y, x). \quad (4.11)$$

We also have $U(x) = \frac{x - \sin x \cos x}{4x^2} = \frac{1 - T(2x)}{4x}$. Then,

$$U(x)U(y) - Z(x, y)Z(y, x) = \frac{(1 - T(2x))(1 - T(2y)) - (T(x + y) - T(x - y))^2}{16x^2 y^2}.$$

Let us check the behaviour of this function as $(x, y) \rightarrow (0, 0)$. By the standard Taylor's expansions of \sin at the origin, we have $T(x) = \frac{\sin x}{x} = 1 - \frac{x^2}{3!} + \frac{x^4}{5!} - \frac{x^6}{7!} + o(x^7)$, where $o(x^7)$ denotes a function such that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{o(x^7)}{x^7} = 0$. Thus,

$$1 - T(2x) = 4x^2 \left(\frac{1}{3!} - \frac{(2x)^2}{5!} + \frac{(2x)^4}{7!} + o(x^5) \right) \quad \text{and}$$

$$1 - T(2y) = 4y^2 \left(\frac{1}{3!} - \frac{(2y)^2}{5!} + \frac{(2y)^4}{7!} + o(y^5) \right).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
& T(x+y) - T(x-y) \\
&= -\frac{(x+y)^2 - (x-y)^2}{3!} + \frac{(x+y)^4 - (x-y)^4}{5!} - \frac{(x+y)^2 - (x-y)^2}{7!} + o(|(x,y)|^7) \\
&= -\frac{4xy}{3!} + \frac{8xy(x^2+y^2)}{5!} - \frac{4(xy)(3x^4+10x^2y^2+3y^4)}{7!} + o(|(x,y)|^7) \\
&= 4xy \left(-\frac{1}{3!} + \frac{2(x^2+y^2)}{5!} - \frac{(3x^4+10x^2y^2+3y^4)}{7!} + o(|(x,y)|^5) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& U(x)U(y) - Z(x,y)Z(y,x) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{3!} - \frac{(2x)^2}{5!} + \frac{(2x)^4}{7!} \right) \left(\frac{1}{3!} - \frac{(2y)^2}{5!} + \frac{(2y)^4}{7!} \right) + \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{1}{3!} - \frac{2(x^2+y^2)}{5!} + \frac{(3x^4+10x^2y^2+3y^4)}{7!} \right)^2 + o(|(x,y)|^5) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{3!3!} - \frac{4}{3!5!}(x^2+y^2) + \frac{16}{5!5!}x^2y^2 + \frac{16}{3!7!}(x^4+y^4) \right) + \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{1}{3!3!} - \frac{4(x^2+y^2)}{3!5!} + \frac{4(x^2+y^2)^2}{5!5!} + \frac{2(3x^4+10x^2y^2+3y^4)}{3!7!} \right) + o(|(x,y)|^5) \\
&= \frac{1}{3!5!} \frac{4}{3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7} (x^2 - y^2)^2 + o(|(x,y)|^5).
\end{aligned}$$

The first term is positive, but not uniformly for $0 < y < x$ close to $(0,0)$. In order to make the estimate uniform, we can work for example on the set $\{(x,y) : 0 < y < bx\}$ for some $b < 1$.

Remark 4.10 (Degeneration to the rank-3 case). Let us consider the generic extremal point $(x,t) = (r_1T_1v_1 + r_2t_2v_2, r_1^2U_1u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_1r_2Z_{12}u_1 \wedge v_2 + r_1r_2Z_{21}u_2 \wedge v_1 + r_2^2U_2u_2 \wedge v_2)$. Letting $\varphi_2 = 0$ we have the degenerations $T_2 = T(0) = 1$, $Z_{12} = Z(\varphi_1, 0) = V(\varphi_1) = V_1$, $Z(\varphi_2, \varphi_1)|_{\varphi_2=0} = 0$, $U(\varphi_2) = U(0) = 0$. Therefore, we get the extremal point

$$(x,t) = (r_1T_1v_1 + r_2v_2, r_1^2U_1u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_1r_2V_1u_1 \wedge v_2) = (T_1\beta_1 + \beta_2, \alpha_1 \wedge (U_1\beta_1 + V_1\beta_2)).$$

