Symmetry of relative equilibria with one dominant and four infinitesimal point vortices

Alanna Hoyer-Leitzel^{*} and Sophie (Phuong) Le^{**}

*Mathematics and Statistics Department, Mount Holyoke College **Department of Mathematics, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign

July 5, 2021

Abstract

We investigate the symmetry of point vortices with one dominant vortex and four vortices with infinitesimal circulations in the (1+4)-vortex problem, a subcase of the five-vortex problem. The four infinitesimal vortices inscribe quadrilaterals in the unit circle with the dominant vortex at the origin. We consider symmetric configurations which have one degree of spacial freedom, namely the (1+N)-gon, kites, rectangles, and trapezoids with three equal sides. We show there is only one possible rectangular configuration (up to rotation and ordering of the vortices) and one possible trapezoid with three equal sides (up to rotation and ordering), while there are parametrically defined families of kites. Additionally we consider the (1+4)-gon and show that the infinitesimal vortices must have equal circulations on opposite corners of the square. The proofs are heavily dependent on techniques from algebraic geometry and require the use of a computer to calculate Gröbner bases.

Keywords. n-vortex problem, relative equilibria, symmetry, Gröbner basis

1 Introduction

The Hamiltonian *n*-vortex problem is a historical problem, first posed by Kirchhoff [15]. However, the study of configurations of the vortices has modern applications, and we can find examples of vortex configurations similar to those given by relative equilibria in the *n*-vortex problem, both in nature and experimentally. For example, Hurricane Isabel in 2003 was documented to have six distinct mesovortices making up the eye of the hurricane: one in the center and five symmetrically located around the center [16], much like the (1 + 5)-gon configuration in the *n*-vortex problem. Sheets of water created in low gravitational environments form vortices that also mimic rhombus and pentagon shaped relative equilibria [23]. In another experiment of fluids in a rotating tank designed to mimic vortices on giant plants, we see one large vortex surrounded by smaller vortices created by sheer instability, creating vortex configurations like those given by the (1 + N)-vortex problem [26]. While all relative equilibria in the *n*-vortex problem are unstable because of the overwhelming degeneracy from symmetry in the problem, some have a small subspace of linear stability. This means that these configurations will never last a long time naturally, but those that have some linear stability may be observed briefly. This paper takes a tiny step at examining what configurations of relative equilibria that might be observed naturally or in fluid dynamics experiments.

Relative equilibria of Hamiltonian *n*-point problems are periodic self-similar solutions that rotate around their center of mass, vorticity, or the appropriate equivalent quantity. In a rotating coordinate system, these solutions correspond to an *n*-torus of degenerate fixed points in the phase space. Modern conceptions of the problem of relative equilibria with a dominant mass were first formulated by Hall [12] and Moeckel [20]. Of particular note is the definition of relative equilibria of the (1+N)-body problem with one large and N infinitesimal masses as a limit of relative equilibria with one large and N small but positive masses.

In this same vein, Barry et al [3] and Barry and Hoyer-Leitzel [4], define relative equilibria of the (1 + N)-vortex problem as the limiting case of relative equilibria with one large and Nsmall vortices of any circulation, as the small vortices become infinitesimal. These papers derive a sort of potential function $V(\theta)$ whose critical points correspond to positions of vortices in relative equilibria of the limiting problem, and whose Hessian gives the linear stability of relative equilibria when continued back from the limit. These results are summarized in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 in this paper. These theorems assume that in the limit, vortices are bounded away from each other. Loosening these assumptions would make for interesting future work.

The focus of this paper is to classify the symmetric configurations of relative equilibria of the (1 + N)-vortex problem when N = 4. This corresponds to an examination of the symmetry of critical points of $V(\theta)$. In the limit, the large vortex moves to the origin, and the infinitesimal vortices move to the unit circle. The symmetry of the configurations is dependent on the symmetry of points positioned around the unit circle, inscribing a convex quadrilateral within the unit circle. We consider symmetric quadrilaterals that have only one degree of freedom, after accounting for rotational symmetry around the unit circle. These quadrilaterals are squares (a 4-gon), kites, rectangles, and trapezoids with three equal sides. Section 1.2 defines configurations in detail.

The (1 + 4)-vortex problem is a subcase of the five-vortex problem, and the categorization of the positions of four bodies or four vortices in relative equilibria is well developed and the types of symmetry are related to those used in this paper. In the *n*-body problem, relative equilibria fall within a larger group of configurations called central configurations, and for four bodies, these are classified as concave or convex, with the set of convex configurations further classified by different symmetric or asymmetric quadrilaterals [1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 11, 25].

Certain cases share the exact definitions or similar results to those in this paper. In [9], Cors and Roberts classify co-circurlar symmetric central configurations where all four bodies lie on the same circle. They find the only symmetric co-circular configurations are kites and isosceles trapezoids (a general case containing rectangles and trapezoids with three equal sides). Removing the assumption of co-circular, both Long and Sun in [18] and Perez-Chavela and Santoprete in [22] find that there are symmetric configurations with two equal pairs of masses on opposite vertices of a rhombus, similar to the result in Theorem 2.1 in this paper. In comparison, relative equilibria in the four vortex problem with two equal pairs of vortices are throughly classified in [14] by Hampton, Roberts, and Santoprete. Again the positions of equal pairs in rhombus and kite configurations are similar to results in Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 3.1.

Results for five-point problems are equally interesting. In [13], Hampton shows finiteness of the number of kite configurations in the five-body and and five-vortex problems, and in [24], Roberts finds a continuum of central configurations in the five-body problem that continue across potential functions to the five-vortex problem. In [17] Lee and Santoprete calculate all possible planar central

configurations for five equal masses. For the five-vortex problem, Oliveira and Vidal [21] calculate the linear stability of the rhombus with the central vortex relative equilibrium, where the rhombus is made of two pairs of equal vortices at opposite corners. In contrast, Marchesin and Vidal examine the restricted five-body problem with two equal pairs of vortices in a rhombus and one infinitesimal vortex [19]. This case is different than the one presented in this paper in that no limit is needed in defining the relative equilibria in the restricted problem.

Because, in the limiting case considered in this paper, the infinitesimal vortices lie on the unit circle with the dominant vortex at the origin, the (1 + N)-vortex problem is subset of vortex ring problems where vortices are arranged in a regular N-sided polygon with or without a vortex in the center. Cabral and Schmidt [5] define and look at the (N + 1)-vortex ring with N equal vortices with circulation $\Gamma = 1$ in a polygon and one central vortex with circulation κ . They find that the (4+1)-gon is stable when the central vortex has circulation $\kappa \in (-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{9}{4})$. On the other hand, Barry et al [3] consider the (1 + N)-gon with N infinitesimal vortices with the same circulation, which is linearly unstable regardless of the sign of the small vortices on opposite corners, and is always linearly unstable.

Also of note, in many of these papers ([3, 5, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22]), the circulations or masses of the point objects are assumed to be in a some fixed ratio such that the set of parameters can be given by a one-dimensional set. In this paper and in [4], we give noteworthy examples of vortex configurations with a two-parameter family of circulations.

The remainder of the introduction summarizes the necessary definitions and theorems about relative equilibria in the (1 + N)-vortex problem, defines the different types of symmetric configurations, and gives a brief background of the techniques from algebraic geometry used to prove the results in this paper. The following sections consider the four types of symmetric configurations: the (1 + 4)-gon, kites, rectangles, and trapezoids with three equal sides. Assuming the type of symmetry given, the necessary ratios of the circulation parameters for the infinitesimal vortices are proved, and any restrictions on the positions of the vortices around the unit circle are given.

