

$D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ Mode Interactions and Hidden Rotational Symmetry

John David Crawford
Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

ABSTRACT

Bifurcation problems in which periodic boundary conditions or Neumann boundary conditions are imposed often involve partial differential equations that have Euclidean symmetry. As a result the normal form equations for the bifurcation may be constrained by the “hidden” Euclidean symmetry of the equations, even though this symmetry is broken by the boundary conditions. The effects of such hidden rotation symmetry on $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ mode interactions are studied by analyzing when a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetric normal form \tilde{F} can be extended to a vector field \mathcal{F} with Euclidean symmetry. The fundamental case of binary mode interactions between two irreducible representations of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ is treated in detail. Necessary and sufficient conditions are given that permit \tilde{F} to be extended when the Euclidean group $\mathcal{E}(2)$ acts irreducibly. When the Euclidean action is reducible, the rotations do not impose any constraints on the normal form of the binary mode interaction. In applications, this dependence on the representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ implies that the effects of hidden rotations are not present if the critical eigenvalues are imaginary. Generalization of these results to more complicated mode interactions is discussed.

keywords: bifurcation, symmetry, boundary conditions, hidden symmetry

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Representations of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ and $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$	8
2.1	$\mathcal{E}(2)$ on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$	8
2.2	$D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$	10
2.3	$\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector fields on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$	12
3	Binary Mode interactions with $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ irreducible	13
3.1	The $[4, 8]$ -mode interaction	17
3.2	The $[8, 8]$ -mode interaction	40
3.3	The $[8, 4]$ -mode interaction	51
4	Binary Mode interactions with $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ reducible	62
5	Conclusions	65
6	Appendix	66
6.1	Proof of Theorem II.1	66
6.2	Proof of Theorem II.2	67
6.3	Proof of Proposition III.1	69
6.4	Proof of Proposition III.2	72
6.5	Proof of Proposition III.5	72
7	Acknowledgements	76
	References	

1 Introduction

When the governing equations for a system have Euclidean symmetry then bifurcations can reflect this symmetry even when the boundary conditions for the system are defined for a domain that is invariant only under a subgroup $\Gamma \subset \mathcal{E}(n)$ of the Euclidean group. In particular, the normal form describing bifurcation from a Γ -invariant equilibrium may have extra symmetry or special structure not typically associated with a Γ -symmetric bifurcation. These “non-generic” features of the normal form can be explained by appropriately incorporating the “hidden” Euclidean symmetry into the normal form construction. Bifurcation with hidden symmetry in this sense has been investigated in reaction-diffusion systems,[1]-[4] the Kuramoto-Shivashinsky equation,[5] and fluid dynamical models of convection and surface waves.[6]-[8] In addition, Field *et al* discuss the occurrence of hidden symmetries in more general settings.[9]

Recent research has concentrated on the effects of hidden translation symmetry for systems with Neumann or Dirichlet boundary conditions at rigid sidewalls. The effects of hidden rotation symmetry are less well understood and have not been systematically studied either theoretically or experimentally. This paper analyzes such hidden rotation symmetry in a specific context that occurs often in applications: bifurcation from a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -symmetric equilibrium described by a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -symmetric normal form. For systems described by Euclidean symmetric equations on \mathbf{R}^2 , this type of bifurcation can arise in at least two ways:

- a symmetry breaking bifurcation from an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -invariant equilibrium often leads to spatially periodic states and one can analyze such patterns and their dynamics by posing the problem on a periodic lattice in the plane.[10] For a square lattice, the symmetry of the bifurcation problem is $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ and one would like to understand the effect of hidden rotation symmetry on the $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ normal form;

- the physical system (e.g. a fluid) may occupy a volume of square cross section with boundary conditions at the sidewalls that allow mathematical extension of solutions to a larger square domain such that the extended solutions are spatially periodic.[7] The bifurcation problem for the extended solutions then has $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetry. In typical examples, it is often the presence of Neumann or Dirichlet boundary conditions in the original problem that allows the extension to a bifurcation problem with periodic boundary conditions and $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetry. If the normal form for the extended problem is constrained by hidden rotation symmetry this can in turn modify the normal form for the original problem.

In such examples, one studies bifurcations described by an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant evolution equation

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = G(\psi) \tag{1}$$

subject to periodic boundary conditions (PBC):

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(-\pi, y, t) &= \psi(\pi, y, t) \\ \psi(x, -\pi, t) &= \psi(x, \pi, t) \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

on a square domain $\tilde{\Omega} = [-\pi, \pi] \times [-\pi, \pi]$ in \mathbf{R}^2 . Here $\psi(\vec{r}, t)$ represents the field or multiplet of fields that describes the physical state. Any dependence of ψ on additional spatial coordinates is suppressed. In some cases, the dynamics (1) may be given by a map $\psi_{j+1} = G(\psi_j)$ describing the state of the system at discrete times; our discussion of hidden symmetry applies to such systems as well.

The Euclidean group $\mathcal{E}(2) : \mathbf{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$ is generated by rotations $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$, reflection γ_2 , and translations $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)}$ which we denote by

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot (x, y) \rightarrow (x', y') \tag{3}$$

where

$$\begin{pmatrix} x' \\ y' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\gamma_2 \cdot (x, y) \rightarrow (y, x), \quad (5)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (x, y) \rightarrow (x + a, y + b). \quad (6)$$

A transformation $\gamma \in \mathcal{E}(2)$ acts on the state ψ in the usual way:

$$(\gamma \cdot \psi)(\vec{r}) = \psi(\gamma^{-1} \cdot \vec{r}); \quad (7)$$

in systems described by a multiplet of fields this action may involve a prefactor on the right hand side that rearranges the members of the multiplet. For simplicity of notation we focus on the case without this prefactor; if it is present the transformation in (7) is more complicated but the analysis of normal forms and hidden symmetry is not affected.

The governing equation (1) commutes with this $\mathcal{E}(2)$ action: $\gamma \cdot G(\psi) = G(\gamma \cdot \psi)$. In addition, we assume that solutions satisfying PBC (2) may be extended to solutions of (1) on all of \mathbf{R}^2 by periodic replication. In this case, the PBC solutions form a subset of the solutions on \mathbf{R}^2 and can be precisely identified by their invariance under the subgroup¹ $B_P = \{\mathcal{T}_{(\pm 2\pi, 0)}, \mathcal{T}_{(0, \pm 2\pi)}\}$. It follows easily from the Euclidean symmetry of $G(\psi)$ that this subset of PBC solutions is dynamically invariant.

The subgroup of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ that maps the set of B_P -invariant solutions into itself is the semi-direct product $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ where T^2 denotes the translations $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)}$ with (a, b) taken to be 2π -periodic variables and $D_4 = \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ is generated by reflection in x :

$$\gamma_1 : (x, y) \rightarrow (-x, y), \quad (8)$$

¹The subgroup is specified by listing its generators.

and diagonal reflection γ_2 (5).

We assume an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -invariant equilibrium $G(\psi_0) = 0$ which provides a solution for the PBC problem on $\tilde{\Omega}$ with full $D_4\dot{+}T^2$ symmetry. The linear stability of ψ_0 is determined by the spectrum of $DG(\psi_0)$:

$$DG(\psi_0)\Phi_{\vec{k}} = \lambda(|\vec{k}|)\Phi_{\vec{k}}. \quad (9)$$

The eigenvector

$$\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) = \phi(|\vec{k}|) e^{i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{r}} \quad (10)$$

satisfies PBC on $\tilde{\Omega}$ if \vec{k} has integer components: $(k_x, k_y) \in \mathcal{Z}^2$. The Euclidean invariance of the equilibrium ψ_0 implies that $DG(\psi_0)$ commutes with the action of $\mathcal{E}(2)$, $\gamma \cdot DG(\psi_0) = DG(\gamma \cdot \psi_0)$; hence the eigenspaces for PBC define representations of $D_4\dot{+}T^2$.

At a bifurcation from ψ_0 , the normal form, $\tilde{F} : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$, commutes with the $D_4\dot{+}T^2$ representation carried by $E_c(\tilde{\Omega})$, the center subspace defined by the critical modes. The $D_4\dot{+}T^2$ equivariance of \tilde{F} is the most readily noted consequence of the $\mathcal{E}(2)$ symmetry of $G(\psi)$ and ψ_0 . In addition, \tilde{F} may be further constrained by symmetries in $\mathcal{E}(2) - D_4\dot{+}T^2$ that do *not* leave $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ invariant. Our problem is to characterize these constraints.

The nature of these more subtle constraints appears when we consider the form of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector fields, $\mathcal{F} : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$, on the infinite-dimensional space $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ defined by the critical modes $\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r})$ without regard to PBC. This space carries a representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ induced from the action (7) on functions. The space $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ of the critical modes subject to PBC is a subspace of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$. The normal form \tilde{F} for the PBC bifurcation problem is defined on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$; the consistency requirement that \tilde{F} reflect all constraints on the PBC problem due to the $\mathcal{E}(2)$ symmetry of $G(\psi)$ is formalized by requiring that \tilde{F} arise as the restriction of a Euclidean symmetric vector field. More precisely, there should exist

an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -symmetric $\mathcal{F} : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})}. \quad (11)$$

This requirement ensures that \tilde{F} is $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant, but it can impose further constraints on \tilde{F} . These additional constraints, if present, are said to reflect hidden rotation symmetry in \tilde{F} arising from the manifest rotation symmetry of \mathcal{F} . Because the effect of the $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetry depends on the representation carried by $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$, the role of hidden rotation symmetry depends on the specific representations of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ and $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ under consideration.

For $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$, the irreducible representations $\tilde{V}_{(l,n)}$ may be classified by two mode numbers $l \geq n \geq 0$ physically representing the wave vector components of $\vec{k} = (l, n)$ for an eigenvector. Thus each representation is characterized in part by $\kappa = |\vec{k}|$, the length of the associated wave vectors,

$$\kappa^2 = l^2 + n^2. \quad (12)$$

The center subspace for PBC decomposes into a finite direct sum of these irreducible representations,

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) = \tilde{V}_{(l_1, n_1)} \oplus \tilde{V}_{(l_2, n_2)} \cdots \oplus \tilde{V}_{(l_j, n_j)}; \quad (13)$$

in the simplest bifurcations $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ is $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -irreducible and there is only one term in this sum. In these cases, it is known that the rotations do not constrain the form of \tilde{F} . [12]

Theorem 1.1 *Assume $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ carries an irreducible representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$, and $\tilde{F} : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ is a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field, then there is an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector field $\mathcal{F} : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that $\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})}$.*

The goal of this paper is to generalize this theorem to bifurcations in which the $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ representation carried by $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ is reducible, i.e. when there is a mode interaction. [13] There are many possible mode interactions involving different representations (13), however to

characterize the influence of the hidden rotation symmetry we need only focus on the set of values $\{\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \dots, \kappa_j\}$ defined by (12) - (13) and the structure of the $\mathcal{E}(2)$ representation on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$. For a mode interaction (13) defined by a specific reducible representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$, let

$$E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_{\kappa_1}(\mathbf{R}^2) \oplus E_{\kappa_2}(\mathbf{R}^2) \cdots \oplus E_{\kappa_\nu}(\mathbf{R}^2) \quad (14)$$

give the corresponding decomposition of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ into $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -irreducible subspaces, each of which is labeled by a value of κ appearing the decomposition of $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. In general, this decomposition of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ cannot contain more subspaces than occurred in the original mode interaction (13); i.e.

$$\nu \leq j. \quad (15)$$

There are several possibilities:

1. $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ is irreducible so that $\nu = 1$. This can only happen if $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = \cdots = \kappa_j$ in (13), and the critical modes must correspond to a real eigenvalue.
2. $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ is reducible so that $\nu > 1$; then there are two sub-cases:
 - (a) The case $\nu = j$ so that the decomposition of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ parallels the decomposition of $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$; in this circumstance the eigenvalues of the critical modes may be real or complex. When $\nu = j$ the decomposition of $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ is “forced” by the decomposition of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$. A particular example occurs when all of the κ_i in (13) are distinct: $\kappa_i = \kappa_m$ if and only if $i = m$.
 - (b) The case $\nu < j$ which can be analyzed as a hybrid of cases (1) and (2a).

The normal form \tilde{F} is modified by the hidden rotation symmetry in cases (1) and (2b); in case (2a) there is no effect. This situation may be summarized by saying that the hidden

rotations are important whenever the decomposition of $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ in (13) is not completely forced by the decomposition of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ in (14).

When the hidden symmetries constrain \tilde{F} the mechanism is always the same: the occurrence of hidden rotational symmetries on subspaces of $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. Since $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ is a subspace of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$, for a given rotation $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \in \mathcal{E}(2)$ we may consider the rotated subspace $[\mathcal{R}(\theta)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$; if $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \notin D_4\dot{+}T^2$ and $[\mathcal{R}(\theta)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ intersects $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ in a nontrivial subspace and then $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ is a hidden symmetry on a subspace of $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. The $\mathcal{E}(2)$ symmetry of \mathcal{F} implies that \tilde{F} in (11) must commute with $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ on the subspace $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$. Our main results show that all the constraints imposed on \tilde{F} due to hidden rotation symmetry are of this kind.

In normal form theory \tilde{F} is a formal power series, and the terms at any finite order define a homogeneous vector field. Thus without loss of generality we can assume \tilde{F} is a smooth homogeneous vector field on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. Section II summarizes our notation for the irreducible representations of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ and $D_4\dot{+}T^2$ and characterizes $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector fields on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. Section III forms the main part of the paper; the case of a binary $D_4\dot{+}T^2$ mode interaction with $\mathcal{E}(2)$ acting irreducibly on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ is treated in detail. Necessary and sufficient conditions for \tilde{F} to extend to \mathcal{F} are obtained. Section IV analyzes binary mode interactions with a reducible $\mathcal{E}(2)$ representation.

2 Representations of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ and $D_4\dot{+}T^2$

2.1 $\mathcal{E}(2)$ on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$

We first define the irreducible representations $E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$ of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ associated with a given irreducible representation of $D_4\dot{+}T^2$. For $\tilde{V}_{(l,n)}$ we have $\vec{k} = (l, n)$ and $\kappa^2 = l^2 + n^2$. Let $\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r})$ denote a PBC eigenvector in $\tilde{V}_{(l,n)}$ with wave vector \vec{k} ; the Euclidean action (7) acts on such

modes (10) by

$$(\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot \Phi_{\vec{k}})(\vec{r}) = e^{-i(a k_x + b k_y)} \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}), \quad (16)$$

$$(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi_{\vec{k}})(\vec{r}) = \Phi_{\vec{k}'}(\vec{r}) \quad (17)$$

where $\vec{k}' = \mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \vec{k}$ from (3),

$$(\gamma_2 \cdot \Phi_{\vec{k}})(\vec{r}) = \Phi_{\vec{k}'}(\vec{r}) \quad \text{where } \vec{k}' = (k_y, k_x). \quad (18)$$

The Euclidean symmetry of the problem implies that all of the modes $\Phi_{\vec{k}'}(\vec{r})$ obtained from $\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r})$ under $\mathcal{E}(2)$ are also eigenvectors for the same eigenvalue, although they may not satisfy PBC. The wave vectors \vec{k}' obtained in this way cover $A(\kappa)$, the circle in \vec{k} -space of radius κ ,

$$A(\kappa) = \{\vec{k} \in \mathbf{R}^2 \mid \kappa = |\vec{k}|\}. \quad (19)$$

Sums of these $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -related modes

$$\Phi(\vec{r}) = \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (20)$$

define $E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$; more precisely we introduce a norm

$$\|\Phi(\vec{r})\| \equiv \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa)} |a(\vec{k})|, \quad (21)$$

and assume in (20) that $a(\vec{k}) = 0$ for all but a finite set of points in $A(\kappa)$ to assure convergence. The finite sums in (20) form a linear vector space whose closure with respect to (21) gives us an infinite-dimensional space $E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that $\tilde{V}_{(l,n)} \subset E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$.