This is the general form of points in $\text{Lie}(u_1, v_1, v_2) \simeq \mathbb{F}_3$. Compare the function $G(\alpha, \beta, \zeta, \varphi)$ in [MM17, Remark 2.3]. After some calculations, one can see that the matrix (3.10) in the rank-3 case becomes

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\circlearrowleft u_1v_1 & \circlearrowleft u_1v_2 & \circlearrowleft v_1v_2 & \partial/\partial r_1 & \partial/\partial r_2 & \partial/\partial \varphi_1 \\
\pi_{\alpha_1} & -T_1 & -r_2^2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\pi_{\beta_1} & 0 & 0 & -r_2^2 & T_1 & 0 \\
\pi_{\beta_2} & 0 & 0 & r_1^2T_1 & 0 & 1 \\
\pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_1} & 0 & 0 & -r_2^2V_1 & 2U_1 & 0 \\
\pi_{\alpha_1 \wedge \beta_2} & 0 & 0 & r_1^2U_1 & V_1 & V_1 \\
\pi_{\beta_1 \wedge \beta_2} & V_1 & -r_1^2U_1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix} \tag{4.12}$$

which is singular if and only if at least one among the two matrices below is singular

$$N_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -T_1 & -r_2^2 \\ V_1 & -r_1^2 U_1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{or} \quad N_2 := \begin{bmatrix} -r_2^2 & T_1 & 0 & -2V_1 \\ r_1^2 T_1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -r_2^2 V_1 & 2U_1 & 0 & \frac{\cos \varphi_1}{\varphi_1} V_1 \\ r_1^2 U_1 & V_1 & V_1 & V_1' \end{bmatrix}. \quad (4.13)$$

Note that the requirement $\det N_1 = 0$ becomes $\frac{r_2^2}{r_1^2} = -\frac{T_1 U_1}{V_1} = Q(\varphi_1)$, where $Q(\varphi_1)$ is the function appearing in [MM17, Theorem 4.1]. In that case, points where $\det N_1 = 0$ are the points of cut locus. Points where $\det N_2 = 0$ are conjugate points which likely may not belong to the cut locus. The same splitting of the critical set appears in [Mya02, equation (12)]. Zeros of the factor $e_1(\tau) \cos^2 \varphi + e_2(\tau)$ correspond to zeros of $\det N_1$ and detect cut points. Zeros of the factor $e_3(\tau) \cos^2 \varphi + e_4(\tau)$ correspond to zeros of $\det N_2$. Note that variables of [Mya02] are completely different from ours and the comparison requires some work, which we omit here.

5. UPPER AND FINITENESS ESTIMATES OF THE CUT TIME

In this section we discuss some upper estimates of the cut time of a given non rectilinear extremal. Concerning φ_1 and φ_2 with $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$, we must distinguish the rationally dependent case from the rationally independent one, which requires more work. In the present section, given the extremal $u(s) = \sum_{k=1}^2 a_k \cos(2\varphi_k s) + b_k \sin(2\varphi_k s)$, let us write $\gamma(s)$ by formula (2.18). Define for all s the orthonormal vectors $u_k^s := \frac{a_k^s}{sr_k}$ and $v_k^s = \frac{b_k^s}{sr_k}$, where we refer to (2.17). Under this notation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x(s, a, b, \varphi) &= sr_1 T(\varphi_1 s) v_1^s + sr_2 T(\varphi_2 s) v_2^s \\ t(s, a, b, \varphi) &= s^2 \left(r_1^2 U(\varphi_1 s) u_1^s \wedge v_1^s + r_1 r_2 Z(\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s) u_1^s \wedge v_2^s \right. \\ &\quad \left. + r_1 r_2 Z(\varphi_2 s, \varphi_1 s) u_2^s \wedge v_1^s + r_2^2 U(\varphi_2 s) u_2^s \wedge v_2^s \right). \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

In the rationally dependent case, we have the following easy result, essentially due to Brockett.