1.1 Relative Equilibria of the (1 + N)-Vortex Problem

The classical *n*-vortex problem is a point vortex differential equations model for *n* well-separated vortices in a two-dimensional fluid. Let $q_i = (x_i, y_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ be the position of the *i*th vortex and let Γ_i be the circulation of the *i*th vortex.. The equations of motion for the *n* vortices are a Hamiltonian system with Hamiltonian $H(q) = -\sum_{i < j} \Gamma_i \Gamma_j \log |q_i - q_j|$ so that

$$\Gamma_i \dot{q}_i = J \nabla_i H(q) \quad \text{with} \quad J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$
(1)

and where ∇_i is the two-dimensional partial gradient with respect to q_i . A relative equilibrium is a solution $q_i(t) = e^{-\omega Jt}q_i(0), i = 1, ..., n$ to which rotates around the center of vorticity at the origin with angular velocity ω . We will assume $\omega = 1$.

We consider the case of one dominant and N smaller vortices. Let $\Gamma_0 = 1$ be the circulation of one strong vortex and let $\Gamma_i = \epsilon \mu_i$, $\mu_i \neq 0$ for i = 1, ..., N be the circulations of N smaller vortices. This is sometimes referred to as the (N + 1)-vortex problem, and we use this convention here. Given a sequence of relative equilibria to the (N + 1)-vortex problem, parameterized as $\epsilon \to 0$, the limiting case is called a relative equilibria of the (1 + N)-vortex problem. We consider only relative equilibria of the (1 + N)-vortex problem where the vortices are bounded away from each other and do not collide in the limit.

Note that this is different than the restricted problem where the circulations of the infinitesimal vortices is set to zero and so that the infinitesimal vortices are passive under the influence of the strong vortex. By considering the limiting case, we preserve the potency of the interactions between the weaker vortices while taking the limit. For a detailed discussion of relative equilibria of the (1 + N)-vortex problem and for proofs of the following lemma and theorems, see [3] and [4].

Lemma 1.1 (Lemma 2 in [4]). In the limit as $\epsilon \to 0$, $|q_0| \to 0$ and $|q_i| = 1$ for i = 1, ..., N. In other words, in the limit, the strong vortex is at the origin, and the infinitesimal vortices are on the unit circle.

Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 1 in [4]). Let $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}) = (1, ..., 1, \bar{\theta}_1, ..., \bar{\theta}_N)$ be the positions (in polar coordinates) of the N small vortices in a a relative equilibrium of the (1 + N)-vortex problem. Then $\bar{\theta}$ is a critical point of the function

$$V(\theta) = -\sum_{i < j} \mu_i \mu_j [\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2 - 2\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j))]$$

$$\tag{2}$$

The function V has a few important symmetries. Any rotation of a critical point of V is also a critical point of V. V is an even function so if $\bar{\theta}$ is a critical point of V, then so is $-\bar{\theta}$, corresponding to reflection over the x-axis in the position of vortices around the unit circle. Additionally, if $\bar{\theta}$ is a critical point of V for the parameter set $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4)$, then $\bar{\theta}$ is also a critical point for any scalar multiple of $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4)$.

Because of rotational symmetry, all critical points of V are degenerate, i.e. the Hessian $V_{\theta\theta}$ at the critical point has one zero eigenvalue, corresponding to the eigenvector $v = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix}^T$. However, we can partition the nullspace of $V_{\theta\theta}$ into the span of v and its complement, and define nondegeneracy on the complement.

Definition 1.1. A critical point $\bar{\theta}$ of V is *nondegenerate* provided the Hessian $V_{\theta\theta}(\bar{\theta})$ has only one zero eigenvalue.

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 2 in [4]). Suppose $\bar{\theta} = (\bar{\theta}_1, ..., \bar{\theta}_N)$ is a nondegenerate critical point of V. Then for $\bar{r} = (1, 1, ..., 1)$, the configuration $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta})$ are the positions of the N infinitesimal vortices in a relative equilibrium of the (1 + N)-vortex problem.

The function V works as a sort of potential function for relative equilibria of the (1 + N)-vortex problem, in that the eigenvalues of a *weighted* Hessian correspond to the linear stability of relative equilibria in the full, not limiting, (N + 1)-vortex problem. Let μ be the diagonal matrix with the circulation parameters $\mu_1, \mu_2, ..., \mu_N$ on the diagonal. The stability criteria are given in the next theorem.

Theorem 1.3 (Theorem 3 in [4]). Let $(r^{\varepsilon}, \theta^{\varepsilon})$ be a sequence of relative equilibria of the (N + 1)vortex problem that converges to a relative equilibrium $(\bar{r}, \bar{\theta}) = (1, ..., 1, \bar{\theta}_1, ..., \bar{\theta}_N)$ of the (1 + N)vortex problem as $\varepsilon \to 0$, and let $\bar{\theta}$ be a nondegenerate critical point of V. For ε sufficiently small, $(r^{\varepsilon}, \theta^{\varepsilon})$ is nondegenerate and is linearly stable if and only if $\mu^{-1}V_{\theta\theta}(\bar{\theta})$ has N - 1 positive eigenvalues.



Figure 1: Examples of symmetric relative equilibria in the (1 + 4)-vortex problem

1.2 Symmetry when N = 4

We consider the case of relative equilibria of the (1 + N)-vortex problem when N = 4. As stated in Lemma 1.1, the dominant vortex is at the origin, and the four infinitesimal vortices are positioned around the unit circle. The five vortices together may form a convex or concave configuration, and the overall configuration will be convex when all four infinitesimal vortices lie on one half of the circle. We will focus on the convex quadrilateral inscribed in the unit circle by the four infinitesimal vortices, with the vertices of the quadrilateral as the positions of the vortices.

Symmetry is defined by reflective symmetry of the quadrilateral. There are two cases depending on whether the line of symmetry contains any vortices. A kite has two vortices on an axis of symmetry while the other two vortices are symmetric by reflection over this axis. All other symmetric configurations inscribe isosceles trapezoids and have a line of reflective symmetry containing no vortices. We only consider subcases of isosceles trapezoids with one degree of freedom: rectangles and trapezoids with three equal sides.

At the intersection of the definitions of kites, rectangles, and trapezoids with three equal sides is a square. A regular polygon inscribed in a circle with central vortex is called the (1 + N)-gon configuration. When N = 4, this is, of course, a square.

Let v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 be the four infinitesimal vortices. The position of the vortex is given by the angle around the unit circle, so when the value of θ_i is defined, this means that v_i is at the point $(1, \theta_i)$ in polar coordinates.

In the proofs that follow, we set $\theta_1 = 0$ to reduce the rotational symmetry of the critical points of V. For the (1+4)-gon, assuming the ordering of the vortices around the unit circle counterclockwise is $v_1 < v_2 < v_3 < v_4$, we can assume that $\theta_2 = \pi/2$, $\theta_3 = \pi$, $\theta_4 = 3\pi/2$.

The other configurations are defined with one degree of freedom. For kites, we assume the line of reflection is over the x-axis and fix $\theta_3 = \pi$. Then θ_2 is free and $\theta_4 = -\theta_2$. For rectangles, pairs of vortices are lie on parallel lines, so again with $\theta_1 = 0$, we fix $\theta_3 = \pi$, with θ_2 free and $\theta_4 = \theta_2 + \pi$. For trapezoids with three equal sides, we let θ_2 be free with $\theta_3 = 2\theta_2$, and $\theta_4 = 3\theta_2$.

Figure 1 shows the four types of symmetric configurations considered in this paper.