The action of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ on the basic modes (16) - (18) defines a representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ on $E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$. Melbourne has shown that these representations are absolutely irreducible.

Theorem 2.1 (Melbourne) *Let $L : E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$ be a linear map which commutes with the representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ in (16) - (18), then L must be a scalar multiple of the identity $L = \sigma(\kappa) I$.*

Proof.

See the Appendix. \square

This construction extends easily to a mode interaction (13) involving multiple irreducible representations. We replace (20) by

$$\Phi(\vec{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^j \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a_i(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (22)$$

where each $\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r})$ is a critical mode. The collection of all such finite sums forms a linear vector space whose closure with respect to

$$\|\Phi(\vec{r})\| \equiv \sum_{i=1}^j \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa)} |a_i(\vec{k})| \quad (23)$$

defines the space $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$. In general the representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ will not be irreducible and $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ is a direct sum of the irreducible representations $E_{\kappa}(\mathbf{R}^2)$:

$$E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_{\kappa_1}(\mathbf{R}^2) \oplus E_{\kappa_2}(\mathbf{R}^2) \cdots \oplus E_{\kappa_\nu}(\mathbf{R}^2). \quad (24)$$

Here each irreducible representation is labeled by a value of κ appearing in the initial decomposition of $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ into $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -irreducibles. If $l^2 + n^2 = l'^2 + n'^2 = \kappa^2$, then different representations of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ in (13), $\tilde{V}_{(l,n)}$ and $\tilde{V}_{(l',n')}$, corresponding to a single eigenvalue may both be subspaces of $E_{\kappa}(\mathbf{R}^2)$. Hence the number of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ irreducibles in $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ can be smaller than the number of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -irreducibles in $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$: $\nu \leq j$.

2.2 $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$

The center subspace $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ for PBC is a subspace of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ and corresponds to the fixed point subspace for B_P . Since the intersection of the circle $A(\kappa)$ with the integer lattice \mathcal{Z}^2 ,

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) = A(\kappa) \cap \mathcal{Z}^2, \quad (25)$$

contains a finite number of points, $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ will always be finite-dimensional.

The (non-trivial) irreducible representations $\tilde{V}_{(l,n)}$ of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ have dimension four or eight and may be classified by two mode numbers $\vec{k} = (l, n)$ with $l \geq n \geq 0$ giving the components of a specific wave vector in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$.

1. There are two sets of distinct four-dimensional irreducible representations:

- (a) For $l = n > 0$, $\tilde{A}(\kappa) = \{\pm \vec{k}_1, \pm \vec{k}_2\}$ where $\vec{k}_1 = (l, l)$ and $\vec{k}_2 = (l, -l)$. Then $\kappa^2 = 2l^2$ and

$$\tilde{V}_{(l,l)} = \{z_1 \Phi_{\vec{k}_1}(\vec{r}) + z_2 \Phi_{\vec{k}_2}(\vec{r}) + cc \mid (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbf{C}^2\}, \quad (26)$$

carries the representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ generated by

$$\gamma_1 \cdot (z_1, z_2) = (\bar{z}_2, \bar{z}_1) \quad (27)$$

$$\gamma_2 \cdot (z_1, z_2) = (z_1, \bar{z}_2) \quad (28)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z_1, z_2) = (e^{-il(a+b)} z_1, e^{-il(a-b)} z_2). \quad (29)$$

- (b) For $l > n = 0$, $\tilde{A}(\kappa) = \{\pm \vec{k}_1, \pm \vec{k}_2\}$ where $\vec{k}_1 = (l, 0)$ and $\vec{k}_2 = (0, l)$. Then $\kappa^2 = l^2$ and

$$\tilde{V}_{(l,0)} = \{z_1 \Phi_{\vec{k}_1}(\vec{r}) + z_2 \Phi_{\vec{k}_2}(\vec{r}) + cc \mid (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbf{C}^2\}, \quad (30)$$

carries the representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ generated by

$$\gamma_1 \cdot (z_1, z_2) = (\bar{z}_1, z_2) \quad (31)$$

$$\gamma_2 \cdot (z_1, z_2) = (z_2, z_1) \quad (32)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z_1, z_2) = (e^{-ila} z_1, e^{-ilb} z_2). \quad (33)$$

Note that $\mathcal{T}_{(\pi/l, \pi/l)}$ is in the kernel of type 1 representations but not type 2 representations, hence they must be inequivalent.

2. The eight-dimensional representations correspond to $l > n > 0$ with $\tilde{A}(\kappa) = \{\pm\vec{k}_1, \pm\vec{k}_2, \pm\vec{k}_3, \pm\vec{k}_4\}$ where $\vec{k}_1 = (l, n)$, $\vec{k}_2 = (l, -n)$, $\vec{k}_3 = (n, l)$, and $\vec{k}_4 = (n, -l)$. Now $\kappa^2 = l^2 + n^2$ and

$$\tilde{V}_{(l,n)} = \{(z_1\Phi_{\vec{k}_1}(\vec{r}) + z_2\Phi_{\vec{k}_2}(\vec{r}) + z_3\Phi_{\vec{k}_3}(\vec{r}) + z_4\Phi_{\vec{k}_4}(\vec{r}) + cc) \mid (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \in \mathbf{C}^4\} \quad (34)$$

transforms under the following representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$:

$$\gamma_1 \cdot z = (\bar{z}_2, \bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_4, \bar{z}_3) \quad (35)$$

$$\gamma_2 \cdot z = (z_3, \bar{z}_4, z_1, \bar{z}_2) \quad (36)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot z = (e^{-i(la+nb)}z_1, e^{-i(la-nb)}z_2, e^{-i(na+lb)}z_3, e^{-i(na-lb)}z_4). \quad (37)$$

where $z = (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$.

2.3 $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector fields on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$

Next we describe a result that characterizes the nonlinear $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector fields on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_{\kappa_1}(\mathbf{R}^2) \oplus E_{\kappa_2}(\mathbf{R}^2) \cdots \oplus E_{\kappa_\nu}(\mathbf{R}^2)$. For a given representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ we define

$$A_c = A(\kappa_1) \cup A(\kappa_2) \cup \dots \cup A(\kappa_\nu), \quad (38)$$

and let

$$\mathcal{F} : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \quad (39)$$

be a Euclidean-symmetric polynomial vector field of degree p . That is we assume

$$\mathcal{F}(\alpha\Phi) = \alpha^p \mathcal{F}(\Phi) \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbf{R} \quad (40)$$

and

$$\gamma \cdot \mathcal{F}(\Phi) = \mathcal{F}(\gamma \cdot \Phi) \quad \text{for any } \gamma \in \mathcal{E}(2). \quad (41)$$

When $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ is reducible ($\nu > 1$), then \mathcal{F} has multiple components

$$\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 + \mathcal{F}_2 \dots + \mathcal{F}_\nu \quad (42)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_i : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E_{\kappa_i}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ for $i = 1, \dots, \nu$. If we represent Φ as in (22), then the homogeneity of \mathcal{F} (40) implies \mathcal{F}_i must have the form

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\Phi) = \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a'_i(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (43)$$

where

$$a'_i(\vec{k}) = \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in A(\kappa_{l_1})} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in A(\kappa_{l_2})} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in A(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}_1) a_{l_2}(\vec{k}_2) \dots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}_p) P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \right]. \quad (44)$$

Theorem 2.2 \mathcal{F} will have Euclidean symmetry (41) if each $P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ satisfies two conditions. Given $p+1$ vectors, $\{\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\}$, such that $\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)$ and $\vec{k}_j \in A_c$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$ then

$$P_i(\gamma \cdot \vec{k}, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}_1, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}_2, \dots, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}_p) = P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \text{ for all } \gamma \in O(2); \quad (45)$$

and

$$P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = 0 \text{ if } \vec{k} \neq \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \dots + \vec{k}_p. \quad (46)$$

In addition, if \mathcal{F}_i is real-valued then P_i must be real-valued.

Proof.

The proof is an easy generalization of Melbourne's result for the case $\nu = 1$; see the Appendix. \square

3 Binary Mode interactions with $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ irreducible

Irreducibility of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ means that $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$, so the critical modes correspond to a single eigenvalue $\sigma(\kappa)$ in Theorem II.1. If the original problem is described by real fields, so

that complex eigenvalues must come in conjugate pairs, then $\sigma(\kappa)$ must be real. In addition, $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$ implies that in the decomposition

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) = \tilde{V}_{(l_1, n_1)} \oplus \tilde{V}_{(l_2, n_2)} \cdots \oplus \tilde{V}_{(l_j, n_j)} \quad (47)$$

we will find $\kappa^2 = l_1^2 + n_1^2 = l_2^2 + n_2^2 = \cdots = l_j^2 + n_j^2$. In (47) a given representation $\tilde{V}_{(l, n)}$ appears at most once; a so-called ‘‘accidental’’ degeneracy cannot occur. This feature allows us to order the mode indices $l_1 > l_2 > \cdots > l_j$ and $n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_j$ in (47) without loss of generality.

The form of an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -symmetric vector field \mathcal{F} of degree p is given by (39)-(44); for a vector

$$\Phi(\vec{r}) = \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (48)$$

in $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$, $\mathcal{F}(\Phi)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\Phi) = \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa)} a'(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (49)$$

with

$$a'(\vec{k}) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in A(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in A(\kappa)} \cdots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in A(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \cdots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (50)$$

The function P satisfies

$$P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = 0 \text{ if } \vec{k} \neq \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \dots + \vec{k}_p; \quad (51)$$

$$P(\gamma \cdot \vec{k}, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}_1, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}_2, \dots, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}_p) = P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \text{ for all } \gamma \in \text{O}(2) \quad (52)$$

where $\vec{k} \in A(\kappa)$ and $\vec{k}_j \in A(\kappa)$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$. The restriction of \mathcal{F} to $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})} \quad (53)$$

is accomplished by choosing $a(\vec{k})$ in (48) so that $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$; the appropriate form of $a(\vec{k})$ depends on the specific mode interaction.

Table 1. Examples of Binary Mode Interactions

κ^2	(l_1, n_1)	(l_2, n_2)	Type
25	(5,0)	(4,3)	[4,8]
50	(7,1)	(5,5)	[8,4]
65	(8,1)	(7,4)	[8,8]

We consider binary mode interactions comprised of two irreducible representations of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$, $\tilde{V}_{(l_1, n_1)}$ and $\tilde{V}_{(l_2, n_2)}$, such that

$$\kappa^2 = l_1^2 + n_1^2 = l_2^2 + n_2^2 \quad (54)$$

and $l_1 > l_2$. For simplicity write \tilde{V}_i for $\tilde{V}_{(l_i, n_i)}$ so that

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) = \tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2. \quad (55)$$

There are three possibilities in (55) which we refer to as the [4, 8] mode interaction, the [8, 8] mode interaction, and the [8, 4] mode interaction. The first integer gives the dimension of \tilde{V}_1 and the second integer gives the dimension of \tilde{V}_2 . Table 1 gives an example of each type. Note that the condition (54) does not allow a [4, 4] mode interaction between two four-dimensional representations.

The relevant hidden rotations connect the representations \tilde{V}_1 and \tilde{V}_2 . For example, in terms of the angles $\tan \theta_1 = n_1/l_1$ and $\tan \theta_2 = n_2/l_2$ characterizing the two representations, we define $\phi \equiv \theta_2 - \theta_1$. The rotation $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$ is not an element of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ and it matches our

earlier description of a hidden symmetry on a subspace:

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] \neq \{0\}. \quad (56)$$

Thus there are non-zero vectors $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that $\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. It turns out that for the binary mode interactions considered here, the subspace in (56) is the fixed point subspace for an isotropy subgroup of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ and therefore any $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field \tilde{F} leaves $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ invariant. Our main result is that the necessary and sufficient condition for \tilde{F} to extend to a Euclidean symmetric vector field is simply that \tilde{F} commutes with $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ on the subspace $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ for all $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \in \mathcal{E}(2)$. Obviously this requirement is nontrivial only for those rotations not in $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ for which $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] \neq \{0\}$.

Theorem 3.1 *Assume $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ is $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -irreducible and $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) = \tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2$ carries an reducible representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ with $l_1 > l_2$ and $\kappa^2 = l_1^2 + n_1^2 = l_2^2 + n_2^2$. For a homogeneous $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$, there exists an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector field, $\mathcal{F} : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$, such that*

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})} \quad (57)$$

if and only if, for all $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \in \mathcal{E}(2)$, \tilde{F} satisfies

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi) \quad (58)$$

for $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$.

Proof.

The necessity of (58) will be proved here. Sufficiency follows by analyzing the three types of mode interaction separately. This is done in the following subsections; see Lemmas III.3, III.6, and III.9. Since $\gamma \cdot \mathcal{F}(\Phi) = \mathcal{F}(\gamma \cdot \Phi)$ for all

$\gamma \in \mathcal{E}(2)$ and $\Phi \in E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$, then

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \mathcal{F}(\Phi) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi). \quad (59)$$

For $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ then $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ so if \tilde{F} denotes the restriction of \mathcal{F} to $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ we can write:

$$\mathcal{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\Phi) \quad (60)$$

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi), \quad (61)$$

and substitute in (59). Hence (59) becomes (58). \square

3.1 The [4, 8]-mode interaction

In the notation of section II.B, the four-dimensional representation $(l_1, n_1) = (l_1, 0)$

$$\tilde{V}_1 = \{z_1 \Phi_{\vec{q}_1}(\vec{r}) + z_2 \Phi_{\vec{q}_2}(\vec{r}) + cc \mid (z_1, z_2) \in \mathbf{C}^2\}, \quad (62)$$

has wave vectors $\vec{q}_1 = (l_1, 0)$ and $\vec{q}_2 = (0, l_1)$. The eight-dimensional representation (l_2, n_2)

$$\tilde{V}_2 = \{(w_1 \Phi_{\vec{p}_1}(\vec{r}) + w_2 \Phi_{\vec{p}_2}(\vec{r}) + w_3 \Phi_{\vec{p}_3}(\vec{r}) + w_4 \Phi_{\vec{p}_4}(\vec{r}) + cc \mid (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) \in \mathbf{C}^4\} \quad (63)$$

has wave vectors $\vec{p}_1 = (l_2, n_2)$, $\vec{p}_2 = (l_2, -n_2)$, $\vec{p}_3 = (n_2, l_2)$ and $\vec{p}_4 = (n_2, -l_2)$. The reducible representation of $D_4 + T^2$ on the twelve-dimensional space $\tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2$ is generated by

$$\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w) = (\bar{z}_1, z_2, \bar{w}_2, \bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_4, \bar{w}_3) \quad (64)$$

$$\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w) = (z_2, z_1, w_3, \bar{w}_4, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \quad (65)$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w) = (e^{-il_1 a} z_1, e^{-il_1 b} z_2, e^{-i(l_2 a + n_2 b)} w_1, e^{-i(l_2 a - n_2 b)} w_2, e^{-i(n_2 a + l_2 b)} w_3, e^{-i(n_2 a - l_2 b)} w_4) \quad (66)$$

where $z \equiv (z_1, z_2)$ and $w \equiv (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$. We will also refer to the reflection $\gamma_3 \equiv \gamma_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_2$ which acts by

$$\gamma_3 \cdot (z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) = (z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_2, w_1, w_4, w_3). \quad (67)$$

Our discussion is based on a convenient representation for vector fields that commute with this representation.