Proposition 5.1 (Extremals with rationally dependent parameters φ_1 and φ_2). *The following statements hold true.*

- (1) *Given $(0, t) = (0, t_1 x_1 \wedge y_1 + t_2 x_2 \wedge y_2)$ with $t_1 \geq t_2 > 0$ and x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2 orthonormal family in \mathbb{R}^4 , then all minimizers reaching $(0, t)$ have the form $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ with $\varphi_2 = 2\varphi_1$ or $\varphi_1 = 2\varphi_2$. Moreover, for all $t_1 \geq t_2 > 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} d((0, 0), t_1 x_1 \wedge y_1 + t_2 x_2 \wedge y_2) &= \sqrt{4\pi t_1 + 8\pi t_2} \\ &= \sqrt{4\pi \max\{|t_1|, |t_2|\} + 8\pi \min\{|t_1|, |t_2|\}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

- (2) *Let $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$, where φ_1 and φ_2 are rationally dependent. Take $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and consider the extremal $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$, where $r_k = |a_k| = |b_k| > 0$ for $k = 1, 2$. Then:*

- (a) *If $\varphi_1 = 2\varphi_2$ and $r_2^2 \geq \frac{r_1^2}{2}$, then we have $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) = \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2}$ and $\gamma(t_{\text{cut}}) = (0, \frac{\pi}{8\varphi_2^2} a_1 \wedge b_1 + \frac{\pi}{4\varphi_2^2} a_2 \wedge b_2)$.*

- (b) If $\varphi_1 = 2\varphi_2$ and $r_2^2 < \frac{r_1^2}{2}$, then we have $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) \leq \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2}$
(c) If $\frac{\varphi_1}{\varphi_2} = \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} \cap]1, +\infty[\setminus \{2\}$, then assuming that p and q do not have common divisors, we have $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) \leq \frac{\pi q}{\varphi_2} = \bar{s}(\frac{\varphi_1}{\varphi_2}) := \min\{s > 0 : s\varphi_1 = s\varphi_2 = 0 \pmod{\pi}\}$.

In cases (2b) and (2c) the curve γ reaches its cut-time before touching the vertical set $\{0\} \times \Lambda^2 \mathbb{R}^4$.

Proof. Part (1) is essentially contained in [Bro82]. Let us recapitulate the proof. Let $(0, t) = (0, t_1 x_1 \wedge y_1 + t_2 x_2 \wedge y_2)$, where $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2) \in \Sigma$ and without loss of generality we assume that $t_1 \geq t_2 > 0$. By reparametrization invariance, we may search for the shorter among all $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ such that $\gamma(1, a, b, \varphi) = (0, t)$. Length here is $\int_0^1 |u(s)| ds = \sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2}$, with $r_k = |a_k| = |b_k|$. This gives

$$\begin{cases} r_1 T_1 v_1 + r_2 T_2 v_2 = 0 \\ r_1^2 U_1 u_1 \wedge v_1 + r_1 r_2 Z_{12} u_1 \wedge v_2 + r_1 r_2 Z_{21} u_2 \wedge v_1 + U_2 u_2 \wedge v_2 = t_1 x_1 \wedge y_1 + t_2 x_2 \wedge y_2. \end{cases}$$

The first line implies that $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2 = 0 \pmod{\pi}$, i.e. $\varphi_1 = n_1 \pi$ and $\varphi_2 = n_2 \pi$, where $n_1 > n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, if we consider as usual $\varphi_2 \leq \varphi_1$. We must exclude $n_1 = n_2$ because $\text{rank}(t) = 4$. By properties of the functions U and Z we obtain

$$\frac{r_1^2}{4n_1 \pi} u_1 \wedge v_1 + \frac{r_2^2}{4n_2 \pi} u_2 \wedge v_2 = t_1 x_1 \wedge y_1 + t_2 x_2 \wedge y_2. \quad (5.3)$$