1.3 Gröbner Bases and Elimination Ideals

We give a brief overview of the techniques from algebraic geometry used in this paper. A *What is* paper by Sturmfels [27] gives a brief and insightful introduction to Gröbner bases. For a deeper look, see the book *Using Algebraic Geometry* by Cox, Little, and O'Shea [10].

At its simplest, a Gröbner basis is a technique for solving a system of polynomial equations. The algorithm involved finds another set of polynomials with the same set of zeros as the original equations. The advantages of a Gröbner basis come in the monomial ordering in the algorithm, naturally ordering the new polynomials from simplest (fewest variables and lowest exponents) to more complicated.

Let k be a field, and let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, ..., p_i\}$ be a set of polynomials in the polynomial ring $k[x_1, ..., x_n]$. Then \mathcal{P} generates an ideal

$$\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle = \{ h_1 p_1 + \dots + h_i p_i \text{ where } p_1, \dots, p_i \in \mathcal{P} \text{ and } h_1, \dots, h_i \in k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \}$$

The set of zeros of \mathcal{P} is the variety of \mathcal{P} and denoted $Var(\mathcal{P})$. The variety of a set of polynomials and the variety of the ideal it generates are the same, $Var(\mathcal{P}) = Var(\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle)$. The set \mathcal{P} is referred to as a basis for the ideal it generates. A Gröbner basis \mathcal{G} of $\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle$ is another basis with specific properties for the same ideal, so that $Var(\mathcal{G}) = Var(\mathcal{P})$.

A Gröbner basis is calculated algorithmically. In this paper, Gröbner bases are implement in Mathematica 12 using the default Gröbner basis algorithm (a Gröbner walk rather than the historical Buchberger's Algorithm). However the calculation is dependent on the choice of ordering of the variables. The ordering must be a total well ordering that preserves multiplication on the variables. In this paper, we use two monomial orderings in Mathematica, the default Lexicographic ordering or the DegreeReverseLexicographic ordering, which is equivalent to the graded reverse lexicographic ordering (grevlex) as defined in [10]. The ordering used in each Gröbner basis calculation is specified throughout the paper.

Additionally the Gröbner basis for an elimination ideal can be used to eliminate variables completely. For an ideal $I \subset k[x_1, ..., x_k, x_{k+1}, ..., x_n]$, an elimination ideal is $I_k = I \cap k[x_{k+1}, ..., x_n]$. This eliminates the first k variables from the ideal. Additionally, if \mathcal{G} is the Gröbner basis for I, then the Gröbner basis for the elimination ideal I_k is $G \cap I_k$. Geometrically, this is equivalent to projecting the variety Var(I) onto $x_{k+1} \cdots x_n$ -space.

Example 1.1. To illustrate the above ideas, we give an overly simple example. Consider the set of polynomials

$$\mathcal{P} = \{x - y - z + 2, x^2 + y^2 - z\}$$

The set of roots of these polynomials are a plane and a paraboloid in \mathbb{R}^3 , respectively. The variety of \mathcal{P} is the intersection of these two surfaces. In Mathematica, the command

GroebnerBasis[P, $\{x,y,z\}$]

gives a Gröbner basis $\{4 - 4y + 2y^2 - 5z + 2yz + z^2, 2 + x - y - z\}$ in the default lexicographic ordering, while

$GroebnerBasis[P, \{x, y, z\}, MonomialOrder \rightarrow DegreeReverseLexicographic]$

gives a Gröbner basis $\{2 + x - y - z, 4 - 4y + 2y^2 - 5z + 2yz + z^2\}$ in grevlex ordering. Finally, we can find the projection of the variety onto the xy-plane by computing the Gröbner basis of the elimination ideal using a grevlex or Degree Reverse Lexicographic ordering. In Mathematica, the command is

GroebnerBasis [P, $\{x, y\}$, z, MonomialOrder \rightarrow EliminationOrder]

which results in the Gröbner basis $\{-2 - x + x^2 + y + y^2\}$.

The surfaces described by the polynomials of \mathcal{P} , the variety $Var(\mathcal{P})$, and the projection of $Var(\mathcal{P})$ are shown in Figure 2.

Often we will want to eliminate trivial or unwanted subsets of a variety. See Example 1.2 where we remove a plane from the variety in order to explicitly identify the rest of the structure. One common trick is to saturate the ideal before a Gröbner basis calculation. Assume the roots of a polynomial g are a subset of $Var(\mathcal{P})$, but we would like find a basis for the ideal with variety $Var(\mathcal{P}) \setminus \{g = 0\}$. We add the polynomial wg + 1 to the set \mathcal{P} and calculate the Gröbner Basis while eliminating the variable w. This eliminates the roots of g from the variety of the saturated ideal.

Example 1.2. Consider the set of polynomials

$$Q = \{x^2 - xy - xz + 2x, x^3 + xy^2 - xz\}$$

This is almost the same set of polynomials as in Example 1.1, but now both polynomials have been multiplied by x, so that the variety of Q consists of the ellipse $Var(\mathcal{P})$ and the plane x = 0. We can essentially remove the trivial root x = 0 by saturating the ideal with the polynomial wx + 1. Define the set $Q' = \{x^2 - xy - xz + 2x, x^3 + xy^2 - xz, wx + 1\}$ and compute the Gröbner basis for the elimination ideal with monomial ordering w > x > y > z and eliminate the variable w. In Mathematica, the command is

GroebnerBasis[Qprime, $\{x, y, z\}$, w, MonomialOrder \rightarrow EliminationOrder]

which results in the Gröbner basis $\{2+x-y-z, 4-4y+2y^2-5z+2yz+z^2\}$, which is the Gröbner basis for \mathcal{P} in grevlex ordering.

Finally, a quick reminder of Descartes Rule of Signs, used for counting roots of polynomials in one variable.

Theorem 1.4 (Descartes Rule of Signs). The number of positive real roots of a polynomial f(x) is the number of sign changes of its coefficient sequence, or is less than it by an even number. The number of negative real roots of a polynomial is the number of sign changes in the coefficient sequence for f(-x), or is less than it by an even number.

1.4 Outline of Proofs

In each of the following sections, a certain type of symmetry is assumed and we derive conditions on the circulation parameters necessary to get that symmetry. Each proof uses Mathematica for algebraic simplification, converting the gradient $\nabla V(\theta)$ into an equivalent system of polynomials and then computing a Gröbner basis.¹ The process in Mathematica is the following

¹The authors can share the Mathematica notebooks for the work in this paper upon request.



Figure 2: Pictured are the surfaces in \mathcal{P} for Example 1.1, the variety $Var(\mathcal{P})$ and its projection onto the xy-plane, i.e. the variety of the elimination ideal which eliminates the variable z.

1. We start by calculating ∇V and dividing each function by the common factor μ_i .

$$\mu^{-1}\nabla V = (V_{\theta_1}, V_{\theta_2}, V_{\theta_3}, V_{\theta_4})$$
(3)

$$V_{\theta_i} = \sum_{j \neq i} \mu_j \left(-\sin(\theta_i - \theta_j) + \frac{\sin(\theta_i - \theta_j)}{2 - 2\cos(\theta_i - \theta_j)} \right)$$
(4)

Note 1: We will be using a slight abuse of notation where $V_{\theta_i} = \frac{1}{\mu_i} \frac{\partial V}{\partial \theta_i}$.