Proposition 3.1 \tilde{F} is $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant if and only if it has the form

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f(z, w) \\ f(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h(z, w) \\ h(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h(\gamma_2 \gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f(z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) \\ f(z_2, z_1, w_3, \bar{w}_4, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \\ h(z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) \\ h(z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_2, w_1, w_4, w_3) \\ h(z_2, z_1, w_3, \bar{w}_4, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \\ h(\bar{z}_2, z_1, w_4, \bar{w}_3, w_2, \bar{w}_1) \end{pmatrix} \quad (68)$$

where $f(z, w)$ and $h(z, w)$ are complex-valued functions satisfying following conditions:

1. $f(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \overline{f(z, w)}$ and $h(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \overline{h(z, w)}$
2. $f(z, w)$ is γ_3 -invariant:

$$f(z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) = f(z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_2, w_1, w_4, w_3) \quad (69)$$

3. $\bar{z}_1 f(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 h(z, w)$ are invariant under the translations T^2 .

Proof.

See the appendix. \square

If $f(z, w)$ and $h(z, w)$ are functions satisfying the conditions of this theorem, we write

$$\tilde{F} = [f, h] \quad (70)$$

to indicate the corresponding $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetric vector field (68).

For $D_4 + T^2$ -symmetric vector fields $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$, we can assume f and h are homogeneous functions with no essential loss of generality. A $\{T^2, \gamma_3\}$ -invariant function such as $\bar{z}_1 f$ can always be written in the form $M(z, w) + M(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w))$ where $M(z, w)$ is T^2 -invariant. For homogeneous f we can reduce to the case where $M(z, w) = \bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ is a monomial and

$$f(z, w) = m(z, w) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)). \quad (71)$$

Similarly when h is homogeneous, then we can reduce to the case of single monomial

$$h(z, w) = m'(z, w) \quad (72)$$

where $M(z, w) = \bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ is a T^2 -invariant monomial. Henceforth we shall assume f and h have the simple forms given in (71) and (72) respectively.

The T^2 -invariant monomials are important in characterizing the vector field \tilde{F} . For the representation (66) there are the elementary quadratic invariants given by

$$\sigma_i = |z_i|^2 \quad (73)$$

$$\rho_i = |w_i|^2. \quad (74)$$

For the general case it is convenient to introduce the notation

$$\Omega_i^{\mu_i} \equiv \begin{cases} z_i^{\mu_i} & \text{if } \mu_i \geq 0 \\ \bar{z}_i^{|\mu_i|} & \text{if } \mu_i < 0 \end{cases} \quad (75)$$

$$\omega_i^{\nu_i} \equiv \begin{cases} w_i^{\nu_i} & \text{if } \nu_i \geq 0 \\ \bar{w}_i^{|\nu_i|} & \text{if } \nu_i < 0. \end{cases} \quad (76)$$

Proposition 3.2 *A T^2 -invariant monomial $M(z, w)$ can always be written in the form*

$$M(z, w) = (\sigma_1^{\mu'_1} \sigma_2^{\mu'_2} \rho_1^{\nu'_1} \rho_2^{\nu'_2} \rho_3^{\nu'_3} \rho_4^{\nu'_4}) \Omega_1^{\mu_1} \Omega_2^{\mu_2} \omega_1^{\nu_1} \omega_2^{\nu_2} \omega_3^{\nu_3} \omega_4^{\nu_4} \quad (77)$$

where $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu_4)$ are integers satisfying

$$l_1\mu_1 + l_2(\nu_1 + \nu_2) + n_2(\nu_3 + \nu_4) = 0 \quad (78)$$

$$l_1\mu_2 + n_2(\nu_1 - \nu_2) + l_2(\nu_3 - \nu_4) = 0 \quad (79)$$

and the integers $(\mu'_1, \mu'_2, \nu'_1, \nu'_2, \nu'_3, \nu'_4)$ are non-negative.

Proof.

See the Appendix. \square

The geometry of the wave vector set (25)

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) = \{\pm\vec{q}_1, \pm\vec{q}_2, \pm\vec{p}_1, \pm\vec{p}_2, \pm\vec{p}_3, \pm\vec{p}_4\} \quad (80)$$

is important for our analysis, see Fig. 1. Since $\theta_1 = 0$ in this case, we have $\phi = \theta_2 = \arctan(n_2/l_2)$; for this mode interaction it is sufficient to restrict attention to ϕ . Let α denote the angle between \vec{p}_3 and \vec{p}_1 , a notable feature of Fig. 1 is that α and ϕ are unequal. Since $\cos\phi = l_2/\kappa$ and $\cos\alpha = 2l_2n_2/\kappa^2$, these angles are only equal when $2n_2 = \kappa$ which would imply $3n_2^2 = l_2^2$. Since l_2 and n_2 are integers, this is impossible. Because ϕ and α are unequal, the set $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ satisfies

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm\vec{q}_1, \pm\vec{q}_2, \pm\vec{p}_1, \pm\vec{p}_4\} \quad (81)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm\vec{q}_1, \pm\vec{q}_2, \pm\vec{p}_2, \pm\vec{p}_3\}. \quad (82)$$

The non-zero intersections (81) and (82) imply that $\mathcal{R}(\pm\phi)E^c$ intersects E^c along eight-dimensional subspaces²:

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) \quad (83)$$

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0). \quad (84)$$

²The abbreviated notation $(z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4)$ denotes the subspace $\{(z_1\Phi_{\vec{q}_1}(\vec{r}) + z_2\Phi_{\vec{q}_2}(\vec{r}) + w_1\Phi_{\vec{p}_1}(\vec{r}) + w_4\Phi_{\vec{p}_4}(\vec{r}) + cc) \mid (z_1, z_2, w_1, w_4) \in \mathbf{C}^4\}$.

These subspaces are related by reflection symmetry; for example since $\gamma_3 \cdot (z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = (z_1, \bar{z}_2, 0, w_1, w_4, 0)$ we have

$$\gamma_3 : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]. \quad (85)$$

Proposition 3.3 *For the representation (64)-(66), the subspaces $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ and $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ are fixed point subspaces for isotropy subgroups of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$; hence they are invariant under any $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetric vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$. This invariance implies*

$$h(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = 0. \quad (86)$$

Proof.

Since $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ and $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ are related by reflection, if $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ is the fixed point subspace $\text{Fix}(\Sigma)$ for an isotropy subgroup Σ then $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ is the fixed point subspace for $\gamma_3 \Sigma \gamma_3$. Thus it is sufficient to consider (84) with Σ the isotropy subgroup for $(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)$. Let $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \in \Sigma$, then $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)$, or

$$e^{-il_1 a} = 1 \quad e^{-il_1 b} = 1 \quad (87)$$

$$e^{-i(l_2 a - n_2 b)} = 1 \quad e^{-i(n_2 a + l_2 b)} = 1. \quad (88)$$

The (z_1, z_2) equations require

$$(a, b) = \left(\frac{2\pi a'}{l_1}, \frac{2\pi b'}{l_1} \right) \quad (89)$$

where (a', b') are arbitrary integers, and the (w_2, w_3) equations require

$$\frac{(l_2 a' - n_2 b')}{l_1} = s_1 \quad (90)$$

$$\frac{n_2 a' + l_2 b'}{l_1} = s_2 \quad (91)$$

where (s_1, s_2) are integers. Since $l_1^2 = \kappa^2$ and $(\cos \phi, \sin \phi) = (l_2/\kappa, n_2/\kappa)$, if we regard (a', b') and (s_1, s_2) as vectors then (90)-(91) are equivalent to $\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot (a', b') = (s_1, s_2)$. If we seek solutions in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ then $(a', b') \in \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]$ or

$$(a', b') \in \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{p}_2, \pm \vec{p}_3\} \quad (92)$$

from (82). The translation corresponding to $(a', b') = \vec{p}_2$ provides a necessary condition for $(z, w) \in \text{Fix}(\Sigma)$: $\mathcal{T}_{(2\pi l_2/l_1, -2\pi n_2/l_1)} \cdot (z, w) = (z, w)$ or

$$e^{-i2\pi(l_2^2 - n_2^2)/l_1} w_1 = w_1 \quad e^{-i2\pi(2l_2 n_2)/l_1} w_4 = w_4. \quad (93)$$

Since neither $(l_2^2 - n_2^2)/l_1$ nor $(2l_2 n_2)/l_1$ can be an integer, the necessary condition (93) implies $w_1 = 0$ and $w_4 = 0$. By definition this is also a sufficient condition for $(z, w) \in \text{Fix}(\Sigma)$ so $\text{Fix}(\Sigma) = (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)$ or equivalently

$$\text{Fix}(\Sigma) = E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]. \quad (94)$$

The invariance of fixed point subspaces is a well known property and for $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)$ this invariance implies (86) from (84) and (68). \square

When \tilde{F} is obtained by restriction from \mathcal{F} there are additional conditions on f and h . For example we know from (58) that \tilde{F} commutes with $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$. This implies a crucial relationship between f and h .

Proposition 3.4 *For a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$, the condition*

$$\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \Phi) \quad (95)$$

for all $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ is satisfied if and only if

$$f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2), \quad (96)$$

or equivalently

$$h(z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = f(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, z_1, z_2, 0). \quad (97)$$

Proof.

We will verify that (96) is necessary and sufficient; condition (97) follows from (96) by relabeling arguments. In coordinates, $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ is represented as $\Phi = (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \Phi = (w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2)$. Since $h(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = 0$ from (86) we have

$$\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} h(z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_2, 0, 0, w_3) \\ h(z_2, z_1, w_3, 0, 0, \bar{w}_2) \\ f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ f(\bar{z}_2, \bar{z}_1, \bar{w}_3, 0, 0, w_2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (98)$$

and

$$\tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \Phi) = \begin{pmatrix} f(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) \\ f(w_3, w_2, 0, z_2, z_1, 0) \\ h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ h(\bar{w}_3, w_2, \bar{z}_2, 0, 0, \bar{z}_1) \end{pmatrix} \quad (99)$$

from Propositions III.1 and III.3. Comparing (98) and (99) we find equality if and only if

$$h(z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_2, 0, 0, w_3) = f(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) \quad (100)$$

$$h(z_2, z_1, w_3, 0, 0, \bar{w}_2) = f(w_3, w_2, 0, z_2, z_1, 0) \quad (101)$$

$$f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) \quad (102)$$

$$f(\bar{z}_2, \bar{z}_1, \bar{w}_3, 0, 0, w_2) = h(\bar{w}_3, w_2, \bar{z}_2, 0, 0, \bar{z}_1). \quad (103)$$

These four conditions are not independent: (103) is obtained from (100) by simply relabeling arguments, similarly (101) is obtained from (102). Furthermore (100) is equivalent to (102); this follows from the γ_3 -invariance of f (69) and a relabeling of arguments. Thus (102) is a necessary and sufficient condition for (95). \square

From (48)-(50) we can represent those homogeneous $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -symmetric vector fields that arise by restricting $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -symmetric vector fields \mathcal{F} . The restriction in (53) is accomplished by choosing $a(\vec{k})$ in (48) so that $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$:

$$\begin{aligned} a(\vec{k}) = & z_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_1} + \bar{z}_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_1} + z_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_2} + \bar{z}_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_2} + w_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_1} + \bar{w}_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_1} \\ & + w_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_2} + \bar{w}_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_2} + w_3 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_3} + \bar{w}_3 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_3} + w_4 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_4} + \bar{w}_4 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_4} \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

where $\delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}}$ equals one if $\vec{k} = \vec{q}$ and zero otherwise (the two-dimensional Kronecker delta). This determines a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that f and h are homogeneous functions of degree p :

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (105)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (106)$$

where $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ is given in (80). When f and h are determined by monomials as in (71) and (72) then these expressions become

$$m(z, w) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (107)$$

$$m'(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (108)$$

The essential problem of extension from \tilde{F} to \mathcal{F} is formulated in terms of these equations: if we choose monomials m and m' in (71) and (72), does there exist a function P , satisfying conditions (51)-(52), such that (107) and (108) will hold? We answer this by analyzing a specific procedure for constructing P .

As a motivating example, consider the case of extending a linear vector field \tilde{F} . For arbitrary real constants λ and λ' let $m(z, w) = \lambda z_1/2$ and $m'(z, w) = \lambda' w_1$ so that $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ are T^2 -invariant, and from (71) and (72), we have $f(z, w) = \lambda z_1$ and $h(z, w) = \lambda' w_1$. This determines $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ the most general *linear* $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field:

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda z_1 \\ \lambda z_2 \\ \lambda' w_1 \\ \lambda' w_2 \\ \lambda' w_3 \\ \lambda' w_4 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (109)$$

Note that the condition (96) is not satisfied unless we impose $\lambda = \lambda'$; in which case it is possible to extend \tilde{F} to \mathcal{F} by taking

$$P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1) = \lambda \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_1, \kappa^2}. \quad (110)$$

This choice clearly satisfies the conditions (51)-(52) since $\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_1$ is $O(2)$ -invariant and $P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1) = 0$ unless $\vec{k} = \vec{k}_1$. It is also straightforward to verify that we recover f and h :

$$\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1) = \lambda \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \delta_{\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_1, \kappa^2}$$

$$= \lambda a(\vec{q}_1) = \lambda z_1 = f(z, w) \quad (111)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1) &= \lambda \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \delta_{\vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_1, \kappa^2} \\ &= \lambda a(\vec{p}_1) = \lambda w_1 = h(z, w). \end{aligned} \quad (112)$$

In this example the necessary condition (96) is also sufficient; this turns out to be true for the nonlinear case as well.

The procedure of constructing P as in (110) can be generalized and formalized. The technique is to identify the set of wave vectors characteristic of a monomial $m(z, w)$ and then use inner products between the wave vectors to obtain an $O(2)$ -invariant description of the monomial. This $O(2)$ -invariant description is formalized in the function P . In (104) each mode amplitude $(z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$ and its complex conjugate is associated with a distinct wave vector in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$, so the amplitudes in a monomial $m(z, w)$ determine an associated wave vector set for that monomial. For example $m(z, w) = z_1 z_2 \bar{w}_3$ is associated with $\{\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, -\vec{p}_3\}$ and $m(z, w) = z_1 |z_1|^2 z_2 \bar{w}_3$ is associated with $\{\pm \vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_2, -\vec{p}_3\}$. Note that we list each vector only once. Thus for an arbitrary monomial $m(z, w)$ of degree p the associated wave vector set $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ is a subset of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ with $n \leq p$.

We shall establish that (107) and (108) can be satisfied separately using different functions P_f and P_h . Then we show that it is possible to satisfy (107) and (108) simultaneously with a single function P only when f and h satisfy the condition (96).