We have then to minimize $\sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2}$ under the constraint given by equality (5.3). We are working with $n_1 > n_2$. It is easy to see that the optimal choice is given by $n_1 = 2, n_2 = 1$, $u_1 \wedge v_1 = x_2 \wedge y_2$ and $u_2 \wedge v_2 = x_1 \wedge y_1$. As a consequence $r_1^2 = 8\pi t_2$ and $r_2^2 = 4\pi t_1$ and formula (5.2) follows. The proof of (1) is complete. Note that, since $t_1 \geq t_2$, we have $\frac{r_1^2}{2} \leq r_2^2$.

Next we prove (2a). Let $\varphi_1 = 2\varphi_2$ and calculate by (5.1) the point $\gamma(\bar{s}, a, b, 2\varphi_2, \varphi_2)$ letting $\bar{s} = \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma\left(\frac{\pi}{\varphi_2}, a, b, 2\varphi_2, \varphi_2\right) &= \left(0, \frac{\pi^2}{\varphi_2^2} \left(\frac{r_1^2}{8\pi} u_1^{\bar{s}} \wedge v_1^{\bar{s}} + \frac{r_2^2}{4\pi} u_2^{\bar{s}} \wedge v_2^{\bar{s}}\right)\right) \\ &= \left(0, \frac{\pi r_1^2}{8\varphi_2^2} u_1^{\bar{s}} \wedge v_1^{\bar{s}} + \frac{\pi r_2^2}{4\varphi_2^2} u_2^{\bar{s}} \wedge v_2^{\bar{s}}\right) \\ &= \left(0, \frac{\pi}{8\varphi_2^2} a_1 \wedge b_1 + \frac{\pi}{4\varphi_2^2} a_2 \wedge b_2\right), \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

by identity $r_k^2 u_k^s \wedge v_k^s = a_k \wedge b_k$ for all $s > 0$. Since $r_2^2 \geq \frac{r_1^2}{2}$, (5.2) gives that the distance of such point from the origin is $\sqrt{4\pi \frac{\pi r_2^2}{4\varphi_2^2} + 8\pi \frac{\pi r_1^2}{8\varphi_2^2}} = \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2} \sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2}$. This agrees with $\text{length}(\gamma|_{[0, \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2}]}) = \int_0^{\pi/\varphi_2} \sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2} ds$. Then γ minimizes on $[0, \pi/\varphi_2]$ and we conclude that $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) = \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2}$.

We pass to the proof of (2b). We get (5.4), as in the previous case. However, here we have $r_2^2 < \frac{r_1^2}{2}$. Thus (5.2) gives that the distance is

$$\sqrt{4\pi \frac{\pi r_1^2}{8\varphi_2^2} + 8\pi \frac{\pi r_2^2}{4\varphi_2^2}} = \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2} \sqrt{\frac{r_1^2}{2} + 2r_2^2} \leq \frac{\pi}{\varphi_2} \sqrt{r_1^2 + r_2^2} = \text{length}(\gamma|_{[0, \pi/\varphi_2]}).$$

Thus γ is not a minimizer on $[0, \pi/\varphi_2]$.

Finally we show (2c). Let $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \frac{p}{q}\varphi_2, \varphi_2)$, where $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p > q$, $p \neq 2q$ and assume p, q do not have common divisors. By (5.1) we have

$$x(s) := x\left(s, a, b, \frac{p}{q}\varphi_2, \varphi_2\right) = sr_1 T\left(\frac{p}{q}\varphi_2 s\right) v_1^s + sr_2 T(\varphi_2 s) v_2^s.$$

The smallest $s > 0$ such that $x(s) = 0$ is $s = \frac{q\pi}{\varphi_2}$. We also have $x(s) = 0$ for all $s = k\frac{q\pi}{\varphi_2}$ with $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, by part (1) of the theorem, γ does not minimize length on $[0, \frac{q\pi}{\varphi_2}]$. Then, we have the upper estimate $t_{\text{cut}} \leq \frac{q\pi}{\varphi_2}$. \square

Let us pass to the analysis of extremal controls with rationally independent φ_1 and φ_2 .