Note 2: The equations of $\mu^{-1}\nabla V$ are linearly dependent: $\mu_1 V_{\theta_1} + \mu_2 V_{\theta_2} + \mu_3 V_{\theta_3} + \mu_4 V_{\theta_4} = 0$. Thus we need only find solutions to the system

$$V_{\theta_2} = 0, \quad V_{\theta_3} = 0, \quad V_{\theta_4} = 0$$
 (5)

- 2. Next, the symmetry assumptions are substituted into the equations V_{θ_i} . We set $\theta_1 = 0$ to reduce by rotational symmetry in V. In each case, the only angular variable left in the equations is θ_2 .
- 3. The fractions of each function of V_{θ_i} are given a common denominator using the Together command. Since we are looking for solutions to $\mu^{-1}\nabla V = 0$, we consider only the numerators of these equations using the Numerator command. The resulting equations are referred to as $V_{\theta_i}^{num}$. Note that the denominators of V_{θ_i} are

$$2(-1 + \cos(\theta_1 - \theta_4))(-1 + \cos(\theta_2 - \theta_4))(-1 + \cos(\theta_3 - \theta_4)),$$

the roots of which correspond to collisions of the vortices and can be ignored.

4. The trigonometric terms are expanded using trigonometric identities by the TrigExpand command in Mathematica. These trigonometric identities can introduce some fractions with constant denominators, so we again apply the Together and Numerator commands. The equations are factored again using the Factor command, and any roots corresponding to

collisions are removed. These collision roots are $\sin(\theta_2)$, corresponding to a collision of the second vortex with the first vortex with $\theta_1 = 0$ or with the third vortex in the cases when we assume $\theta_3 = \pi$.

5. The trigonometric terms are replaced using the tangent half angle identities

$$\sin(\theta_2) = \frac{2r}{1+r^2} \qquad \cos(\theta_2) = \frac{r^2 - 1}{1+r^2} \tag{6}$$

These identities are such that r = 0 corresponds to $\theta_2 = \pi$, r > 0 corresponds to $\theta_2 \in (0, \pi)$, and r < 0 corresponds to $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, 0)$. Furthermore, these coorespondances are symmetric since r^* corresponds to θ_2^* if and only if $-r^*$ corresponds to $-\theta_2^*$.

- 6. Again the equations are factored using the Factor command and the denominators are discarded using the Numerator command. Factors that correspond to collisions of vortices are removed from the equations. These factors are powers of r (corresponding to $\theta_2 = \theta_3 = \pi$ in the kites and rectangles case), and $-1 + 3r^2$ (corresponding to $\theta_2 = 2\pi/3 \Rightarrow \theta_4 \mod 2\pi = \theta_1 = 0$ in the trapezoids with three equal sides case). At this point we have polynomial equations whose roots correspond to the zeros of $\mu^{-1}\nabla V = 0$. These polynomial equations are referred to as $V_{\theta_i}^{num*}$.
- 7. A Gröbner basis is calculated for the ideal generated by $V_{\theta_i}^{num*}$ or for a saturated ideal generated by $V_{\theta_i}^{num*}$ and other polynomials. The monomial and elimination orderings used are given in each proof.
- 8. Any additional analysis on the Gröbner basis concludes the proof.

2 The 1 + N-gon with N = 4

The infinitesimal vortices in the (1 + 4)-gon inscribe a square in the unit circle.

Theorem 2.1. Assuming $\mu_i \neq 0$, the (1+4)-gon must have two equal pairs of vortices at opposite corners of the square.

Proof. Let $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 = \pi/2$, $\theta_3 = \pi$, and $\theta_4 = 3\pi/2$ so that the vortices are ordered $v_1 < v_2 < v_3 < v_4$ as the corners of a square inscribed in the unit circle. Then v_1 is opposite v_3 and v_2 is opposite v_4 . Substituting these values of θ_i into $V_{\theta_i}^{num}$ gives

$$\frac{1}{2}\{(\mu_4-\mu_2),(\mu_1-\mu_3),(\mu_2-\mu_4),(\mu_3-\mu_1)\}.$$

The zero set of these polynomials gives $\mu_1 = \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_4$. Thus the vortices on opposite corners must have equal circulations. Because of the symmetry of $V(\theta)$, any permutation of v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 will result in vortices on opposite corners having equal circulations.

Theorem 2.2. The (1 + 4)-gon is a nondegenerate critical point of $V(\theta)$ except when the pairs of vortices are in a 3:2 ratio, and are never linearly stable, using the criteria in Theorem 1.3.

Proof. We substitute $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 = \pi/2$, $\theta_3 = \pi$, and $\theta_4 = 3\pi/2$ and $\mu_3 = \mu_1$, $\mu_4 = \mu_2$ into the Hessian $V_{\theta\theta}$, and compute the eigenvalues using Mathematica:

$$\lambda = 0, 2\mu_1\mu_2, \frac{1}{2}(-3\mu_1^2 + 2\mu_1\mu_2), \frac{1}{2}(2\mu_1\mu_2 - 3\mu_2^2)$$

When $\mu_2 = \frac{3}{2}\mu_1$ or $\mu_2 = \frac{2}{3}\mu_1$, there is more than one zero eigenvalue and the critical point is degenerate.

To determine linear stability, we calculate the eigenvalues of the weighted Hessian $\mu^{-1}V_{\theta\theta}$ in Mathematica:

$$\lambda = 0, \frac{1}{2}(2\mu_1 - 3\mu_2), \frac{1}{2}(-3\mu_1 + 2\mu_2), \mu_1 + \mu_2$$

Linear stability criterion in Theorem 1.3 requires N-1 positive eigenvalues of $\mu^{-1}V_{\theta\theta}$. Using Reduce in Mathematica on the equations

$$\frac{1}{2}(2\mu_1 - 3\mu_2) > 0, \quad \frac{1}{2}(-3\mu_1 + 2\mu_2) > 0, \quad \mu_1 + \mu_2 > 0$$

produces a False result. In other words, it is never possible for all three nonzero eigenvalues to be positive, and the (1 + 4)-gon is never linearly stable.

Note that when $\mu_i = 1$ for all *i* or when $\mu_i = -1$ for all *i*, our results coincide with the stability results of the (1 + N)-gon in [3].

3 Kites

A kite is symmetric by reflection over a line containing two of the infinitesimal vortices.

Theorem 3.1. Assume $\mu_i \neq 0$. Assume that a configuration of the (1+4)-vortex problem is a kite. Then the two vortices that are not on the line of symmetry must have equal circulation parameters.

Proof. Without loss of generality assume $\theta_1 = 0$ and assume the line of symmetry along the horizontal axis contains v_1 and v_3 . Thus $\theta_3 = \pi$, and configurations of this type can be described as a one-parameter family of configurations $\theta = (0, \theta_2, \pi, -\theta_2)$.

Substituting $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_3 = \pi$ and $\theta_4 = -\theta_2$ into $\mu^{-1}\nabla V$ and simplifying as described in Section 1.4 gives the following

$$V_{\theta_2}^{num} = -2((\mu_1 + \mu_3)\cos(\theta_2) + (\mu_1 - \mu_3)\cos(2\theta_2) + \mu_4\cos(3\theta_2))\sin^3(\theta_2)$$
(7)

$$V_{\theta_3}^{num} = (\mu_2 - \mu_4)(1 + 2\cos(\theta_2))\sin(\theta_2)$$
(8)

$$V_{\theta_4}^{num} = 2((\mu_1 + \mu_3)\cos(\theta_2) + (\mu_1 - \mu_3)\cos(2\theta_2) + \mu_2\cos(3\theta_2))\sin^3(\theta_2)$$
(9)

After removing the $\sin(\theta_2)$ factor from all three equations, expanding trig functions and using the tangent half-angle change of variables, we get the polynomials

$$V_{\theta_2}^{num^*} = 32(-2\mu_3 - \mu_4 - 6\mu_1r^2 + 4\mu_3r^2 + 15\mu_4r^2 - 4\mu_1r^4 + 6\mu_3r^4 - 15\mu_4r^4 + 2\mu_1r^6 + \mu_4r^6)$$
(10)

$$V_{\theta_3}^{num^*} = (\mu_2 - \mu_4)(-1 + 3r^2) \tag{11}$$

$$V_{\theta_4}^{num*} = 32(-\mu_2 - 2\mu_3 - 6\mu_1r^2 + 15\mu_2r^2 + 4\mu_3r^2 - 4\mu_1r^4 - 15\mu_2r^4 + 6\mu_3r^4 + 2\mu_1r^6 + \mu_2r^6)$$
(12)

We can quickly see that $\mu_2 = \mu_4$ and $r = \pm 1/\sqrt{3}$ is a root of $V_{\theta_3}^{num^*}$, but it is not apparent that these are roots of the other two equations.