The inner products amongst the vectors in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ are used below to specify subsets of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$. Given a vector $\vec{c}_i \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)$ denote the reflection in $\mathcal{E}(2)$ that fixes \vec{c}_i by $\gamma_{\vec{c}_i}$, i.e.

$$\gamma_{\vec{c}_i} \cdot \vec{c}_i = \vec{c}_i. \quad (113)$$

For example, $\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} = \gamma_3$, $\gamma_{\vec{q}_2} = \tilde{\gamma}_1$, and $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} = \mathcal{R}(\phi)\gamma_3\mathcal{R}(-\phi)$. Thus $\gamma_{\vec{q}_1}$ and $\gamma_{\vec{q}_2}$ leave $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$

invariant, but for \vec{p}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ we have:

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_4} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_4\} \quad (114)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_2} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_3} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{p}_2, \pm \vec{p}_3\}. \quad (115)$$

Proposition 3.5 *Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote a fixed subset of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$. Given (\vec{k}, \vec{k}') , let $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ denote a second set of n vectors in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ required to satisfy the conditions:*

$$\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i = \vec{k}' \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (116)$$

$$\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (117)$$

1. *If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_1)$, then the conditions (116)-(117) can be satisfied in only one way:*

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (118)$$

unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \quad (119)$$

in which case there is a second (not necessarily distinct) solution:

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (120)$$

2. *If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_1)$, then the conditions (116)-(117) have only two (not necessarily distinct) solutions:*

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (121)$$

and

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (122)$$

3. If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{q}_1, \vec{p}_1)$, then the conditions (116)-(117) have no solutions unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]. \quad (123)$$

When (123) holds then there are two (not necessarily distinct) solutions:

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi)\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (124)$$

and

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (125)$$

4. If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{p}_1, \vec{q}_1)$, then the conditions (116)-(117) have only two (not necessarily distinct) solutions:

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ \gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]. \end{cases} \quad (126)$$

Otherwise there are no solutions.

Proof.

See the appendix. \square

Corollary 3.1 *If the monomial $\overline{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ is T^2 -invariant and the wave vector set $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ for $m'(z, w)$ satisfies*

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)], \quad (127)$$

then $m'(z, w)$ must have the form

$$m'(z, w) = w_1 |w_1|^{2\nu'_1} |w_4|^{2\nu'_4}. \quad (128)$$

This implies

$$\begin{aligned}
m'(z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) &= m'(z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) \\
&= m'(0, 0, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) \\
&= m'(0, 0, w_1, 0, 0, \bar{w}_4).
\end{aligned} \tag{129}$$

Proof.

Since $\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\bar{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_4\}$, the assumption in (127) implies that $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ depends only on the amplitudes $(w_1, \bar{w}_1, w_4, \bar{w}_4)$. Then Proposition III.2 asserts that (ν'_1, ν'_4) are the only possible non-zero exponents so that

$$\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w) = |w_1|^{2\nu'_1} |w_4|^{2\nu'_4} \tag{130}$$

with $\nu'_1 \geq 1$ and $\nu'_4 \geq 0$. Relabeling $\nu'_1 \rightarrow \nu'_1 + 1$ gives (128). \square

Corollary 3.2 *If the monomial $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ is T^2 -invariant. Then $f(z, w) = m(z, w) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w))$ satisfies*

$$f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = \begin{cases} 2m(z, 0) & \text{if } m(z, 0) \neq 0 \\ m(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) & \text{if } m(z, 0) = 0 \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)) & \text{if } m(z, 0) = 0 \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{131}$$

where $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ is the wave vector set for $m(z, w)$.

Proof.

By definition

$$f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = m(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)). \quad (132)$$

The first term vanishes unless $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]$ and the second term vanishes unless $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]$. Both terms can be non-zero only if $m(z, w)$ is independent of w or equivalently $m(z, 0) \neq 0$; in this case $m(z, 0) = m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, 0))$ so (132) yields $2m(z, 0)$. \square

Lemma 3.1 *Let $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ be T^2 -invariant monomials of degree p such that $f(z, w) = m(z, w) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w))$ and $h(z, w) = m'(z, w)$ meet the conditions of Proposition III.1. There exist functions P_f and P_h satisfying (51)-(52) such that*

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (133)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (134)$$

and

$$\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = f(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, z_1, z_2, 0) \quad (135)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ &= \begin{cases} h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) & \text{if } h(0, w) \neq 0 \\ h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) + h(w_1, w_4, z_1, 0, 0, z_2) & \text{if } h(0, w) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (136) \end{aligned}$$

where $a(\vec{k})$ is given by (104).

Proof.

The procedure for constructing P_f and P_h is essentially the same so we present it in detail only for P_h .

1. Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote the wave vector set associated with the monomial $m'(z, w)$ used to define $h(z, w)$; note that $n \leq p$ since $m'(z, w)$ has degree p . In order to allow for monomials satisfying the special condition (119), define the numerical factor

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \neq \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (137)$$

the $\epsilon = 1/2$ monomials are described in Corollary III.1. First we define P_h when $n = p$, then $m'(z, w)$ is entirely specified by its wave vector set:

$$m'(z, w) = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) \quad (n = p). \quad (138)$$

The inner product relations for $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$,

$$\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i = \vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (139)$$

$$\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (140)$$

determine our choice for $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$:

$$P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \epsilon \prod_{i=1}^p \prod_{j=1}^p \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i, \vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i} \delta_{\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j, \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j} \quad (n = p). \quad (141)$$

The $O(2)$ -invariance of P_h required by (52) is assured by the $O(2)$ -invariance of the inner product. Translation symmetry required by (51) is discussed below. By Proposition III.5, if $\epsilon = 1/2$ then

$$P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (142)$$

and if $\epsilon = 1$ then

$$P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (143)$$

Thus for $\epsilon = 1$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) \\ = m'(z, w) \\ = h(z, w), \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

and for $\epsilon = 1/2$ the same sum can be evaluated using Corollary III.1 to give the same result

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ = \frac{1}{2} [a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) + a(\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_1) a(\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_2) \dots a(\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_n)] \\ = \frac{1}{2} [m'(0, 0, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) + m'(0, 0, w_1, 0, 0, \bar{w}_4)] \\ = \frac{1}{2} [m'(z, w) + m'(z, w)] \\ = h(z, w). \end{aligned} \quad (145)$$

This verifies (134) for the case $n = p$. From Proposition III.5 we can evaluate $P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ similarly.

$$P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi)\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (146)$$

When

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \not\subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)], \quad (147)$$

then $P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = 0$ in (146) and the left hand side of (136) is zero.

The right hand side is also zero since (147) implies $h(z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = 0$.

Now consider (136) when

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]. \quad (148)$$

If $h(0, w) = m'(0, w) = 0$, then $\epsilon = 1$ and $\gamma_{p\vec{1}}\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \neq \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$;

in this case we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ &= [a(\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{c}_1) a(\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{c}_2) \dots a(\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{c}_n) + \\ & \quad a(\gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{c}_1) a(\gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{c}_2) \dots a(\gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{c}_n)] \\ &= [m'(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) + m'(w_1, w_4, z_1, 0, 0, z_2)] \\ &= [h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) + h(w_1, w_4, z_1, 0, 0, z_2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

If $h(0, w) = m'(0, w) \neq 0$, then m' is described in Corollary III.1, and the two terms in (149) are equal. If $\epsilon = 1$, then the sets $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ in (146)

are identical and we get only one term from the sum in (149). If $\epsilon = 1/2$ the

sets $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ in (146) are distinct and we get both terms in (149).

Either way the result is the same:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ &= \begin{cases} m'(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) & \text{if } \epsilon = 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} [m'(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) + m'(w_1, w_4, z_1, 0, 0, z_2)] & \text{if } \epsilon = 1/2 \end{cases} \\ &= m'(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) \\ &= h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

This verifies (136) for the case $n = p$.

2. This construction of P_h easily extends to the general case with $n \leq p$. For these monomials the expression (138) for $m'(z, w)$ becomes

$$m'(z, w) = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) a(\vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}) \dots a(\vec{c}_{l_p}) \quad (151)$$

where the subscripts $\{l_{n+1}, \dots, l_p\}$ depend on the monomial m' considered. Noting that the inner product relations $\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j} = \kappa^2$ for $j = n+1, \dots, p$ require $\vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_{l_j}$ we replace (141) by

$$P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \epsilon \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i, \vec{p}_i \cdot \vec{c}_i} \delta_{\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j, \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j} \right) \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^p \delta_{\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j}, \kappa^2} \right). \quad (152)$$

Then the previous calculations generalize immediately by making the obvious changes. For example for $\epsilon = 1$ (143) becomes

$$P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (153)$$

so when we evaluate the sum in (144) we still find

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ &= a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) \sum_{\vec{k}_{n+1} \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_{n+1}) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^p \delta_{\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j}, \kappa^2} \right) \\ &= a(\vec{c}_1) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) a(\vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}) \dots a(\vec{c}_{l_p}) \\ &= m'(z, w) \\ &= h(z, w). \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

3. It remains to verify that $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ in (152) satisfies the requirement of translation symmetry in (51). It suffices to prove that

$$\vec{k} = \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \dots + \vec{k}_p \quad (155)$$

holds whenever $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \neq 0$. Note that since $|\vec{k}| = \kappa = |\vec{p}_1|$ in (155) we can always rotate the arguments of P_h so that $\vec{k} = \vec{p}_1$ using the $O(2)$ -invariance of P_h :

$$P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = P_h(\vec{p}_1, \mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \vec{k}_1, \dots, \mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \vec{k}_p). \quad (156)$$

where $\vec{k} = \mathcal{R}(-\theta) \cdot \vec{p}_1$. Thus we need only verify (51) for the specific case $\vec{k} = \vec{p}_1$. By Proposition III.5 $P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \neq 0$ can only occur if

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \quad (157)$$

or

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\}. \quad (158)$$

If we express $\overline{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ in the notation of Proposition III.2, then

$$m'(z, w) = \frac{\sigma_1^{\mu'_1} \sigma_2^{\mu'_2} \rho_1^{\nu'_1} \rho_2^{\nu'_2} \rho_3^{\nu'_3} \rho_4^{\nu'_4} \Omega_1^{\mu_1} \Omega_2^{\mu_2} \omega_1^{\nu_1} \omega_2^{\nu_2} \omega_3^{\nu_3} \omega_4^{\nu_4}}{\overline{w}_1} \quad (159)$$

and from (151) and (78)-(79)

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{c}_1 + \vec{c}_2 + \dots + \vec{c}_n + \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}} + \dots + \vec{c}_{l_p} &= \mu_1 \vec{q}_1 + \mu_2 \vec{q}_2 + (\nu_1 + 1)\vec{p}_1 + \nu_2 \vec{p}_2 + \nu_3 \vec{p}_3 + \nu_4 \vec{p}_4 \\ &= \mu_1 (l_1, 0) + \mu_2 (0, l_1) + (\nu_1 + 1)(l_2, n_2) + \\ &\quad \nu_2(l_2, -n_2) + \nu_3(n_2, l_2) + \nu_4(n_2, -l_2) \\ &= (l_2, n_2) = \vec{p}_1. \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

Since $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{p}_1 = \vec{p}_1$ this implies

$$\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot (\vec{c}_1 + \vec{c}_2 + \dots + \vec{c}_n + \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}} + \dots + \vec{c}_{l_p}) = \vec{p}_1. \quad (161)$$

Thus for $\vec{k} = \vec{p}_1$, both possible solutions (157)-(158) satisfy the condition (155). This proves that $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ satisfies the condition (51).

4. For $P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ we let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote the wave vector set associated with the monomial $m(z, w)$ used to define $f(z, w) = m(z, w) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w))$. Since f is defined to have two terms even when $m(z, w)$ and $m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w))$ are identical, no numerical factor ϵ is required in this case. The monomial $m(z, w)$ can be written as

$$m(z, w) = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) a(\vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}) \dots a(\vec{c}_{l_p}) \quad (162)$$

in analogy with (151), and using the inner product relations,

$$\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i = \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (163)$$

$$\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (164)$$

we define P_f :

$$P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i, \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i} \delta_{\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j, \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j} \right) \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^p \delta_{\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j}, \kappa^2} \right). \quad (165)$$

It then follows from Proposition III.5 that for $\vec{k} = \vec{q}_1$ and $\vec{k} = \vec{p}_1$ we have

$$P_f(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 1 & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (166)$$

and

$$P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 1 & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (167)$$

respectively. Note that *both* contributions in (167) arise for the same monomial when $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \{\pm\vec{q}_1, \pm\vec{q}_2\}$ or equivalently $m(z, 0) \neq 0$. From (166) the relation in (133) follows immediately, and we evaluate the sum in (135) using (167) and Corollary III.2:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\
&= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} m(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, 0, 0, 0) + & \text{if } m(z, 0) \neq 0 \\ m(w_1, w_4, 0, 0, 0, 0) & \\ \\ m(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, z_1, z_2, 0) & \text{if } m(z, 0) = 0 \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ \\ m(w_1, w_4, z_1, 0, 0, z_2) & \text{if } m(z, 0) = 0 \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right. \\
&= \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} m(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, 0, 0, 0) + & \text{if } m(z, 0) \neq 0 \\ m(\gamma_3 \cdot (w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, 0, 0, 0)) & \\ \\ m(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, z_1, z_2, 0) & \text{if } m(z, 0) = 0 \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ \\ m(\gamma_3 \cdot (w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, z_1, z_2, 0)) & \text{if } m(z, 0) = 0 \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \\ \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right. \\
&= f(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, z_1, z_2, 0). \tag{168}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally the translation symmetry (51) of P_f can be proved as in the case of P_h . \square

Lemma 3.2 *Let $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ be T^2 -invariant monomials of degree p such that $f(z, w) = m(z, w) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w))$ and $h(z, w) = m'(z, w)$ meet the conditions of Proposition*

III.1. *There exists a single function P satisfying (51)-(52) such that*

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (169)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (170)$$

if and only if

$$f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2). \quad (171)$$

Proof.

The necessity of (171) is established by Proposition III.4 and the proof of necessity in Theorem III.1. Assume that (171) holds and let $P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ and $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ be the functions of Lemma III.1 for f and h respectively.

1. If $f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = 0$ then $h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) = 0$ and

$$0 = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (172)$$

$$0 = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (173)$$

from (135)-(136). In this case we can define

$$P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \equiv P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) + P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p); \quad (174)$$

the equations (169)-(170) then follow from (133)-(134) and (172)-(173).

2. If instead $f(z_1, z_2, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) \neq 0$ then $h(w_2, w_3, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_2) \neq 0$ and the monomial $m'(z, w)$ must be independent of $(w_2, w_3, \bar{w}_2, \bar{w}_3)$:

$$m'(z_1, z_2, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) = m'(z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) \neq 0. \quad (175)$$

In this case we define $P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \equiv P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$; this gives (169) by construction, and the right hand side of (170) can be evaluated using (135):

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \bar{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \bar{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) &= f(w_1, \bar{w}_4, 0, z_1, z_2, 0) \\
&= h(z_1, z_2, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) \\
&= h(z, w). \tag{176}
\end{aligned}$$

This verifies (170). \square

Lemma 3.3 *For a homogeneous vector field \tilde{F} , equivariant with respect to the representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ in (64)-(66), there exists a $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -symmetric vector field \mathcal{F} on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that*

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})} \tag{177}$$

if and only if for all $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \in \mathcal{E}(2)$

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi) \tag{178}$$

for $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$.

Proof.