Theorem 5.2. *Let $u(s) = \sum_{k=1}^2 a_k \cos(2\varphi_k s) + b_k \sin(2\varphi_k s)$ be an admissible control. Assume also that $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $\frac{\varphi_1}{\varphi_2} > 1$ is irrational. Consider the corresponding trajectory $\gamma(s, a, b, \varphi)$. Then there is a sequence $s_j \rightarrow +\infty$ such that $\gamma(s_j) \in \Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \subset C_4$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, see formula (1.15).*

As a trivial consequence we have the following corollary.

Corollary 5.3. *Under the hypotheses of Theorem 5.2, we have $t_{\text{cut}}(\gamma) < \infty$.*

Proof. The statement in the nongeneric case is known from [Mya02, MM17]. Consider a generic extremal $\gamma = \gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$. Observe that such γ is strictly normal. Then, by [ABB20, Theorem 8.52], the cut-time is smaller or equal to the first conjugate time. Therefore, the Corollary follows from Proposition 5.1 and Theorem 5.2. \square

In order to proof Theorem 5.2, we need to write the equivalent conditions (4.2) or (4.3) of Theorem 4.3 at any time $s > 0$. In the statement we use the functions A and B defined in (4.6).

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ be an extremal with $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$. Then, the corresponding extremal $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ satisfies the equivalent conditions (4.2) or (4.3) at time $s > 0$ if and only if*

$$\begin{aligned} D(s, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) := & A(\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s) r_1^4 + \{B(\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s) - B(\varphi_2 s, \varphi_1 s)\} r_1^2 r_2^2 \\ & - A(\varphi_2 s, \varphi_1 s) r_2^4 = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.5)$$

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Starting from (5.1), it is then easy to see that the equivalent conditions (4.2) and (4.3) hold if and only if (5.5) holds. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Let $\gamma(\cdot, a, b, \varphi)$ be an extremal control. If γ is not a line, and $\gamma(\mathbb{R})$ is contained in a strict Carnot subgroup, then the proof is contained in [MM17] and [Mya02].

If $\gamma(\mathbb{R}, a, b, \varphi)$ is not contained in any subgroup, then we are in the generic case $r_1, r_2 > 0$ and $0 < \varphi_2 < \varphi_1$. We consider the case φ_1 and φ_2 rationally independent (otherwise the result is contained in Proposition 5.1). By Lemma 4.6 and Lemma 5.4, we must prove that there is a sequence $s_j \rightarrow +\infty$ such that $D(r, \varphi, s_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall that $A(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = T_1 U_1 (T_1 Z_{12} - T_2 U_1)$ and $B(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) = T_2 Z_{12} (T_1 Z_{12} - T_2 U_1)$. Denote $(x, y) := (\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s)$ below. Denote also as $P_d(x, y)$ a homogeneous polynomial of degree d in (x, y) and write $h(x, y)$ for a function bounded in x, y .

$$\begin{aligned} A(x, y) &= \frac{\sin x}{x} \left(\frac{x - \sin x \cos x}{4x^2} \right) \left[\frac{\sin x}{x} \cdot \frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{2y(x^2 - y^2)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\sin y}{y} \left(\frac{x - \sin x \cos x}{4x^2} \right) \right] \\ &= \left(\frac{\sin x}{4x^2} - \frac{\sin^2 x \cos x}{4x^3} \right) \left[-\frac{\sin y}{4xy} + \frac{\sin x \cos x \sin y}{4x^2 y} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\sin x}{x} \left(\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{2y(x^2 - y^2)} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Organizing terms in $A(x, y)$ by the homogeneity degree of the denominators we get

$$A(x, y) = -\frac{\sin x \sin y}{16x^3 y} + \frac{\sin^2 x \cos x \sin y}{8x^4 y} + \frac{\sin^2 x}{4x^3} \left[\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{2y(x^2 - y^2)} \right] + \frac{h(x, y)}{P_6(x, y)}.$$