Since we are investigating the relation between circulation weights μ_i that would guarantee symmetry of relative equilibria, we project the ideal $\langle V_{\theta_2}^{num^*}, V_{\theta_3}^{num^*}, V_{\theta_4}^{num^*} \rangle$ on to $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4)$ space. We specify an elimination ordering $r > \mu_1 > \mu_2 > \mu_3 > \mu_4$ and use a Gröbner basis to calculate the elimination ideal in *grevlex* ordering that removes configuration variable r. We perform Gröbner basis algorithm through Mathematica to obtain the following basis for the elimination ideal:

$$\{\mu_2 - \mu_4\}$$
 (13)

Thus $\mu_2 = \mu_4$. In this proof, we assumed the line of symmetry contained the vortices v_1 and v_3 , thus the vortices not on the line must have equal circulation. The symmetry $V(\theta)$ means the result will be the same for any reordering of the vortices.

Next we ask the question, what actual angles θ_2 correspond to solutions that are kite configurations, and how are they related to the ratio of the circulation parameters?

Example 3.1. In $V_{\theta_3}^{num^*}$, the root $r = \pm 1/\sqrt{3}$, corresponding to $\theta_2 = \pm 2\pi/3$ is apparent. When substituted into ∇V , the gradient becomes

$$\nabla V = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(\mu_1(\mu_4 - \mu_2), \mu_2(\mu_1 - \mu_4), 0, \mu_4(\mu_2 - \mu_1))$$

Thus the solutions for $\mu_i \neq 0$ are $\mu_2 = \mu_4 = \mu_1$. Checking for nondegeneracy of the critical point, we look at the Hessian $V_{\theta\theta}$. When substituting $\mu_2 = \mu_1$, $\mu_4 = \mu_1$ and the configuration $\theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 = \pm 2\pi/3, \theta_3 = \pi$, and $\theta_4 = -\theta_2$ into $V_{\theta\theta}$, the eigenvalues are

$$\lambda_1 = 0, \qquad \lambda_2 = -\frac{1}{2}\mu_1(\mu_1 - 3\mu_3),$$

$$\lambda_{3,4} = \frac{1}{4}\mu_1 \left(-\mu_1 + 6\mu_3 \pm \sqrt{\mu_1^2 + 12\mu_1\mu_3 + 108\mu_3^2}\right)$$

Degenerate solutions occur when there is more one zero eigenvalue. We see $\lambda_2 = 0$ is zero when $\mu_1 = 3\mu_3$ and one of $\lambda_{3,4}$ vanishes $\mu_1 = -3\mu_3$. So the solution is nondegenerate for any values of $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_4 \neq \pm 3\mu_3$.

The linear stability of the relative equilibria for ε > continued from this configuration is determined by the eigenvalues of the weighted Hessian $\mu^{-1}V_{\theta\theta}$. Using the same substitutions, we get

$$\lambda_1 = 0, \qquad \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2}(-\mu_1 + 3\mu_3)$$
$$\lambda_{3,4} = \frac{1}{8} \left(7\mu_1 + 3\mu_3 \pm \sqrt{121\mu_1^2 + 282\mu_1\mu_3 + 81\mu_3^2} \right)$$

Using Reduce on the equations $\lambda_2 > 0$, $\lambda_3 > 0$, and $\lambda_4 > 0$ in Mathematica, we find that there are N-1=3 positive eigenvalues when $\mu_3 > 0$ and $\frac{3}{121}(-47+4\sqrt{70})\mu_3 \approx -0.335544\mu_3 \leq \mu_1 \leq -\frac{1}{3}\mu_3$. Thus there is a small range of ratios $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = \mu_4 : \mu_3$ where kites at an angle of $\theta_2 = 2\pi/3$ are linearly stable.

Next we consider the problem of kite configurations more generally.

Theorem 3.2. Assume $\mu_2 = \mu_4$. Then there is at least one and at most three kite configurations such that $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_3 = \pi$ and the vortices are ordered $v_1 < v_2 < v_3 < v_4$ counter clockwise around the circle.

Proof. In $V_{\theta_A}^{num*}$ (12), we see the factor

$$p(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, r) = -\mu_2 - 2\mu_3 - 6\mu_1 r^2 + 15\mu_2 r^2 + 4\mu_3 r^2 - 4\mu_1 r^4 - 15\mu_2 r^4 + 6\mu_3 r^4 + 2\mu_1 r^6 + \mu_2 r^6$$
(14)

This factor is the same the one in $V_{\theta_2}^{num*}$ (10) with the substitution $\mu_4 = \mu_2$. Roots of p where r > 0 correspond to the ordering of vortices given in the theorem statement. Descartes' Rule of Signs says that if there is one sign change in the coefficient sequence of a polynomial, then there is one root. Using **Reduce** in Mathematica on the inequalities giving an all positive coefficient sequence

$$-\mu_2 - 2\mu_3 > 0, \quad -6\mu_1 + 15\mu_2 + 4\mu_3 > 0, \quad -4\mu_1 - 15\mu_2 + 6\mu_3 > 0, \quad 2\mu_1 + \mu_2 > 0$$
(15)

produces a False result. In other words, it is not possible for all the coefficients to have the same sign, so there must be at least one sign change and at least one real root of p. Additionally, p is an even polynomial in r, so there is always an even number of roots in \pm pairs. Thus there is always at least one positive real root. Finally, p is a degree six polynomial in r, so there are at most six real roots of which at most three would be positive. Thus there is at least one and at most three kite configurations given two equal vortices.

4 Rectangles

Here we use the property that rectangles are symmetric by reflection through their centroid. By inscribing the rectangle in the unit circle, we put the centroid at the origin. Assume that vortices v_1 and v_3 are symmetric by reflection through the origin, as is the pair v_2 and v_4 .

Lemma 4.1. Assume that the positions of the vortices v_1 and v_3 are symmetric by reflection by reflection through the origin, as are the positions of the pair v_2 and v_4 . If $\mu_1 = \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_4$, $\mu_i \neq 0$ for i = 1, 2, 3, 4, then the vortices form the square configuration.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\theta_1 = 0$, and the vortices are symmetric by reflection through the origin so that v_3 is the reflection v_1 . Then $\theta_3 = \pi$. Assume $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$ and $\theta_4 = \theta_2 + \pi$. Configurations of this type can be described by a one parameter family $\theta = (0, \theta_2, \pi, \theta_2 + \pi)$. Additionally assume $\mu_1 = \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_4$. Substituting these values into $\mu^{-1}\nabla V$ and simplifying as in section 1.4 gives the following

$$V_{\theta_2}^{num} = 2\mu_1 \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_2) \tag{16}$$

$$V_{\theta_3}^{num} = -2\mu_2 \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_2) \tag{17}$$

$$V_{\theta_4}^{num} = 2\mu_1 \cos(\theta_2) \sin(\theta_2) \tag{18}$$

We ignore the factor of $\sin(\theta_2)$ which corresponds to collisions of v_2 and v_1 or v_3 , and consider roots for which $\mu_1, \mu_2 \neq 0$, we see that $\cos(\theta_2) = 0$ so that $\theta_2 = \pm \pi/2$, and the configuration must be a square.