The proof that (178) is a necessary condition was given after Theorem III.1. The sufficiency of (178) follows from the observation that \tilde{F} is a sum of the elementary vector fields $[f, h]$

$$f(z, w) = m(z, w) + m(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) \tag{179}$$

$$h(z, w) = m'(z, w) \tag{180}$$

considered in Lemma III.2. The general vector field \tilde{F} can be extended to \mathcal{F} if each of the elementary vector fields extends as in Lemma III.2. By Proposition III.4 the necessary and sufficient condition of Lemma III.2 for these extensions is given by (178) with $\theta = \phi$. \square

3.2 The [8, 8]-mode interaction

For the binary mode interaction between two eight-dimensional representations we have for (l_1, n_1)

$$\tilde{V}_1 = \{(z_1 \Phi_{\vec{q}_1}(\vec{r}) + z_2 \Phi_{\vec{q}_2}(\vec{r}) + z_3 \Phi_{\vec{q}_3}(\vec{r}) + z_4 \Phi_{\vec{q}_4}(\vec{r}) + cc) \mid (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \in \mathbf{C}^4\}, \quad (181)$$

with wave vectors $\vec{q}_1 = (l_1, n_1)$, $\vec{q}_2 = (l_1, -n_1)$, $\vec{q}_3 = (n_1, l_1)$ and $\vec{q}_4 = (n_1, -l_1)$, and for (l_2, n_2)

$$\tilde{V}_2 = \{(w_1 \Phi_{\vec{p}_1}(\vec{r}) + w_2 \Phi_{\vec{p}_2}(\vec{r}) + w_3 \Phi_{\vec{p}_3}(\vec{r}) + w_4 \Phi_{\vec{p}_4}(\vec{r}) + cc) \mid (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) \in \mathbf{C}^4\} \quad (182)$$

with wave vectors $\vec{p}_1 = (l_2, n_2)$, $\vec{p}_2 = (l_2, -n_2)$, $\vec{p}_3 = (n_2, l_2)$ and $\vec{p}_4 = (n_2, -l_2)$. The reducible representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ on the sixteen-dimensional space $\tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2$ is generated by

$$\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w) = (\bar{z}_2, \bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_4, \bar{z}_3, \bar{w}_2, \bar{w}_1, \bar{w}_4, \bar{w}_3) \quad (183)$$

$$\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w) = (z_3, \bar{z}_4, z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_3, \bar{w}_4, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \quad (184)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w) = & (e^{-i(l_1 a + n_1 b)} z_1, e^{-i(l_1 a - n_1 b)} z_2, e^{-i(n_1 a + l_1 b)} z_3, e^{-i(n_1 a - l_1 b)} z_4, \\ & e^{-i(l_2 a + n_2 b)} w_1, e^{-i(l_2 a - n_2 b)} w_2, e^{-i(n_2 a + l_2 b)} w_3, e^{-i(n_2 a - l_2 b)} w_4) \end{aligned} \quad (185)$$

where $z \equiv (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$ and $w \equiv (w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4)$.

We adopt the following notation for vector fields that commute with this representation.

Proposition 3.6 \tilde{F} is $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant if and only if it has the form

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f(z, w) \\ f(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) \\ f(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ f(\gamma_2 \gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h(z, w) \\ h(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h(\gamma_2 \gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) \\ f(z_2, z_1, z_4, z_3, w_2, w_1, w_4, w_3) \\ f(z_3, \bar{z}_4, z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_3, \bar{w}_4, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \\ f(\bar{z}_4, z_3, \bar{z}_2, z_1, \bar{w}_4, w_3, \bar{w}_2, w_1) \\ h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4) \\ h(z_2, z_1, z_4, z_3, w_2, w_1, w_4, w_3) \\ h(z_3, \bar{z}_4, z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_3, \bar{w}_4, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \\ h(\bar{z}_4, z_3, \bar{z}_2, z_1, \bar{w}_4, w_3, \bar{w}_2, w_1) \end{pmatrix} \quad (186)$$

where $f(z, w)$ and $h(z, w)$ are complex-valued functions satisfying following conditions:

1. $f(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \overline{f(z, w)}$ and $h(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \overline{h(z, w)}$
2. $\bar{z}_1 f(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 h(z, w)$ are invariant under the translations T^2 .

Proof.

The proof follows that for Proposition III.1. \square

We continue to use the notation $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ to indicate the vector field (186).

For $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -symmetric vector fields $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ such that f and h are homogeneous functions, we can reduce to the case where each function is a single monomial

$$f(z, w) = m(z, w) \quad (187)$$

$$h(z, w) = m'(z, w) \quad (188)$$

where $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ are T^2 -invariant. With the previous notation for the quadratic invariants (73)-(74), these monomials are easily described.

Proposition 3.7 *A T^2 -invariant monomial $M(z, w)$ can always be written in the form*

$$M(z, w) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^4 \sigma_i^{\mu_i} \rho_i^{\nu_i} \right) \Omega_1^{\mu_1} \dots \Omega_4^{\mu_4} \omega_1^{\nu_1} \dots \omega_4^{\nu_4} \quad (189)$$

where $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_4, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_4)$ are integers satisfying

$$l_1(\mu_1 + \mu_2) + n_1(\mu_3 + \mu_4) + l_2(\nu_1 + \nu_2) + n_2(\nu_3 + \nu_4) = 0 \quad (190)$$

$$n_1(\mu_1 - \mu_2) + l_1(\mu_3 - \mu_4) + n_2(\nu_1 - \nu_2) + l_2(\nu_3 - \nu_4) = 0. \quad (191)$$

The geometry of the wave vector set (25)

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) = \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{q}_3, \pm \vec{q}_4, \pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_2, \pm \vec{p}_3, \pm \vec{p}_4\} \quad (192)$$

is shown in Fig. 2. For this mode interaction there are two independent rotations $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$ and $\mathcal{R}(\alpha + \phi)$ that must be taken into account. One can verify that $\phi \neq \alpha$, $2\theta_1$ and $\alpha \neq 2\theta_1$, $2\theta_1 + \phi$, $2\theta_1 - \phi$, and this implies that the set $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ satisfies

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{q}_3, \pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_4\} \quad (193)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_4, \pm \vec{p}_2, \pm \vec{p}_3\} \quad (194)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\alpha + \phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{q}_3, \pm \vec{p}_2, \pm \vec{p}_3\} \quad (195)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\alpha - \phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_4, \pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_4\}. \quad (196)$$

These non-zero intersections show that $\mathcal{R}(\pm\phi)E^c$ and $\mathcal{R}(\pm(\alpha + \phi))E^c$ intersect E^c along eight-dimensional subspaces,

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) \quad (197)$$

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) \quad (198)$$

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\alpha + \phi)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) \quad (199)$$

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\alpha - \phi)E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, 0, 0, w_4), \quad (200)$$

that are related by reflection symmetry:

$$\gamma_3 : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] \quad (201)$$

$$\gamma_3 : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\alpha + \phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\alpha - \phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]. \quad (202)$$

Proposition 3.8 *For the representation (183)-(185), the subspaces (197)-(200) are fixed point subspaces for isotropy subgroups of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$; hence they are invariant under any $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetric vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$. This invariance implies*

$$f(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = f(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = 0 \quad (203)$$

$$h(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = h(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = 0. \quad (204)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that of Proposition III.3. The isotropy subgroup Σ for $(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, 0, 0, w_4)$ contains the translation $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)}$ where

$$(a, b) = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa^2} (l_1 l_2 + n_1 n_2, l_1 n_2 - n_1 l_2). \quad (205)$$

Thus $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w) = (z, w)$ is a necessary condition for $(z, w) \in \text{Fix}(\Sigma)$; this condition implies

$$e^{-i(l_1 a + n_1 b)} z_1 = z_1 \quad e^{-i(n_1 a - l_1 b)} z_4 = z_4 \quad (206)$$

$$e^{-i(l_2 a - n_2 b)} w_2 = w_2 \quad e^{-i(n_2 a + l_2 b)} w_3 = w_3. \quad (207)$$

If $z_1 \neq 0$, then the z_1 equation requires $(l_1 a + n_1 b) = 2\pi$ (integer) or equivalently

$$\frac{l_2}{\kappa} \frac{(l_1^2 - n_1^2)}{\kappa} - \frac{2l_1 n_1}{\kappa} \frac{n_2}{\kappa} = \text{integer}. \quad (208)$$

However since $\cos \theta_2 = l_2/\kappa$, $\cos 2\theta_1 = (l_1^2 - n_1^2)/\kappa$, $\sin \theta_2 = n_2/\kappa$, and $\sin 2\theta_1 = 2l_1n_1/\kappa$, this becomes $\cos(\theta_2 + 2\theta_1) = \text{integer}$ which is impossible. Therefore we must set $z_1 = 0$. In a similar fashion the remaining conditions require $z_4 = w_2 = w_3 = 0$ which proves that

$$\text{Fix}(\Sigma) = (0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, 0, 0, w_4). \quad (209)$$

The proof for $(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_2, w_3, 0)$ is the same with

$$(a, b) = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa^2}(l_1n_2 + n_1, l_2, l_1l_2 - n_1n_2) \quad (210)$$

replacing (205). \square

When \tilde{F} is obtained by restriction from \mathcal{F} there are additional conditions on f and h . For this mode interaction one finds two independent conditions arising from $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ and $\mathcal{R}(\alpha + \phi)$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\alpha + \phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$.

Proposition 3.9 *For $\theta = \phi$ and $\theta = \alpha + \phi$, the condition*

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi) \quad (211)$$

for all $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ is satisfied if and only if

$$f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = h(0, w_2, w_3, 0, z_1, 0, 0, z_4) \quad (212)$$

$$f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = h(w_1, 0, 0, \bar{w}_4, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_4), \quad (213)$$

or equivalently

$$h(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = f(w_1, 0, 0, w_4, 0, z_2, z_3, 0) \quad (214)$$

$$h(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = f(w_1, 0, 0, \bar{w}_4, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_4). \quad (215)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that for Proposition III.4. \square

The restriction in (53) is accomplished by choosing $a(\vec{k})$ in (48) so that $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$:

$$a(\vec{k}) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \left[z_i \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_i} + \bar{z}_i \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_i} + w_i \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_i} + \bar{w}_i \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_i} \right]. \quad (216)$$

This determines a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that f and h are homogeneous functions of degree p ; when f and h are determined by monomials as in (187) and (188) then

$$m(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (217)$$

$$m'(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (218)$$

Given monomials m and m' in (187) and (188), the essential question is whether there exists a function P , satisfying conditions (51)-(52), such that (217) and (218) hold. We answer this as before by constructing P ; the procedure is the same as in the [4,8] mode interaction.

The inner products amongst the vectors in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ are used to specify subsets of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$. Given a vector $\vec{c}_i \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)$ denote the reflection in $\mathcal{E}(2)$ that fixes \vec{c}_i by $\gamma_{\vec{c}_i}$, i.e. $\gamma_{\vec{c}_i} \cdot \vec{c}_i = \vec{c}_i$. For example, $\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} = \mathcal{R}(\theta_1) \gamma_3 \mathcal{R}(-\theta_1)$. One can check that:

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_4} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_4\} \quad (219)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_2} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_3} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{q}_3\}, \quad (220)$$

and

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_4} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_4\} \quad (221)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_2} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_3} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{p}_2, \pm \vec{p}_3\}. \quad (222)$$

Proposition 3.10 *Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote a fixed subset of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$. Given (\vec{k}, \vec{k}') , let $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ denote a second set of n vectors in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ required to satisfy the conditions:*

$$\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i = \vec{k}' \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (223)$$

$$\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (224)$$

1. *If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_1)$, then the conditions (223)-(224) can be satisfied in only one way:*

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (225)$$

unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \quad (226)$$

in which case there is a second (not necessarily distinct) solution:

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (227)$$

2. *If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_1)$, then the conditions (223)-(224) can be satisfied in only one way:*

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (228)$$

unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \quad (229)$$

in which case there is a second (not necessarily distinct) solution:

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (230)$$

3. *If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{q}_1, \vec{p}_1)$, then the conditions (223)-(224) have no solutions unless*

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)], \quad (231)$$

or

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\gamma_{\vec{q}_1}\tilde{A}(\kappa)]. \quad (232)$$

When (231) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi)\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (233)$$

and when (232) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi)\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1}\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (234)$$

4. If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{p}_1, \vec{q}_1)$, then the conditions (223)-(224) have no solutions unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)], \quad (235)$$

or

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1}\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]. \quad (236)$$

When (235) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi)\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (237)$$

and when (236) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi)\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (238)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that for Proposition III.5. \square

Lemma 3.4 *Let $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ be T^2 -invariant monomials of degree p such that $f(z, w) = m(z, w)$ and $h(z, w) = m'(z, w)$ meet the conditions of Proposition III.6. There*

exist functions P_f and P_h satisfying (51)-(52) such that

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (239)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (240)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ = & \begin{cases} f(w_1, 0, 0, w_4, 0, z_2, z_3, 0) & \text{if } f(w_1, 0, 0, w_4, 0, z_2, z_3, 0) \neq 0 \\ f(w_1, 0, 0, \overline{w}_4, z_1, 0, 0, \overline{z}_4) & \text{if } f(w_1, 0, 0, w_4, z_1, 0, 0, z_4) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (241)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ = & \begin{cases} h(0, w_2, w_3, 0, z_1, 0, 0, z_4) & \text{if } h(0, w_2, w_3, 0, z_1, 0, 0, z_4) \neq 0 \\ h(w_1, 0, 0, \overline{w}_4, z_1, 0, 0, \overline{z}_4) & \text{if } h(w_1, 0, 0, w_4, z_1, 0, 0, z_4) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (242)$$

where $a(\vec{k})$ is given by (216).

Proof

The proof follows that for Lemma III.1.

1. Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote the wave vector set associated with the monomial $m(z, w)$ used to define $f(z, w)$. The monomial $m(z, w)$ can be written as

$$m(z, w) = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) a(\vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}) \dots a(\vec{c}_p) \quad (243)$$

in analogy with (162). For P_f we introduce the numerical factor

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \neq \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (244)$$

and define P_f as

$$P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \epsilon \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i, \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i} \delta_{\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j, \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j} \right) \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^p \delta_{\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j}, \kappa^2} \right). \quad (245)$$

From Proposition III.10 we then have

$$P_f(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (246)$$

and

$$P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (247)$$

The calculations to verify (239) and (241) are now straightforward.

2. Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote the wave vector set associated with the monomial $m'(z, w)$ used to define $h(z, w)$. The monomial $m'(z, w)$ can be written as

$$m'(z, w) = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) a(\vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}) \dots a(\vec{c}_{l_p}). \quad (248)$$

For P_h we require the numerical factor

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \neq \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (249)$$

and P_h is defined as

$$P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \epsilon \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i, \vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i} \delta_{\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j, \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j} \right) \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^p \delta_{\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j}, \kappa^2} \right). \quad (250)$$

The verification of (240) and (242) proceeds as for P_f .

□

Lemma 3.5 *Let $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ be T^2 -invariant monomials of degree p such that $f(z, w) = m(z, w)$ and $h(z, w) = m'(z, w)$ meet the conditions of Proposition III.6. There exists a single function P satisfying (51)-(52) such that*

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (251)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (252)$$

if and only if

$$f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = h(0, w_2, w_3, 0, z_1, 0, 0, z_4) \quad (253)$$

$$f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = h(w_1, 0, 0, \bar{w}_4, z_1, 0, 0, \bar{z}_4). \quad (254)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that for Lemma II.2. The necessity of (253) and (254) is established by Proposition III.9 and the proof of necessity in Theorem III.1. Assume that (253) and (254) hold and let $P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ and $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ be the functions of Lemma III.4 for f and h respectively.

1. If $f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) = f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) = 0$ then define

$$P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \equiv P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) + P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (255)$$

The equations (251) and (252) follow from the previous Lemma.

2. If $f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, w_2, w_3, 0) \neq 0$ or $f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, 0, 0, w_4) \neq 0$ then define

$$P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \equiv P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (256)$$

Again (251) and (252) can be verified using the previous Lemma. \square

These results imply the analogue of Lemma III.3 for this mode interaction.

Lemma 3.6 *For a homogeneous vector field \tilde{F} , equivariant with respect to the representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ in (183)-(185), there exists a $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -symmetric vector field \mathcal{F} on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that*

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})} \quad (257)$$

if and only if for all $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \in \mathcal{E}(2)$,

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi) \quad (258)$$

for all $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$.