Let us look at B .

$$\begin{aligned} B(x, y) &= \frac{\sin y}{y} \left(\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{2y(x^2 - y^2)} \right) \cdot \left[\frac{\sin x}{x} \left(\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{2y(x^2 - y^2)} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{\sin y}{y} \left(\frac{x - \sin x \cos x}{4x^2} \right) \right] \\ &= -\frac{\sin^2 y}{8xy^3} \left(\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{x^2 - y^2} \right) + \frac{h(x, y)}{P_6(x, y)}, \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$B(x, y) - B(y, x) = \left(\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{x^2 - y^2} \right) \left[\frac{\sin^2 x}{8x^3 y} - \frac{\sin^2 y}{8xy^3} \right] + \frac{h(x, y)}{P_6(x, y)}.$$

Let us try first to keep only terms of homogeneity -4 .

$$\begin{aligned} D(s, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) &= A(x, y)r_1^4 + \{B(x, y) - B(y, x)\}r_1^2 r_2^2 - A(y, x)r_2^2 \\ &= \frac{\sin x \sin y}{16xy} \left[\frac{r_2^4}{y^2} - \frac{r_1^4}{x^2} \right] + \frac{h(x, y, r_1, r_2)}{P_5(x, y)} + \frac{h(x, y, r_1, r_2)}{P_6(x, y)} \\ &= \frac{1}{s^4} \frac{\sin(\varphi_1 s) \sin(\varphi_2 s)}{16\varphi_1 \varphi_2} \left[\frac{r_2^4}{\varphi_2^2} - \frac{r_1^4}{\varphi_1^2} \right] + \frac{h(s)}{s^5 P_5(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)} + \frac{h(s)}{s^6 P_6(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where h depends also on $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, r_1, r_2)$ and is bounded globally. At this point, if $\frac{r_2^4}{\varphi_2^2} - \frac{r_1^4}{\varphi_1^2} \neq 0$, we claim that there are sequences s_n^+ and $s_n^- \rightarrow +\infty$ such that $D(s_n^-, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) < 0 <$

$D(s_n^+, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This will imply that there is a sequence $s_n \rightarrow +\infty$ of zeros of D . To see that, since φ_1 and φ_2 are rationally independent, letting $\sigma := \varphi_2 s$, we get $\sin(\varphi_2 s) \sin(\varphi_1 s) = \sin \sigma \sin(\alpha \sigma)$, where $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$. Take $\sigma_n = \frac{\pi}{2} + 2\pi n$, so that $\sin \sigma_n = 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, since $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$, the sequence $\sin(\alpha \sigma_n) = \sin\left(2\pi \alpha n + \frac{\alpha \pi}{2}\right)$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is dense in $[-1, 1]$ (by standard properties of irrational flows on torus, see [Jos05, p. 26]). Therefore, taking a subsequence σ_n^+ such that $\sin(\alpha \sigma_n^+) \rightarrow 1$, we have $\sin(\sigma_n^+) \sin(\alpha \sigma_n^+) \rightarrow 1$, a strictly positive bound. An analogous argument gives us a sequence σ_n^- such that $\sin(\sigma_n^-) \sin(\alpha \sigma_n^-) \rightarrow -1$ and the claim is proved.

Let us pass now to case $\frac{r_2^4}{\varphi_2^4} - \frac{r_1^4}{\varphi_1^4} = 0$. We must take into account the term $\frac{h(x, y)}{P_5(x, y)}$ appearing in (5.6). Using the expansions of A and B obtained above, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & A(x, y)r_1^4 + \{B(x, y) - B(y, x)\}r_1^2r_2^2 - A(y, x)r_2^4 \\ &= \left\{ \frac{\sin^2 x \cos x \sin y}{8x^4y} + \frac{\sin^2 x}{8x^3y} \left(\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{x^2 - y^2} \right) \right\} r_1^4 \\ &+ \left\{ \frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{x^2 - y^2} \right\} \left[\frac{\sin^2 x}{8x^3y} - \frac{\sin^2 y}{8xy^3} \right] r_1^2r_2^2 \\ &- \left\{ \frac{\sin x \sin^2 y \cos y}{8xy^4} + \frac{\sin^2 y}{8xy^3} \left(\frac{y \cos y \sin x - x \cos x \sin y}{x^2 - y^2} \right) \right\} r_2^4 + \frac{h(x, y, r_1, r_2)}{P_6(x, y)}. \end{aligned}$$