Theorem 4.1. Assume that the positions of the vortices v_1 and v_3 are symmetric by reflection through the origin, as is the pair v_2 and v_4 . Then the only rectangular configuration that is not the square occurs when the lines containing each pair are at an angle of $\frac{\pi}{4}$ and when the circulations satisfy $\mu_1 = -\mu_3$ and $\mu_2 = -\mu_4$, $\mu_i \neq 0$ for i = 1 to 4.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume $\theta_1 = 0$, and the vortices are symmetric by reflection through the origin so that v_3 is the reflection v_1 . Then $\theta_3 = \pi$. Assume $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$ and $\theta_4 = \theta_2 + \pi$. Configurations of this type can be described by a one parameter family $\theta = (0, \theta_2, \pi, \theta_2 + \pi)$. Additionally assume $\mu_1 \neq \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 \neq \mu_4$.

Substituting $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_3 = \pi$ and $\theta_4 = \theta_2 + \pi$ into $\mu^{-1} \nabla V$ and simplifying as described in Section 1.4 gives the following

$$V_{\theta_2}^{num} = ((\mu_1 + \mu_3)\cos(\theta_2) + (\mu_1 - \mu_3)\cos(2\theta_2))\sin(\theta_2)$$
(19)

$$V_{\theta_3}^{num} = -((\mu_2 + \mu_4)\cos(\theta_2) + (-\mu_2 + \mu_4)\cos(2\theta_2))\sin(\theta_2)$$
(20)

$$V_{\theta_4}^{num} = ((\mu_1 + \mu_3)\cos(\theta_2) + (\mu_3 - \mu_1)\cos(2\theta_2))\sin(\theta_2)$$
(21)

After removing the $\sin(\theta_2)$ factor from all three equations, expanding trig functions and using the tangent half-angle change of variables, we get the polynomials

$$V_{\theta_2}^{num^*} = 4(-\mu_3 - 3\mu_1 r^2 + 3\mu_3 r^2 + \mu_1 r^4)$$
(22)

$$V_{\theta_3}^{num^*} = 4(\mu_2 - 3\mu_2 r^2 + 3\mu_4 r^2 - \mu_4 r^4)$$
(23)

$$V_{\theta_4}^{num^*} = 4(-\mu_1 + 3\mu_1 r^2 - 3\mu_3 r^2 + \mu_3 r^4)$$
(24)

We will now saturate the ideal by including the polynomials $\nu(\mu_1 - \mu_3) + 1$ and $\omega(\mu_2 - \mu_4) + 1$ so that $\mu_1 = \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_4$ are not included in the ideal, and we eliminate the possibility of a square configuration. We project the ideal $\langle V_{\theta_2}^{num^*}, V_{\theta_3}^{num^*}, \nu(\mu_1 - \mu_3) + 1, \omega(\mu_2 - \mu_4) + 1 \rangle$ on to the $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, r)$ -space. We specify the elimination ordering $\nu > \omega > \mu_1 > \mu_2 > \mu_3 > \mu_4 > r$ and use a Gröbner basis to calculate the elimination ideal in grevlex ordering that removes the extra variables ν and ω . We perform Gröbner basis algorithm through Mathematica to obtain the following basis for the elimination ideal

$$\{\mu_2 + \mu_4, \mu_1 + \mu_3, 1 - 6r^2 + r^4\}$$
(25)

Thus rectangular configurations that are not squares must satisfy $\mu_2 = -\mu_4$, $\mu_1 = -\mu_3$, and $1 - 6r^2 + r^4 = 0$. This last equation gives the possible positions of v_2 and v_4 . The roots of $1 - 6r^2 + r^4 = 0$ are $r = 1 \pm \sqrt{2}, -1 \pm \sqrt{2}$, corresponding to $\theta_2 = \pm \pi/4, \pm 3\pi/4$.

Theorem 4.2. Rectangular configurations that are not squares are nondegenerate critical points of $V(\theta)$ and always linearly unstable.

The proof of theorem 4.2 follows from substituting in $\mu_1 = -\mu_3$, $\mu_2 = -\mu_4$ and $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_3 = \pi$, $\theta_4 = \theta_2 + \pi$ and $\theta_2 = \pm \pi/4, \pm 3\pi/4$ into the matrices $V_{\theta\theta}$ and $\mu^{-1}V_{\theta\theta}$ and using the **Eigenvalues** command in Mathematica. There are three nonzero eigenvalues of $V_{\theta\theta}$ for $\mu_1, \mu_2 \neq 0$, and $\mu^{-1}V_{\theta\theta}$ has two zero eigenvalues, possibly indicating a bifurcation in the critical points of V.

5 Trapezoids with three equal sides

An inscribed trapezoid with three equal sides with ordering v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 of vortices around the unit circle can be parameterized as $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 \in (0, 2\pi/3)$, $\theta_3 = 2\theta_2$, and $\theta_4 = 3\theta_2$. This trapezoid would have a line of reflection at an angle of $\frac{3}{2}\theta_2$. We start with a more general assumption of $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{\pm 2\pi/3\}$ (both of these values giving a collision between v_1 and v_4). **Lemma 5.1.** Assume $\mu_i \neq 0$ and assume $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 - \theta_1 = \theta_3 - \theta_2 = \theta_4 - \theta_3$, i.e. $\theta_3 = 2\theta_2$ and $\theta_4 = 3\theta_2$, with $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{\pm 2\pi/3\}$. If $\mu_1 = \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_4$, $\mu_i \neq 0$ for i = 1, 2, 3, 4, then the vortices form the square configuration.

Proof. Let $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_3 = 2\theta_2$, and $\theta_4 = 3\theta_2$, $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{\pm 2\pi/3\}$, and $\mu_1 = \mu_2$ and $\mu_3 = \mu_4$, as described in the lemma statement. Substituting these values into $\mu^{-1}\nabla V$, removing factors of $\sin(\theta_2)$ which would lead to collisions, we'd get equations $V_{\theta_2}^{num}, V_{\theta_3}^{num}, V_{\theta_4}^{num}$ in μ_1, μ_2 , and θ_2 . Changing coordinates as in Section 1.4, we get polynomial equations:

$$V_{\theta_2}^{num^*} = 8\mu_2(-1+r)(1+r)(1-4r+r^2)(1+4r+r^2)$$
(26)

$$V_{\theta_3}^{num^*} = -8\mu_1(-1+r)(1+r)(1-4r+r^2)(1+4r+r^2)$$
(27)

$$V_{\theta_4}^{num^*} = 32(-1+r)(1+r)(-1+3r^2)(-\mu_2 - 24\mu_1r^2 + 16\mu_2r^2 + 152\mu_1r^4 - 26\mu_2r^4 - 72\mu_1r^6 - 40\mu_2r^6 + 8\mu_1r^8 + 3\mu_2r^8)$$
(28)

We see $r = \pm 1$ are two roots of these equations, but we'll use a Gröbner Basis to consider others. Additionally, we want to look at roots where $\mu_i \neq 0$, so we saturate the ideal by adding two polynomials $\nu\mu_1 + 1$ and $\omega\mu_2 + 1$. We project the variety of the ideal $\langle V_{\theta_2}^{num^*}, V_{\theta_4}^{num^*} \rangle$ on to (μ_1, μ_2, r) -space. We specify an elimination ordering $\nu > \omega > \mu_1 > \mu_2 > r$ and use a Gröbner basis to calculate the elimination ideal in *grevlex* ordering that removes the extra variables ν and ω . We perform Gröbner basis algorithm through Mathematica with the elimination ordering to obtain a basis $\{-1 + r^2\}$ for the elimination ideal. Thus $r = \pm 1$, corresponding to $\theta_2 = \pi/2$ or $-\pi/2$. Thus the only nontrivial configurations of trapezoids with three equal sides and circulation parameters $\mu_1 = \mu_3, \mu_2 = \mu_4$ is the square configuration.