3.3 The [8, 4]-mode interaction

In the notation of section II.B, the eight-dimensional representation (l_1, n_1) is

$$\tilde{V}_1 = \{(z_1 \Phi_{\vec{q}_1}(\vec{r}) + z_2 \Phi_{\vec{q}_2}(\vec{r}) + z_3 \Phi_{\vec{q}_3}(\vec{r}) + z_4 \Phi_{\vec{q}_4}(\vec{r}) + cc) \mid (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4) \in \mathbf{C}^4\}, \quad (259)$$

with wave vectors $\vec{q}_1 = (l_1, n_1)$, $\vec{q}_2 = (l_1, -n_1)$, $\vec{q}_3 = (n_1, l_1)$ and $\vec{q}_4 = (n_1, -l_1)$ and the four-dimensional representation (l_2, l_2) is

$$\tilde{V}_2 = \{w_1 \Phi_{\vec{p}_1}(\vec{r}) + w_2 \Phi_{\vec{p}_1}(\vec{r}) + cc \mid (w_1, w_2) \in \mathbf{C}^2\} \quad (260)$$

has wave vectors $\vec{p}_1 = (l_2, l_2)$ and $\vec{p}_2 = (l_2, -l_2)$. The reducible representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ on the twelve-dimensional space $\tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2$ is generated by

$$\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w) = (\bar{z}_2, \bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_4, \bar{z}_3, \bar{w}_2, \bar{w}_1) \quad (261)$$

$$\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w) = (z_3, \bar{z}_4, z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \quad (262)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w) = & (e^{-i(l_1 a + n_1 b)} z_1, e^{-i(l_1 a - n_1 b)} z_2, e^{-i(n_1 a + l_1 b)} z_3, e^{-i(n_1 a - l_1 b)} z_4, \\ & e^{-il_2(a+b)} w_1, e^{-il_2(a-b)} w_2) \end{aligned} \quad (263)$$

where $z \equiv (z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4)$ and $w \equiv (w_1, w_2)$.

We adopt the following notation for vector fields that commute with this representation.

Proposition 3.11 \tilde{F} is $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant if and only if it has the form

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f(z, w) \\ f(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) \\ f(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ f(\gamma_2 \gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h(z, w) \\ h(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} f(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, w_1, w_2) \\ f(z_2, z_1, z_4, z_3, w_2, w_1) \\ f(z_3, \bar{z}_4, z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \\ f(z_4, \bar{z}_3, z_2, \bar{z}_1, w_2, \bar{w}_1) \\ h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, w_1, w_2) \\ h(z_2, z_1, z_4, z_3, w_2, w_1) \end{pmatrix} \quad (264)$$

where $f(z, w)$ and $h(z, w)$ are complex-valued functions satisfying following conditions:

1. $f(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \overline{f(z, w)}$ and $h(\bar{z}, \bar{w}) = \overline{h(z, w)}$
2. $h(z, w)$ is γ_2 -invariant:

$$h(z_1, z_2, z_3, z_4, w_1, w_2) = h(z_3, \bar{z}_4, z_1, \bar{z}_2, w_1, \bar{w}_2) \quad (265)$$

3. $\bar{z}_1 f(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 h(z, w)$ are invariant under the translations T^2 .

Proof.

The proof follows that for Proposition III.1 \square

We write $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ to indicate the map (264) corresponding to f and h .

For $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -symmetric vector fields $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$, we assume f and h are homogeneous functions and reduce to the case with each function determined by a single monomial

$$f(z, w) = m(z, w) \quad (266)$$

$$h(z, w) = m'(z, w) + m'(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (267)$$

where $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ are T^2 -invariant. With the same notation for the quadratic invariants (73)-(74), these monomials are readily characterized.

Proposition 3.12 *A T^2 -invariant monomial $M(z, w)$ can always be written in the form*

$$M(z, w) = (\sigma_1^{\mu_1} \sigma_2^{\mu_2} \sigma_3^{\mu_3} \sigma_4^{\mu_4} \rho_1^{\nu_1} \rho_2^{\nu_2}) \Omega_1^{\mu_1} \Omega_2^{\mu_2} \Omega_3^{\mu_3} \Omega_4^{\mu_4} \omega_1^{\nu_1} \omega_2^{\nu_2} \quad (268)$$

where $(\mu_1, \mu_2, \mu_3, \mu_4, \nu_1, \nu_2)$ are integers satisfying

$$l_1(\mu_1 + \mu_2) + n_1(\mu_3 + \mu_4) + l_2(\nu_1 + \nu_2) = 0 \quad (269)$$

$$n_1(\mu_1 - \mu_2) + l_1(\mu_3 - \mu_4) + n_2(\nu_1 - \nu_2) = 0. \quad (270)$$

The geometry of the wave vector set (25)

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) = \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{q}_3, \pm \vec{q}_4, \pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_2\} \quad (271)$$

is shown in Fig. 3. For this mode interaction, as for the [4,8] interaction, it is sufficient to consider a single rotation $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$. One can verify that $\phi \neq 2\theta_1$, and this implies that the set $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ satisfies

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{q}_3, \pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_2\} \quad (272)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_4, \pm \vec{p}_1, \pm \vec{p}_2\}. \quad (273)$$

These non-zero intersections show that $\mathcal{R}(\phi)E^c$ and $\mathcal{R}(-\phi)E^c$ intersect E^c along eight-dimensional subspaces,

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, w_2) \quad (274)$$

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] = (z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, w_2), \quad (275)$$

that are related by reflection symmetry:

$$\gamma_2 : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})] \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]. \quad (276)$$

Proposition 3.13 *For the representation (261)-(263), the subspaces (274)-(275) are fixed point subspaces for isotropy subgroups of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$; hence they are invariant under any $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetric vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$. This invariance implies*

$$f(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, w_2) = 0. \quad (277)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that of Proposition III.3. The isotropy subgroup Σ for $(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, w_2)$ contains the translations $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)}$ where

$$(a, b) = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa^2} (l_2(l_1 + n_1), l_2(l_1 - n_1)) = 2\pi(\cos \phi, \sin \phi) \quad (278)$$

and

$$(a, b) = \frac{2\pi}{\kappa^2} (-l_2(l_1 - n_1), l_2(l_1 + n_1)) = 2\pi(-\sin \phi, \cos \phi). \quad (279)$$

Thus $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w) = (z, w)$ is a necessary condition for $(z, w) \in \text{Fix}(\Sigma)$, and this condition implies

$$e^{-i(l_1 a + n_1 b)} z_1 = z_1 \quad (280)$$

$$e^{-i(n_1 a - l_1 b)} z_4 = z_4. \quad (281)$$

If $z_1 \neq 0$, then for (278) - (279) the z_1 equation requires

$$l_1 \cos \phi + n_1 \sin \phi = \text{integer} \quad (282)$$

$$-l_1 \sin \phi + n_1 \cos \phi = \text{integer}, \quad (283)$$

or equivalently $\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{q}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)$ which is impossible since $\phi \neq 2\theta_1$. Hence $(z, w) \in \text{Fix}(\Sigma)$ requires $z_1 = 0$. A similar discussion of (281) shows that $z_4 = 0$.

□

When \tilde{F} is obtained by restriction from \mathcal{F} there are additional conditions on f and h .

Proposition 3.14 *For a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$, the condition*

$$\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \Phi) \quad (284)$$

for all $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$ is satisfied if and only if

$$f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, w_2) = h(0, \bar{w}_2, w_1, 0, z_1, \bar{z}_4), \quad (285)$$

or equivalently

$$h(0, z_2, z_3, 0, w_1, w_2) = f(w_1, 0, 0, \bar{w}_2, z_3, \bar{z}_2). \quad (286)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that of Proposition III.4. □

The restriction in (53) is accomplished by choosing $a(\vec{k})$ in (48) so that $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$:

$$\begin{aligned} a(\vec{k}) = & z_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_1} + \bar{z}_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_1} + z_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_2} + \bar{z}_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_2} + z_3 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_3} + \bar{z}_3 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_3} + z_4 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_4} + \bar{z}_4 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_4} \\ & + w_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_1} + \bar{w}_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_1} + w_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_2} + \bar{w}_2 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (287)$$

This determines a $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ such that f and h are homogeneous functions of degree p ; when f and h are determined by monomials as in (266) and (267) then

$$m(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (288)$$

$$m'(z, w) + m'(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (289)$$

Given monomials m and m' in (266) and (267), the essential question is whether there exists a function P , satisfying conditions (51)-(52), such that (288) and (289) hold. We answer this by constructing P ; the procedure is the same as in the [4,8] mode interaction.

The inner products amongst the vectors in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ are used to specify subsets of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$. Given a vector $\vec{c}_i \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)$ denote the reflection in $\mathcal{E}(2)$ that fixes \vec{c}_i by $\gamma_{\vec{c}_i}$, i.e. $\gamma_{\vec{c}_i} \cdot \vec{c}_i = \vec{c}_i$.

For example, $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} = \gamma_2$, $\gamma_{\vec{p}_2} = \gamma_2 \tilde{\gamma}_1$, and $\gamma_{\vec{q}_i} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \gamma_2 \mathcal{R}(\phi)$. Thus $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1}$ and $\gamma_{\vec{p}_2}$ leave $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ invariant, but for \vec{q}_i , $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ we have:

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_4} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_1, \pm \vec{q}_4\} \quad (290)$$

$$\tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_2} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_3} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] = \{\pm \vec{q}_2, \pm \vec{q}_3\}. \quad (291)$$

Proposition 3.15 *Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote a fixed subset of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$. Given (\vec{k}, \vec{k}') , let $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ denote a second set of n vectors in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ required to satisfy the conditions:*

$$\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i = \vec{k}' \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (292)$$

$$\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (293)$$

1. *If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{p}_1, \vec{p}_1)$, then the conditions (292)-(293) have only two (not necessarily distinct) solutions:*

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (294)$$

and

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (295)$$

2. If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{q}_1, \vec{q}_1)$, then the conditions (292)-(293) can be satisfied in only one way:

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (296)$$

unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \quad (297)$$

in which case there is a second (not necessarily distinct) solution:

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (298)$$

3. If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{q}_1, \vec{p}_1)$, then the conditions (292)-(293) have no solutions unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)], \quad (299)$$

or

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \mathcal{R}(\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)]. \quad (300)$$

When (299) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (301)$$

and when (300) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (302)$$

4. If $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{p}_1, \vec{q}_1)$, then the conditions (223)-(224) have no solutions unless

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)], \quad (303)$$

or

$$\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \tilde{A}(\kappa)]. \quad (304)$$

When (303) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (305)$$

and when (304) holds then

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (306)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that of Proposition III.5. \square

Lemma 3.7 *Let $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ be T^2 -invariant monomials of degree p such that $f(z, w) = m(z, w)$ and $h(z, w) = m'(z, w) + m'(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w))$ meet the conditions of Proposition III.11. There exist functions P_f and P_h satisfying (51)-(52) such that*

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (307)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (308)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \\ &= \begin{cases} f(w_1, 0, 0, w_2, 0, 0) & \text{if } f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, 0) \neq 0 \\ f(w_1, 0, 0, \bar{w}_2, z_3, \bar{z}_2) & \text{if } f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, 0, 0) = 0 \text{ and} \\ \quad + f(w_1, 0, 0, w_2, z_1, \bar{z}_4) & f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, w_2) \neq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (309) \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = h(w_1, 0, 0, w_2, z_1, z_4) \quad (310)$$

where $a(\vec{k})$ is given by (287).

Proof

The proof follows that of Lemma III.1.

1. Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote the wave vector set associated with the monomial $m(z, w)$ used to define $f(z, w)$. Then $m(z, w)$ can be written as

$$m(z, w) = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) a(\vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}) \dots a(\vec{c}_{l_p}) \quad (311)$$

in analogy with (162). For P_f we introduce the numerical factor

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \neq \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (312)$$

and define P_f as

$$P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \epsilon \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i, \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i} \delta_{\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j, \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j} \right) \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^p \delta_{\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j}, \kappa^2} \right). \quad (313)$$

From Proposition III.15 we then have

$$P_f(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (314)$$

and

$$P_f(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \begin{cases} \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ \epsilon & \text{if } \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{q}_1}\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)] \text{ and} \\ & \{\vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi)\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n, \vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}, \dots, \vec{c}_{l_p}\} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (315)$$

The calculations to verify (307) and (309) are now straightforward.

2. Let $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ denote the wave vector set associated with the monomial $m'(z, w)$ used to define $h(z, w)$. Then $m'(z, w)$ can be written as

$$m'(z, w) = a(\vec{c}_1) a(\vec{c}_2) \dots a(\vec{c}_n) a(\vec{c}_{l_{n+1}}) \dots a(\vec{c}_{l_p}). \quad (316)$$

P_h is defined as

$$P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n \prod_{j=1}^n \delta_{\vec{k} \cdot \vec{k}_i, \vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i} \delta_{\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j, \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j} \right) \left(\prod_{j=n+1}^p \delta_{\vec{k}_j \cdot \vec{c}_{l_j}, \kappa^2} \right). \quad (317)$$

The verification of (308) and (310) proceeds as for P_f .

□

Lemma 3.8 *Let $\bar{z}_1 m(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 m'(z, w)$ be T^2 -invariant monomials of degree p such that $f(z, w) = m(z, w)$ and $h(z, w) = m'(z, w) + m'(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w))$ meet the conditions of Proposition III.11. There exists a single function P satisfying (51)-(52) such that*

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (318)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \sum_{\vec{k}_2 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}_1) a(\vec{k}_2) \dots a(\vec{k}_p) P(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (319)$$

if and only if

$$f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, w_2) = h(0, \bar{w}_2, w_1, 0, z_1, \bar{z}_4). \quad (320)$$

Proof.

The proof follows that for Lemma II.2. The necessity of (320) is established by Proposition III.14 and the proof of necessity in Theorem III.1. Assume that (320) holds and let $P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ and $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ be the functions of Lemma III.7 for f and h respectively.

1. If $f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, w_2) = 0$ then define

$$P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \equiv P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) + P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (321)$$

The equations (318) and (319) follow from the previous Lemma.

2. If $f(z_1, 0, 0, z_4, w_1, w_2) \neq 0$ or then define

$$P(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \equiv P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p). \quad (322)$$

Again (318) and (319) can be verified using the previous Lemma. \square

For this mode interaction, these results imply the analogue of Lemmas III.3 and III.6.

Lemma 3.9 *For a homogeneous vector field \tilde{F} , equivariant with respect to the representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ in (261)-(263), there exists a $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -symmetric vector field \mathcal{F} on $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that*

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})} \quad (323)$$

if and only if for all $\mathcal{R}(\theta) \in \mathcal{E}(2)$

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \tilde{F}(\Phi) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{R}(\theta) \cdot \Phi) \quad (324)$$

for all $\Phi \in E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\theta) E^c(\tilde{\Omega})]$.

4 Binary Mode interactions with $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ reducible

For these mode interactions we still assume the decomposition

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) = \tilde{V}_1 \oplus \tilde{V}_2, \quad (325)$$

but the irreducible form $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_{\kappa}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ is replaced by

$$E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_{\kappa_1}(\mathbf{R}^2) \oplus E_{\kappa_2}(\mathbf{R}^2) \quad (326)$$

where $\tilde{V}_i \subset E_{\kappa_i}(\mathbf{R}^2)$. No relationship is assumed between $\kappa_1^2 = l_1^2 + n_1^2$ and $\kappa_2^2 = l_2^2 + n_2^2$; they may be equal or unequal. In (325) any pair of irreducible representations is allowed; in particular [4,4] mode interactions are now possible.