Passing to $(x, y) = (\varphi_1 s, \varphi_2 s)$ and writing $\varphi_k^s := s\varphi_k$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} & D(s, \varphi_1, \varphi_2, r_1, r_2) \\ &= \left\{ \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_1^s \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_1^4 \varphi_2 s^5} + \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_1^s}{8\varphi_1^3 \varphi_2 s^4} \left(\frac{\varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2^s \sin \varphi_1^s - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{s(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)} \right) \right\} r_1^4 \\ &+ \left(\frac{\varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2^s \sin \varphi_1^s - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{s(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)} \right) \left[\frac{\sin^2 \varphi_1^s}{8\varphi_1^3 \varphi_2 s^4} - \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_1 \varphi_2^3 s^4} \right] r_1^2 r_2^2 \\ &- \left\{ \frac{\sin \varphi_1^s \sin^2 \varphi_2^s \cos \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_1 \varphi_2^4 s^5} + \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_1 \varphi_2^3 s^4} \left(\frac{\varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2^s \sin \varphi_1^s - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{s(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)} \right) \right\} r_2^4 + \frac{h(s, \varphi, r)}{s^6 P_6(\varphi, r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiply by $\frac{\varphi_1^2}{r_1^4}$ and eliminate r_2 by $r_2^2 = \frac{\varphi_2}{\varphi_1} r_1^2$.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\varphi_1^2}{r_1^4} D(s, \varphi_1, \varphi_2, r_1, r_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{s^5} \left\{ \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_1^s \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_1^2 \varphi_2} + \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_1^s}{8\varphi_1 \varphi_2} \left(\frac{\varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2^s \sin \varphi_1^s - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2} \right) \right\} \\ &+ \left(\frac{\varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2^s \sin \varphi_1^s - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2} \right) \left[\frac{\sin^2 \varphi_1^s}{8\varphi_1^2} - \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_2^2} \right] \\ &- \left\{ \frac{\sin \varphi_1^s \sin^2 \varphi_2^s \cos \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_1 \varphi_2^2} - \frac{\sin^2 \varphi_2^s}{8\varphi_1 \varphi_2} \left(\frac{\varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2^s \sin \varphi_1^s - \varphi_1 \cos \varphi_1^s \sin \varphi_2^s}{\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2} \right) \right\} + \frac{h(s, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)}{s^6 P_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Take now the sequence $s_n = \frac{n\pi}{\varphi_2}$, so that $\sin(\varphi_2 s_n) = 0$ and we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\varphi_1^2}{r_1^4} D(s_n, r_1, r_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \\ &= \frac{1}{s_n^5} \cdot \frac{\varphi_2}{8\varphi_1(\varphi_1^2 - \varphi_2^2)} \left(\frac{1}{\varphi_2} + \frac{1}{\varphi_1} \right) \cos(\varphi_2 s_n) \sin^3(\varphi_1 s_n) + \frac{h(s_n, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)}{s_n^6 P_4(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we are assuming $\varphi_1 > \varphi_2$, it turns out that the sign of D , for large n is the same of

$$\sin^3(\varphi_1 s_n) \cos(\varphi_2 s_n) = (-1)^n \sin^3\left(\frac{\varphi_1}{\varphi_2} n\pi\right).$$

We must find two subsequences, one converging to a positive limit and the other to a negative one. Since φ_1 and φ_2 are rationally independent, we use again the standard fact that for all $\alpha \notin \mathbb{Q}$ we have $\liminf_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sin(\alpha n\pi) = -1$ and $\limsup_n \sin(\alpha n\pi) = +1$ (see again [Jos05]). The proof is easily concluded. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are supported by PRIN 2022 F4F2LH - CUP J53D23003760006 “Regularity problems in sub-Riemannian structures”.