Theorem 5.1. Assume $\mu_i \neq 0$ and assume $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_2 - \theta_1 = \theta_3 - \theta_2 = \theta_4 - \theta_3$, i.e. $\theta_3 = 2\theta_2$ and $\theta_4 = 3\theta_2$, with $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{\pm 2\pi/3\}$. Additionally, assume that the vortices do not form a square, i.e. $\mu_1 \neq \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 \neq \mu_4$. Then there are six possible values of θ_2 that satisfy this symmetry, corresponding to the six real roots of the polynomial

$$g(r) = -1 + 33r^2 - 202r^4 + 146r^6 - 117r^8 + 13r^{10}.$$
(29)

The corresponding values of θ_2 and the set of circulation parameters are given by $\theta_2 = \arcsin(2r/(1+r^2))$ and $\{(a(r)\mu_2 + b(r)\mu_3, \mu_2, \mu_3, b(r)\mu_2 + a(r)\mu_3) : \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where

$$a(r) = \frac{1}{4352} (2827 - 168410r^2 + 119616r^4 - 107718r^6 + 12181r^8)$$
(30)

$$b(r) = \frac{1}{272} \left(-753 + 16124r^2 - 11428r^4 + 10036r^6 - 1131r^8 \right)$$
(31)

Proof. Let $\theta_1 = 0$, $\theta_3 = 2\theta_2$, and $\theta_4 = 3\theta_2$, $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{\pm 2\pi/3\}$, as described in the theorem statement. Substituting these values into $\mu^{-1}\nabla V$, and changing coordinates as in Section 1.4, we get equations $V_{\theta_2}^{num^*}, V_{\theta_3}^{num^*}, V_{\theta_4}^{num^*}$. The equation associated with $V_{\theta_4}^{num^*}$ contains the factor $(-1 + 3r^2)$, which we disregard because in this parameterization $r = \pm 1/\sqrt{3}$ corresponds to $\theta_2 = 0$

 $\pm 2\pi/3$ and $\theta_4 \mod 2\pi = \theta_1 = 0$. We consider the polynomial equations

$$V_{\theta_2}^{num^*} = -8(\mu_4 - 6\mu_1r^2 + 6\mu_3r^2 - 15\mu_4r^2 - 4\mu_1r^4 + 4\mu_3r^4 + 15\mu_4r^4 + 2\mu_1r^6 - 2\mu_3r^6 - \mu_4r^6)$$
(32)

$$V_{\theta_3}^{num^*} = -8(-\mu_1 + 15\mu_1r^2 - 6\mu_2r^2 + 6\mu_4r^2 - 15\mu_1r^4 - 4\mu_2r^4 + 4\mu_4r^4 + \mu_1r^6 + 2\mu_2r^6 - 2\mu_4r^6)$$
(33)

$$V_{\theta_4}^{num^*} = 32(\mu_2 + 18\mu_1r^2 - 17\mu_2r^2 + 6\mu_3r^2 - 168\mu_1r^4 + 42\mu_2r^4 - 8\mu_3r^4 + 252\mu_1r^6 + 14\mu_2r^6 - 28\mu_3r^6 - 72\mu_1r^8 - 43\mu_2r^8 - 8\mu_3r^8 + 2\mu_1r^{10} + 3\mu_2r^{10} + 6\mu_3r^{10})$$
(34)

We will now saturate the ideal by including the polynomials $\nu(\mu_1 - \mu_3) + 1$ and $\omega(\mu_2 - \mu_4) + 1$, so that $\mu_1 = \mu_3$ and $\mu_2 = \mu_4$ are not included in the ideal and we eliminate the possibility of a square configuration. Additionally we saturate the ideal by including the polynomial $z\mu_1 + 1$, which eliminates the possibility that $\mu_1 = 0$. (One can also choose $z\mu_4 + 1$ to get the same result.) We project the ideal $\langle V_{\theta_2}^{num^*}, V_{\theta_3}^{num^*}, \nu(\mu_1 - \mu_3) + 1, \omega(\mu_2 - \mu_4) + 1, z\mu_1 + 1 \rangle$ on to the $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, r)$ -space. We specify the elimination ordering $\nu > \omega > \mu_1 > \mu_4 > \mu_3 > \mu_2 > r$ and use a Gröbner basis to calculate the elimination ideal in *lex* ordering that removes the extra variables ν , ω , and z. We perform Gröbner basis algorithm through Mathematica to obtain the following basis of three polynomials for the elimination ideal:

$$\{g(r), f_1(\mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, r), f_2(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, r)\}$$
(35)

where

$$g(r) = -1 + 33r^2 - 202r^4 + 146r^6 - 117r^8 + 13r^{10}$$
(36)

$$f_1(\mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, r) = 12048\mu_2 - 2827\mu_3 + 4352\mu_4 - 257984\mu_2r^2 + 168410\mu_3r^2 + 182848\mu_2r^4 - 119616\mu_3r^4 - 160576\mu_2r^6 + 107718\mu_3r^6 + 18096\mu_2r^8 - 12181\mu_3r^8$$
(37)

$$f_2(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, r) = f_1(\mu_3, \mu_2, \mu_4, r)$$
(38)

First note that the polynomial $f_1(\mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, r)$ is linear in μ_2, μ_3 , and μ_4 . Specifically we can solve $f_1(\mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, r) = 0$ for μ_4 in the form $\mu_4 = a(r)\mu_2 + b(r)\mu_3$, where

$$a(r) = \frac{1}{4352} (2827 - 168410r^2 + 119616r^4 - 107718r^6 + 12181r^8)$$
(39)

$$b(r) = \frac{1}{272} \left(-753 + 16124r^2 - 11428r^4 + 10036r^6 - 1131r^8 \right)$$
(40)

Also the third polynomial $f_2(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, r)$ is linear in μ_1, μ_2, μ_3 , and is given by a permutation and substitution variables in f_1 so that we can solve for μ_1 in the form $\mu_1 = b(r)\mu_2 + a(r)\mu_3$.