We denote the wave vector sets $\tilde{A}(\kappa_1) = \{\pm\vec{q}_1, \dots, \pm\vec{q}_{j_1}\}$ and $\tilde{A}(\kappa_2) = \{\pm\vec{p}_1, \dots, \pm\vec{p}_{j_2}\}$ as before, and write the $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ representations in the usual way

$$\tilde{V}_1 = \{z_1 \Phi_{\vec{q}_1}(\vec{r}) + \dots + z_{j_1} \Phi_{\vec{q}_{j_1}}(\vec{r}) + cc \mid (z_1, \dots, z_{j_1}) \in \mathbf{C}^{j_1}\}, \quad (327)$$

$$\tilde{V}_2 = \{(w_1 \Phi_{\vec{p}_1}(\vec{r}) + \dots + w_{j_2} \Phi_{\vec{p}_{j_2}}(\vec{r}) + cc \mid (w_1, \dots, w_{j_2}) \in \mathbf{C}^{j_2}\}. \quad (328)$$

In these expressions $j_i = (\dim \tilde{V}_i)/2$.

As in the $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -irreducible examples, a vector field \tilde{F} , equivariant with respect to the representation (325), is uniquely specified by giving two functions $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ where $f(z, w)$ is the z_1 component of \tilde{F} and determines the other \tilde{V}_1 components and $h(z, w)$ is the w_1 component of \tilde{F} and determines the other \tilde{V}_2 components. The specific properties required of f and h depend on the representations considered.

There are several ways that this type of mode interaction arises in applications. Since all the irreducible representations of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ are absolutely irreducible, a theorem of Golubitsky and Stewart implies that the critical eigenvalues can be imaginary only if the representations in (325) are equivalent.[15] Thus Hopf bifurcation with $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetry leads to mode

interactions of this type. The Hopf bifurcation for the $(l_1, n_1) = (l, 0)$ and $(l_2, n_2) = (l, 0)$ mode interaction has been analyzed by Swift, Pismen, and Silber and Knobloch.[16]-[18] One subtlety in the case of imaginary eigenvalues is that the eigenvectors are complex linear combinations of the vectors $\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r})$ in (327)-(328); see Silber and Knobloch for an example.[18] For real eigenvalues, the mode interaction with equivalent representations occurs at the Takens-Bogdanov bifurcation when the Hopf frequency vanishes. If \tilde{V}_1 and \tilde{V}_2 are inequivalent, then the critical eigenvalues must be real. This situation arises naturally in codimension-two mode interactions. For example these bifurcations may be seen in the parameter space of the Faraday experiment with square geometry.[8, 11]

In light of the reducible structure of $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ in (326), there are no hidden rotations acting on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ to connect the two $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ representations. Consequently for all mode interactions of this type, the $\mathcal{E}(2)$ symmetry of \mathcal{F} imposes no requirements on the normal form \tilde{F} beyond the constraints of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariance. Recall our notation (39)-(44) for the $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -reducible case; \mathcal{F} is given by $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 + \mathcal{F}_2$ where $\mathcal{F}_i : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E_{\kappa_i}(\mathbf{R}^2)$ for $i = 1, 2$. We assume \mathcal{F} is homogeneous of degree p . For a vector in $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$,

$$\Phi(\vec{r}) = \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a_i(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}), \quad (329)$$

the components \mathcal{F}_i must have the form

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\Phi) = \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a'_i(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (330)$$

where

$$a'_i(\vec{k}) = \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p = 1, 2} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in A(\kappa_{l_1})} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in A(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}_1) \dots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}_p) P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \right]. \quad (331)$$

Note that for $P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ the argument \vec{k} only takes values in $A(\kappa_i)$.

The restriction of \mathcal{F} to $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})} \quad (332)$$

is accomplished by specifying $a_1(\vec{k})$ and $a_2(\vec{k})$ appropriately in (329):

$$a_1(\vec{k}) = z_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_1} + \bar{z}_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_1} + \cdots + z_{j_1} \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{q}_{j_1}} + \bar{z}_{j_1} \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{q}_{j_1}} \quad (333)$$

$$a_2(\vec{k}) = w_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_1} + \bar{w}_1 \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_1} + \cdots + w_{j_2} \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{p}_{j_2}} + \bar{w}_{j_2} \delta_{\vec{k}, -\vec{p}_{j_2}}. \quad (334)$$

The $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$ on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ defined in this way is determined by

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p = 1, 2} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa_{l_1})} \cdots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}_1) \cdots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}_p) P_1(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \right] \quad (335)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p = 1, 2} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa_{l_1})} \cdots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}_1) \cdots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}_p) P_2(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \right]. \quad (336)$$

The crucial point is that now, because $\mathcal{E}(2)$ is reducible, f and h are determined from different functions P_1 and P_2 , respectively.

Theorem 4.1 *Assume $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ carries a reducible representation of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ as in (325), and $E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ carries a reducible representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ as in (326). Let $\tilde{F} : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$ denote a homogeneous $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant vector field $\tilde{F} = [f, h]$, then there is a $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector field $\mathcal{F} : E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow E^c(\mathbf{R}^2)$ such that*

$$\tilde{F} = \mathcal{F}|_{E^c(\tilde{\Omega})}. \quad (337)$$

Proof.

The construction of functions $P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ and $P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ satisfying (45) - (46) and

$$f(z, w) = \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p = 1, 2} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \tilde{A}(\kappa_{l_1})} \cdots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \tilde{A}(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}_1) \cdots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}_p) P_f(\vec{q}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \right] \quad (338)$$

$$h(z, w) = \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p = 1, 2} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}_1 \in \vec{A}(\kappa_{l_1})} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}_p \in \vec{A}(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}_1) \dots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}_p) P_h(\vec{p}_1, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \right] \quad (339)$$

follows the same procedure as in the mode interactions with irreducible $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. See Lemmas III.1, III.4, and III.7. Set $P_1(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = P_f(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ and $P_2(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = P_h(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \dots, \vec{k}_p)$ and define $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1 + \mathcal{F}_2$ where each \mathcal{F}_i is defined as in (330) - (331). This gives an $\mathcal{E}(2)$ -equivariant vector field which restricts to \tilde{F} on $E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. \square

5 Conclusions

The analysis of binary mode interactions shows that the Euclidean symmetry of the dynamical equations will constrain the $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -symmetric normal form only if the representation of $\mathcal{E}(2)$ is irreducible. This is our main qualitative conclusion and it implies that the effects of hidden rotation symmetry on such binary mode interactions are only important when the neutral eigenvalue is real. A practical result of this study are the explicit formulas indicating how the standard $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -symmetric normal form must be modified to reflect the hidden rotations; these results are stated as constraints on the functions $[f, h]$ in (171), (253) - (254), and (320) for the $[4, 8]$, $[8, 8]$, and $[8, 4]$ mode interactions respectively. The approach used here for the binary mode interactions may be used to construct normal forms for more complex interactions involving additional representations of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ as in (47),

$$E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) = \tilde{V}_{(l_1, n_1)} \oplus \tilde{V}_{(l_2, n_2)} \cdots \oplus \tilde{V}_{(l_j, n_j)}. \quad (340)$$

In this case \tilde{F} would have j component functions and the hidden rotations connecting the representations would induce relations between the functions. For mode interactions (340)

with reducible representations of $\mathcal{E}(2)$,

$$E^c(\mathbf{R}^2) = E_{\kappa_1}(\mathbf{R}^2) \oplus E_{\kappa_2}(\mathbf{R}^2) \cdots \oplus E_{\kappa_\nu}(\mathbf{R}^2), \quad (341)$$

the analysis of Section IV generalizes immediately when $\nu = j$. Then there are no hidden rotations connecting the representations of $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ and no relations between the ν component functions of \tilde{F} . In the case $\nu < j$ then two or more of the $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ representations in (340) are contained in a single $\mathcal{E}(2)$ representation of (341). These representations will be connected by hidden rotations and there will be constraints on the corresponding component functions of \tilde{F} .

An application of these results to construct normal forms for the bifurcation of surface waves in the Faraday experiment will be published elsewhere. In this experiment parametric forcing of a fluid layer excites waves through period-doubling bifurcations. Under suitable conditions the moving fluid approximately obeys a Neumann boundary condition at the sidewalls and in square containers this boundary condition allows the corresponding fluid model to be extended to a larger square with periodic boundary conditions and $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ symmetry. Thus the hidden rotations are two steps removed from the actual equations describing the fluid behavior, nevertheless their effects on the normal form for the experiment may be quite significant.

6 Appendix

6.1 Proof of Theorem II.1

Let

$$L\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) = \sum_{\vec{k}' \in A(\kappa)} c_{\vec{k}}(\vec{k}') \Phi_{\vec{k}'}(\vec{r}) \quad (342)$$

describe the action of L on $\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r})$. When applied to $\Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r})$ the assumption that L commutes with an arbitrary translation $\mathcal{T}_{\vec{p}}$ requires $e^{-i\vec{k}\cdot\vec{p}} c_{\vec{k}}(\vec{k}') = e^{-i\vec{k}'\cdot\vec{p}} c_{\vec{k}}(\vec{k}')$ for arbitrary \vec{p} . Thus

$c_{\vec{k}}(\vec{k}')$ must vanish unless $\vec{k} = \vec{k}'$: $c_{\vec{k}}(\vec{k}') \equiv \delta_{\vec{k}, \vec{k}'} C(\vec{k})$. When L is applied to a general element of $E_\kappa(\mathbf{R}^2)$, this simplification implies

$$\begin{aligned} L \Phi(\vec{r}) &= \sum_{\vec{k}' \in A(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}') L \Phi_{\vec{k}'}(\vec{r}) \\ &= \sum_{\vec{k}' \in A(\kappa)} a(\vec{k}') C(\vec{k}') \Phi_{\vec{k}'} \end{aligned} \quad (343)$$

where $\Phi(\vec{r})$ is given by (20). Acting alone, the remaining generators $\mathcal{R}(\phi)$ and γ_2 generate the subgroup $O(2)$, and the assumption that $\gamma L \Phi(\vec{r}) = L \gamma \Phi(\vec{r})$ for $\gamma \in O(2)$ implies $C(\vec{k}')$ must be an $O(2)$ invariant function $C(\gamma \cdot \vec{k}') = C(\vec{k}')$. The $O(2)$ invariance of C means that it only depends on the magnitude of \vec{k}' and hence is a κ -dependent constant $C(\vec{k}') = \sigma(\kappa)$. Thus our linear operator is simply $L = \sigma(\kappa) I$.

6.2 Proof of Theorem II.2

The Euclidean group $\mathcal{E}(2) = O(2) \dot{+} T(2)$ is the semi-direct product of $O(2)$ and the group of translations $T(2)$, and the conditions (45) - (46) correspond to these two components.

1. The effect of an arbitrary translation $\mathcal{T}_{\vec{x}}$ on

$$\Phi = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a_i(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (344)$$

is to replace $a_i(\vec{k})$ by $a_i(\vec{k}) e^{-i\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x}}$. Thus $\mathcal{T}_{\vec{x}} \cdot \mathcal{F}(\Phi) = \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{T}_{\vec{x}} \cdot \Phi)$ requires

$$[e^{-i\vec{x} \cdot (\vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \dots + \vec{k}_p - \vec{k})} - 1] P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = 0 \quad (345)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, \nu$ and arbitrary \vec{x} ; hence if $\vec{k} \neq \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 + \dots + \vec{k}_p$, then

$$P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p) = 0. \quad (346)$$

2. For $\gamma \in O(2)$, we evaluate $\gamma \cdot \mathcal{F}$ using the invariance of the inner product $\vec{k} \cdot \vec{r} = (\gamma \vec{k}) \cdot (\gamma \vec{r})$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \cdot \mathcal{F}_i(\Phi) &= \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\gamma^{-1} \vec{r}) a'_i(\vec{k}') \\ &= \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) a'_i(\gamma^{-1} \cdot \vec{k}'), \end{aligned} \quad (347)$$

where

$$a'_i(\gamma^{-1} \cdot \vec{k}) = \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}'_1 \in A(\kappa_{l_1})} \sum_{\vec{k}'_2 \in A(\kappa_{l_2})} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}'_p \in A(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}'_1) a_{l_2}(\vec{k}'_2) \dots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}'_p) P_i(\gamma^{-1} \cdot \vec{k}, \vec{k}'_1, \dots, \vec{k}'_p) \right]. \quad (348)$$

Now from

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma \cdot \Phi)(\vec{r}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a_i(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\gamma^{-1} \vec{r}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a_i(\gamma^{-1} \cdot \vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}), \end{aligned} \quad (349)$$

we obtain

$$\mathcal{F}_i(\gamma \cdot \Phi) = \sum_{\vec{k} \in A(\kappa_i)} a'_i(\vec{k}) \Phi_{\vec{k}}(\vec{r}) \quad (350)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a'_i(\vec{k}) &= \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}'_1 \in A(\kappa_{l_1})} \sum_{\vec{k}'_2 \in A(\kappa_{l_2})} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}'_p \in A(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\gamma^{-1} \cdot \vec{k}'_1) \dots a_{l_p}(\gamma^{-1} \cdot \vec{k}'_p) P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}'_1, \dots, \vec{k}'_p) \right] \\ &= \sum_{l_1 \leq \dots \leq l_p} \left[\sum_{\vec{k}'_1 \in A(\kappa_{l_1})} \dots \sum_{\vec{k}'_p \in A(\kappa_{l_p})} a_{l_1}(\vec{k}'_1) \dots a_{l_p}(\vec{k}'_p) P_i(\vec{k}, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}'_1, \dots, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}'_p) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\gamma \cdot \mathcal{F}(\Phi) = \mathcal{F}(\gamma \cdot \Phi)$ requires that each P_i is an $O(2)$ -invariant function:

$$P_i(\gamma \cdot \vec{k}, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}'_1, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}'_2, \dots, \gamma \cdot \vec{k}'_p) = P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}'_1, \vec{k}'_2, \dots, \vec{k}'_p) \quad (351)$$

for $i = 1, \dots, \nu$.

3. Note that for the reflection $\vec{r} \rightarrow -\vec{r}$, this gives

$$P_i(-\vec{k}, -\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2, \dots, -\vec{k}_p) = P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p); \quad (352)$$

if \mathcal{F} is real-valued then $\mathcal{F}^* = \mathcal{F}$ requires

$$P_i(-\vec{k}, -\vec{k}_1, -\vec{k}_2, \dots, -\vec{k}_p)^* = P_i(\vec{k}, \vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_p) \quad (353)$$

and the reflection symmetry (352) then implies P_i is real-valued.