The authors are also members of the *Gruppo Nazionale per l'Analisi Matematica, la Probabilità e le loro Applicazioni* (GNAMPA) of the *Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica* (INdAM).

REFERENCES

- [ABB20] Andrei Agrachev, Davide Barilari, and Ugo Boscain, *A comprehensive introduction to sub-Riemannian geometry*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 181, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2020.
- [AM16] Christian Autenried and Mauricio Godoy Molina, *The sub-Riemannian cut locus of H-type groups*, Math. Nachr. **289** (2016), no. 1, 4–12.
- [AS15] A. A. Ardentov and Yu. L. Sachkov, *Cut time in sub-Riemannian problem on Engel group*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **21** (2015), no. 4, 958–988.
- [BBG12] Davide Barilari, Ugo Boscain, and Jean-Paul Gauthier, *On 2-step, corank 2, nilpotent sub-Riemannian metrics*, SIAM J. Control Optim. **50** (2012), no. 1, 559–582.
- [BBN19] Davide Barilari, Ugo Boscain, and Robert W. Neel, *Heat kernel asymptotics on sub-Riemannian manifolds with symmetries and applications to the bi-Heisenberg group*, Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) **28** (2019), no. 4, 707–732. MR 4045424
- [BLU07] A. Bonfiglioli, E. Lanconelli, and F. Uguzzoni, *Stratified Lie groups and potential theory for their sub-Laplacians*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, Berlin, 2007.
- [Bro82] R. W. Brockett, *Control theory and singular Riemannian geometry*, New directions in applied mathematics (Cleveland, Ohio, 1980), Springer, New York-Berlin, 1982, pp. 11–27.
- [Jos05] Jürgen Jost, *Dynamical systems*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2005, Examples of complex behaviour.
- [LDLMV13] Enrico Le Donne, Gian Paolo Leonardi, Roberto Monti, and Davide Vittone, *Extremal curves in nilpotent Lie groups*, Geom. Funct. Anal. **23** (2013), no. 4, 1371–1401.
- [Li21] Hong-Quan Li, *The Carnot-Carathéodory distance on 2-step groups*, arXiv 2112.07822, 2021.
- [LZ21] Hong-Quan Li and Ye Zhang, *Sub-Riemannian geometry on some step-two Carnot groups*, arXiv 2102.09860, 2021.

- [MM17] Annamaria Montanari and Daniele Morbidelli, *On the subRiemannian cut locus in a model of free two-step Carnot group*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **56** (2017), no. 2, Paper No. 36, 26.
- [MM24] ———, *Sub-Riemannian cut time and cut locus in Reiter-Heisenberg groups*, ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var. **30** (2024), Paper No. 72, 24.
- [MPAM06] F. Monroy-Pérez and A. Anzaldo-Meneses, *The step-2 nilpotent $(n, n(n+1)/2)$ sub-Riemannian geometry*, J. Dyn. Control Syst. **12** (2006), no. 2, 185–216.
- [Mya02] O. Myasnichenko, *Nilpotent $(3, 6)$ sub-Riemannian problem*, J. Dynam. Control Systems **8** (2002), no. 4, 573–597.
- [RS17] L. Rizzi and U. Serres, *On the cut locus of free, step two Carnot groups*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **145** (2017), no. 12, 5341–5357.
- [Sac22] Yu. L. Sachkov, *Left-invariant optimal control problems on Lie groups: classification and problems integrable by elementary functions*, Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **77** (2022), no. 1(463), 109–176. MR 4461360

(Montanari) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, ALMA MATER STUDIORUM UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA, ITALY. *Email:* annamaria.montanari@unibo.it

(Morbidelli) DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, ALMA MATER STUDIORUM UNIVERSITÀ DI BOLOGNA, ITALY. *Email:* daniele.morbidelli@unibo.it