Now consider the first polynomial g(r). Descartes' Rule of signs gives the possibility of 5, 3, or 1 positive real roots. Additionally g(r) is even, so the roots come in \pm pairs, so there will be 10, 6, or 2 real roots. Solving numerically, there are six real roots of g(r):

$$r \approx \pm 2.79493, \pm 0.375563, \pm 0.199167.$$
 (41)

Solving for θ_2 values that correspond to r in the tangent half-angle identities in Equation (6), we get

$$r = \pm 2.79493 \Leftrightarrow \theta_2 \approx \pm 0.687197$$

$$r = \pm 0.375563 \Leftrightarrow \theta_2 \approx \pm 2.42306$$

$$r = \pm 0.199167 \Leftrightarrow \theta_2 \approx \pm 2.74840.$$
(42)

We can also give numerical approximations for the corresponding set of circulation parameters using a(r) and b(r) as given in equations (39) and (40):

$$r = \pm 2.79493 \Leftrightarrow \theta_2 \approx \pm 0.687197$$

and $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4) \approx (-0.638032\mu_2 + 1.31061\mu_3, \mu_2, \mu_3, 1.31061\mu_2 - 0.638032\mu_3)$
$$r = \pm 0.375563 \Leftrightarrow \theta_2 \approx \pm 2.42306$$

and $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4) \approx (-4.33010\mu_2 + 4.85887\mu_3, \mu_2, \mu_3, 4.85887\mu_2 - 4.33010\mu_3)$
$$r = \pm 0.199167 \Leftrightarrow \theta_2 \approx \pm 2.74840$$

and $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4) \approx (-0.843716\mu_2 - 0.480743\mu_3, \mu_2, \mu_3, -0.480743\mu_2 - 0.843716\mu_3)$
(43)

Three of the possible configurations from Theorem 5.1 are pictured in Figure 3. These all satisfy $\theta_2 \in (0, \pi)$. The other three configurations are reflections over the horizontal axis. Note that two of the possible configurations have $\theta_2 > 2\pi/3$, and thus the inscribed quadrilateral is not a trapezoid with three equal sides. We get the following corollary.



Figure 3: The three possible configurations satisfying $\theta_1 = 0, \theta_3 = 2\theta_2, \theta_4 = 3\theta_2$ and $\theta_2 \in (0, \pi) \setminus \{2\pi/3\}$. The configuration in Figure 3a is the only configuration with $\theta_2 \in (0, 2\pi/3)$ and the only true inscribed trapezoid with three equal sides.

Corollary 5.1. There is only one possible inscribed trapezoid with three equal sides in the (1+4)-vortex problem with vortex ordering $v_1 < v_2 < v_3 < v_4$. Let $r^* \approx 2.79493$ be the largest positive root of the polynomial $g(r) = -1 + 33r^2 - 202r^4 + 146r^6 - 117r^8 + 13r^{10}$. Then the angle of the spacing is given by $\theta^* = \arcsin(2r^*/(1+r^{*2})) \approx 0.687197$ and circulation parameters in the set $\{(a(r^*)\mu_2 + b(r^*)\mu_3, \mu_2, \mu_3, b(r^*)\mu_2 + a(r^*)\mu_3) : \mu_2, \mu_3 \in \mathbb{R}\}$, where a(r) and b(r) are given in equations (39) and (40).

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Sophie Le: Conceptualization, Methodology. **Alanna Hoyer-Leitzel:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Validation, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing.

Acknowledgements

Our deepest appreciation to an anonymous reviewer for help with the proof of Theorem 5.1, particularly the use of the monomial ordering in the Gröbner basis calculation. A.H-L. thanks Sarah Iams, Heidi Goodson, Annie Raymond, Jessica Sidman and Ashley Wheeler for moments of advice and insight as this paper was developed. A.H-L. is supported by the Kennedy-Schuklenoff endowed chair at Mount Holyoke College, and a portion of this work was completed during A.H-L.'s sabbatical which was partially supported by the Hutchcroft Fund and the Mathematics and Statistics Department at Mount Holyoke College. S.L. completed this work while at student at Mount Holyoke College and received a software fellowship from the Hutchcroft Fund.

References

- Alain Albouy. The symmetric central configurations of four equal masses. Contemporary Mathematics, 198:131–136, 1996.
- [2] Alain Albouy, Yanning Fu, and Shanzhong Sun. Symmetry of planar four-body convex central configurations. Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 464(2093):1355–1365, 2008.
- [3] Anna M Barry, Glen R Hall, and C Eugene Wayne. Relative equilibria of the (1 + n)-vortex problem. Journal of nonlinear science, 22(1):63–83, 2012.
- [4] Anna M Barry and Alanna Hoyer-Leitzel. Existence, stability, and symmetry of relative equilibria with a dominant vortex. SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems, 15(4):1783–1805, 2016.
- [5] Hildeberto E Cabral and Dieter S Schmidt. Stability of relative equilibria in the problem of n + 1 vortices. SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis, 31(2):231-250, 2000.
- [6] Montserrat Corbera, Josep M Cors, and Gareth E Roberts. A four-body convex central configuration with perpendicular diagonals is necessarily a kite. *Qualitative theory of dynamical* systems, 17(2):367–374, 2018.
- [7] Montserrat Corbera, Josep M Cors, and Gareth E Roberts. Classifying four-body convex central configurations. *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 131(7):34, 2019.
- [8] Montserrat Corbera and Jaume Llibre. Central configurations of the 4-body problem with masses m1 = m2 > m3 = m4 = m > 0 and m small. Applied Mathematics and Computation, 246:121–147, 2014.
- [9] Josep M Cors and Gareth E Roberts. Four-body co-circular central configurations. *Nonlinearity*, 25(2):343, 2012.
- [10] David A Cox, John Little, and Donal O'shea. Using Algebraic Geometry, volume 185. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [11] Yiyang Deng, Bingyu Li, and Shiqing Zhang. Four-body central configurations with adjacent equal masses. Journal of Geometry and Physics, 114:329–335, 2017.
- [12] GR Hall. Central configurations in the planar 1 + n-body problem. preprint, 1988.
- [13] Marshall Hampton. Finiteness of kite relative equilibria in the five-vortex and five-body problems. Qualitative Theory of Dynamical Systems, 8(2):349–356, 2009.
- [14] Marshall Hampton, Gareth E Roberts, and Manuele Santoprete. Relative equilibria in the fourvortex problem with two pairs of equal vorticities. *Journal of Nonlinear Science*, 24(1):39–92, 2014.
- [15] Gustav Kirchhoff and Kurt Hensel. Vorlesungen über mathematische Physik, volume 1. Druck und Verlag von BG Teubner, 1883.

- [16] James P Kossin and Wayne H Schubert. Mesovortices in hurricane isabel. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 85(2):151–153, 2004.
- [17] Tsung-Lin Lee and Manuele Santoprete. Central configurations of the five-body problem with equal masses. *Celestial Mechanics and Dynamical Astronomy*, 104(4):369–381, 2009.
- [18] Yiming Long and Shanzhong Sun. Four-body central configurations with some equal masses. Archive for rational mechanics and analysis, 162(1):25–44, 2002.
- [19] Marcelo Marchesin and Claudio Vidal. Global dynamics in a restricted five vortices problem on the plane. Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, pages 1–27, 2019.
- [20] Richard Moeckel. Linear stability of relative equilibria with a dominant mass. Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, 6(1):37–51, 1994.
- [21] Allyson Oliveira and Claudio Vidal. Stability of the rhombus vortex problem with a central vortex. Journal of Dynamics and Differential Equations, pages 1–15, 2019.
- [22] Ernesto Perez-Chavela and Manuele Santoprete. Convex four-body central configurations with some equal masses. Archive for rational mechanics and analysis, 185(3):481–494, 2007.
- [23] Don Pettit [NASA Johnson]. Science off the sphere: Thin film physics [video file]. https: //youtu.be/Uddz-3RwA_Y?t=218, 28 March, 2012. Accessed: 2021-07-01.
- [24] Gareth E Roberts. A continuum of relative equilibria in the five-body problem. Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena, 127(3-4):141-145, 1999.
- [25] David Rusu and Manuele Santoprete. Bifurcations of central configurations in the four-body problem with some equal masses. SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems, 15(1):440– 458, 2016.
- [26] UCLA Spinlab. Chapter 8: Vortices in a rotating tank [video file]. https://youtu.be/ qFIgLbFVo28?t=100, February 9, 2012. Accessed 2021-06-01.
- [27] Bernd Sturmfels. What is... a Grobner Basis? Notices-American Mathematical Society, 52(10):1199, 2005.