6.3 Proof of Proposition III.1

Let

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(z, w) \\ f_2(z, w) \\ h_1(z, w) \\ h_2(z, w) \\ h_3(z, w) \\ h_4(z, w) \end{pmatrix} \quad (354)$$

denote an arbitrary vector field $\tilde{F} : E^c(\tilde{\Omega}) \rightarrow E^c(\tilde{\Omega})$. This vector field will be $D_4 \dot{+} T^2$ -equivariant if and only if it commutes with γ_1 , γ_2 and $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)}$ for arbitrary (a, b) . The first condition $\gamma_1 \cdot \tilde{F}(z, w) = \tilde{F}(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w))$ requires

$$\overline{f_1(z, w)} = f_1(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (355)$$

$$f_2(z, w) = f_2(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (356)$$

$$\overline{h_2(z, w)} = h_1(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (357)$$

$$\overline{h_4(z, w)} = h_3(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (358)$$

so we can write \tilde{F} as

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(z, w) \\ f_2(z, w) \\ h_1(z, w) \\ \overline{h_1(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w))} \\ h_3(z, w) \\ \overline{h_3(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w))} \end{pmatrix} \quad (359)$$

where f_1 and f_2 satisfy (355)-(356). The second condition $\gamma_2 \cdot \tilde{F}(z, w) = \tilde{F}(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w))$ applied to (359) requires

$$f_2(z, w) = f_1(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (360)$$

$$h_3(z, w) = h_1(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (361)$$

$$h_3(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) = \overline{h_1(\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdot (z, w))}. \quad (362)$$

By eliminating f_2 and h_3 using (360)-(361), the remaining conditions (355)-(356) and (362) become

$$\overline{f_1(z, w)} = f_1(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (363)$$

$$f_1(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) = f_1(\gamma_2 \gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \quad (364)$$

$$h_1(\gamma_2 \gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) = \overline{h_1(\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdot (z, w))}, \quad (365)$$

and (359) becomes

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(z, w) \\ f_1(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h_1(z, w) \\ \overline{h_1(\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w))} \\ h_1(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ \overline{h_1(\gamma_2\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w))} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (366)$$

Since $\gamma_3 = \gamma_2\gamma_1\gamma_2$ the second condition (364) on f_1 is equivalent to

$$f_1(z, w) = f_1(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)); \quad (367)$$

thus f_1 is γ_3 -invariant. Since $\gamma_1\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w) = (\bar{z}, \bar{w})$, using (367) the remaining condition (363) on f_1 becomes $\overline{f_1(z, w)} = f_1(\bar{z}, \bar{w})$. Similarly the remaining condition (365) on h_1 can be rewritten as

$$\overline{h_1(z, w)} = h_1(\gamma_2\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) = h_1(\bar{z}, \bar{w}). \quad (368)$$

This property of h_1 allows the vector field (366) to be re-expressed as

$$\tilde{F}(z, w) = \begin{pmatrix} f_1(z, w) \\ f_1(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h_1(z, w) \\ h_1(\gamma_3 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h_1(\gamma_2 \cdot (z, w)) \\ h_1(\gamma_2\gamma_1 \cdot (z, w)) \end{pmatrix} \quad (369)$$

where the identity $\gamma_3\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_1 = \gamma_2\gamma_1$ has been applied. This vector field satisfies the requirements of $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ -equivariance and, after dropping subscripts on f and h , agrees with the

form shown in (68). Finally the translation symmetry $\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot \tilde{F}(z, w) = \tilde{F}(\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w))$ requires

$$e^{-il_1 a} f_1(z, w) = f_1(\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w)) \quad (370)$$

$$e^{-i(l_2 a + n_2 b)} h_1(z, w) = h_1(\mathcal{T}_{(a,b)} \cdot (z, w)). \quad (371)$$

This is equivalent to assuming that $\bar{z}_1 f_1(z, w)$ and $\bar{w}_1 h_1(z, w)$ are T^2 -invariant functions. This completes the characterization of \tilde{F} .

6.4 Proof of Proposition III.2

Any monomial

$$M(\mathbf{z}) = z_1^{\alpha_1} \bar{z}_1^{\alpha'_1} z_2^{\alpha_2} \bar{z}_2^{\alpha'_2} w_1^{\beta_1} \bar{w}_1^{\beta'_1} w_2^{\beta_2} \bar{w}_2^{\beta'_2} w_3^{\beta_3} \bar{w}_3^{\beta'_3} w_4^{\beta_4} \bar{w}_4^{\beta'_4}, \quad (372)$$

can be written in the form (77); this reduction only requires extracting all factors of $|z_1|^2$, $|z_2|^2$, $|w_1|^2$, $|w_2|^2$, $|w_3|^2$, and $|w_4|^2$. The result will be T^2 -invariant however only if the remaining factor $\Omega_1^{\mu_1} \Omega_2^{\mu_2} \omega_1^{\nu_1} \omega_2^{\nu_2} \omega_3^{\nu_3} \omega_4^{\nu_4}$ is T^2 -invariant. From the representation (66), this requires the conditions (78)-(79).

6.5 Proof of Proposition III.5

1. For $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (p_1, p_1)$, the vectors $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ must satisfy

$$\vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_i = \vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (373)$$

$$\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n \quad (374)$$

and obviously the set (118) is a solution. The n conditions (373) require that either $\vec{k}_i = \vec{c}_i$ or $\vec{k}_i = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_i$ where the reflection $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1}$ is defined in (113). If $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_i \notin \tilde{A}(\kappa)$ for all i , then (118) is the unique solution and there is nothing to prove. Assume this is

not the case. Note first that $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_i \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)$ requires $\vec{c}_i \in \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \tilde{A}(\kappa)]$ so we have $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_i \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)$ for all i only if (119) holds. In this event the entire set of vectors

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (375)$$

is contained in $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ and provides a second solution. A third solution distinct from (118) and (120) is not possible. For such a solution we need to find two vectors \vec{c}_l and $\vec{c}_{l'}$ in $\{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ such that $\vec{c}_l \neq \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_l$, $\vec{c}_{l'} \neq \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$, and $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_l \in \tilde{A}(\kappa)$. From (114) these assumptions require $\vec{c}_l = \vec{p}_4$ or $\vec{c}_l = -\vec{p}_4$. Now we try to modify the set (118) by substituting $\vec{k}_l = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_l$ for $\vec{k}_l = \vec{c}_l$ but leave $\vec{k}_{l'} = \vec{c}_{l'}$ unchanged. Condition (374) then implies

$$(\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{k}_{l'}) \cdot \vec{c}_l = \vec{c}_{l'} \cdot \vec{c}_l. \quad (376)$$

There are two choices in (376): $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{k}_{l'} = \vec{c}_{l'}$, or $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{k}_{l'} = \gamma_{\vec{c}_l} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$. The first choice means $\vec{k}_{l'} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$ which contradicts our assumption that $\vec{k}_{l'} = \vec{c}_{l'} \neq \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$. The second choice means $\vec{k}_{l'} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \gamma_{\vec{c}_l} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$. This is consistent with $\vec{k}_{l'} = \vec{c}_{l'}$ only if

$$\vec{c}_{l'} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \gamma_{\vec{c}_l} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}; \quad (377)$$

however $\gamma_{\vec{c}_l} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_4}$ and $\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \gamma_{\vec{p}_4} \cdot \vec{k} = -\vec{k}$ so (377) cannot hold. Thus (376) leads to a contradiction and the attempted substitution fails; there are no additional solutions. This proves the first assertion.

2. For the second assertion, recall that $\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} = \gamma_3$ so that both (121) and (122) are subsets of $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ and clearly satisfy the required conditions

$$\vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{k}_i = \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (378)$$

$$\vec{k}_i \cdot \vec{k}_j = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (379)$$

The first n conditions (378) require that either $\vec{k}_i = \vec{c}_i$ or $\vec{k}_i = \gamma_3 \cdot \vec{c}_i$. If $\vec{c}_i = \gamma_3 \cdot \vec{c}_i$ for all i then there is nothing to prove. Suppose $\vec{c}_i \neq \gamma_3 \cdot \vec{c}_i$ for at least two values $i = l, l'$

which requires that $\vec{c}_l \neq \pm\vec{q}_1$ and $\vec{c}_{l'} \neq \pm\vec{q}_1$. We attempt to find a third solution by replacing $\vec{k}_l = \vec{c}_l$ in (121) by $\vec{k}_l = \gamma_3 \cdot \vec{c}_l$ but leaving $\vec{k}_{l'} = \vec{c}_{l'}$. Clearly (378) is still satisfied, but for $(i, j) = (l, l')$ (379) now implies

$$(\gamma_3 \cdot \vec{k}_{l'}) \cdot \vec{c}_l = \vec{c}_{l'} \cdot \vec{c}_l. \quad (380)$$

This requires $\vec{k}_{l'} = \gamma_3 \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$ or $\vec{k}_{l'} = \gamma_3 \gamma_{\vec{c}_l} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$ where the reflection $\gamma_{\vec{c}_l}$ is defined in (113); both possibilities lead to contradictions. The first choice contradicts $\vec{k}_{l'} = \vec{c}_{l'}$ and the second choice is only consistent if

$$\vec{c}_{l'} = \gamma_3 \gamma_{\vec{c}_l} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}. \quad (381)$$

Note that if $\vec{c}_l = \vec{q}_2$ or $\vec{c}_l = -\vec{q}_2$, then $\gamma_{\vec{c}_l} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_2} = \gamma_1$ in (381); since $\gamma_3 \gamma_1 \cdot \vec{k} = -\vec{k}$ this is a contradiction. Thus we must restrict \vec{c}_l to the values

$$\vec{c}_l \in \{\pm\vec{p}_1, \pm\vec{p}_2, \pm\vec{p}_3, \pm\vec{p}_4\}. \quad (382)$$

In addition (381) implies $\vec{c}_{l'} \in \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\gamma_{\vec{c}_l} \tilde{A}(\kappa)]$. In light of (382) and (114)-(115), this requires

$$\vec{c}_{l'} \neq \pm\vec{q}_1, \pm\vec{q}_2, \quad (383)$$

and implies that $\vec{c}_{l'}$ is either equal to $\pm\vec{c}_l$ or $\vec{c}_{l'}$ is perpendicular to \vec{c}_l . The first possibility implies $\vec{c}_{l'} = \gamma_3 \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$ from (381) which is a contradiction. The second possibility yields $\gamma_{\vec{c}_l} \cdot \vec{c}_{l'} = -\vec{c}_{l'}$ so that (381) implies $\vec{c}_{l'} = -\gamma_3 \cdot \vec{c}_{l'}$; this in turn requires $\vec{c}_{l'}$ to be equal to \vec{q}_2 or $-\vec{q}_2$ which contradicts (383). Thus condition (380) cannot be satisfied and the sets (121) and (122) are the only solutions. This proves the second assertion.

3. The third assertion can be reduced to the first case. Since $\vec{q}_1 = \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{p}_1$, the conditions (116)-(117) for $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{q}_1, \vec{p}_1)$ can be re-written as

$$\vec{p}_1 \cdot (\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \vec{k}_i) = \vec{p}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (384)$$

$$(\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \vec{k}_i) \cdot (\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \vec{k}_j) = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (385)$$

Thus by our first assertion we have only two possibilities for solutions: $\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$ and $\mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{p}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}$. Since $\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\gamma_{\vec{p}_1} = \gamma_3\mathcal{R}(-\phi)$, these possibilities can be re-expressed as

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (386)$$

and

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_3\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (387)$$

The final requirement that the vectors $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ belong to $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ is only met if condition (123) holds.

4. The fourth assertion can be reduced to the second case. Since $\vec{p}_1 = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \vec{q}_1$, the conditions (116)-(117) for $(\vec{k}, \vec{k}') = (\vec{p}_1, \vec{q}_1)$ can be re-written as

$$\vec{q}_1 \cdot (\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{k}_i) = \vec{q}_1 \cdot \vec{c}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \quad (388)$$

$$(\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{k}_i) \cdot (\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \vec{k}_j) = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{c}_j \quad \text{for } i, j = 1, \dots, n. \quad (389)$$

Thus by our second assertion we have only two possibilities for solutions:

$$\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (390)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_{\vec{q}_1} \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (391)$$

Since $\gamma_{\vec{q}_1} = \gamma_3$ and $\mathcal{R}(\phi)\gamma_3 = \gamma_3\mathcal{R}(-\phi)$, these possibilities can be re-expressed as

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \mathcal{R}(\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \quad (392)$$

and

$$\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\} = \gamma_3\mathcal{R}(-\phi) \cdot \{\vec{c}_1, \vec{c}_2, \dots, \vec{c}_n\}. \quad (393)$$

The additional requirement that the vectors $\{\vec{k}_1, \vec{k}_2, \dots, \vec{k}_n\}$ in (392) belong to $\tilde{A}(\kappa)$ is only met if $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(-\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]$; this requirement is only satisfied in (393) if $\{\vec{c}_1, \dots, \vec{c}_n\} \subseteq \tilde{A}(\kappa) \cap [\mathcal{R}(\phi)\tilde{A}(\kappa)]$.

7 Acknowledgements

I have enjoyed helpful conversations with I. Melbourne. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant DMS 9201028.

References

- [1] H. Fujii, M. Mimura, and Y. Nishiura, A picture of the global bifurcation diagram in ecological interacting and diffusing systems, *Physica D* **5** (1982) 1-42.
- [2] D. Armbruster and G. Dangelmayr, Coupled stationary bifurcations in non-flux boundary value problems, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **101** (1987) 167-192.
- [3] G. Dangelmayr and D. Armbruster, Steady state mode interactions in the presence of $O(2)$ symmetry and in non-flux boundary conditions, in *Multiparameter Bifurcation Theory* (eds. M. Golubitsky and J. Guckenheimer), Contemp. Math. **56** (1986) 53-68.
- [4] M.G.M. Gomes and Ian Stewart, Steady PDE's on Generalized Rectangles: a Change of Genericity in Mode Interaction, preprint, University of Warwick, 1993.
- [5] P. Ashwin, High corank steady-state mode interactions on a rectangle. In **Bifurcation and Symmetry**, (eds. E.L. Allgower, K. Boömer and M. Golubitsky), ISNM **104** (1992) Birkhäuser, Basel, 23-33.
- [6] M. Impey, D.S. Riley, and K.H. Winters, The effect of sidewall imperfections on pattern formation in Lapwood convection, *Nonlinearity* **3** (1990) 197-230.
- [7] J.D. Crawford, M. Golubitsky, M.G.M. Gomes, E. Knobloch and I. Stewart, Boundary conditions as symmetry constraints, in *Singularity Theory and Its Applications, Warwick 1989*, vol. 2, (eds. R.M. Roberts and I.N.Stewart), Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg (1991).
- [8] J.D. Crawford, J.P. Gollub, and David Lane, Hidden symmetries of parametrically forced waves, *Nonlinearity* **6** (1993) 119-164.

- [9] M. Field, M. Golubitsky, and I.N. Stewart, Bifurcations on hemispheres, *J. Nonlinear Sci.* **1** (1990) 201-223.
- [10] B. Dionne and M. Golubitsky, Planforms in two and three dimensions, *ZAMP* **43** (1992) 36-62.
- [11] F. Simonelli and J.P. Gollub, Surface wave mode interactions: effects of symmetry and degeneracy, *J. Fluid Mech.* **199** (1989) 471-494.
- [12] J.D. Crawford, D_4 -symmetric maps with hidden Euclidean symmetry, Proc. of the Fields Institute Workshop on Pattern Formation and Symmetry Breaking in PDE's, M. Golubitsky and W. Langford, eds., American Mathematical Society, to appear.
- [13] J.D. Crawford and E. Knobloch, Symmetry and symmetry-breaking bifurcations in fluid dynamics, *Annu. Rev. Fluid Mech.* **23** (1991) 341-387.
- [14] J.D. Crawford, Normal forms for driven surface waves: boundary conditions, symmetry, and genericity, *Physica D* **52** (1991) 429-457.
- [15] M. Golubitsky, I. Stewart, and D.G. Schaeffer, **Singularities and Groups in Bifurcation Theory**: Vol. II, Appl. Math. Sci. **69**, Springer-Verlag, New York (1988).
- [16] J.W. Swift, Bifurcation and symmetry in convection, PhD Thesis (1984) University of California, Berkeley.
- [17] L.M. Pismen, Nonlinear dynamics of dissipative wave patterns near a bifurcation point, *Dynamics and Stability of Systems* **1** (1986) 97-113.
- [18] Mary Silber and Edgar Knobloch, Hopf bifurcation on a square lattice, *Nonlinearity* **4** (1991) 1063-1106.