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We characterize the phase-space of all Helical Miura Origami. These are obtained by taking a partially folded Miura parallelogram as the unit cell, applying a generic helical or rod group to the cell, and characterizing all the parameters that lead to a globally compatible origami structure. When such compatibility is achieved, the result is cylindrical-type origami that can be manufactured from a suitably designed flat tessellation and “rolled-up” by a rigidly foldable motion into a cylinder. We find that the closed Helical Miura Origami are generically rigid to deformations that preserve cylindrical symmetry, but multi-stable. We are thus lead to develop two broad strategies for reconfigurability: motion by slip, which involves relaxing the closure condition; and motion by phase transformation, which exploits multi-stability. All these results, in combination, provide an unparalleled and comprehensive description of the phase-space of cylindrical origami, as well as quantitative design guidance for their use as actuators or metamaterials that seek to exploit twist, axial extension, radial expansion, and symmetry.

PACS numbers:

Origami is the ancient Japanese art of paper folding. In recent years, this artform has been appreciated not only for its aesthetics [40], but also for its potential functionality [1]—including in space technologies [2, 3], transforming architectures [4, 5], multistability and topological properties [6–8], biological structures [9–11], deployable antennas [12, 13], metamaterials [14–16], and mechanical properties [17–19]. Origami design utilizes the shape change induced by piecewise affine isometric deformations (i.e., folding along creases)—from, say, an easy-to-manufacture flat reference sheet with a pre-designed folding crease pattern—to achieve a desired configuration in 3-D space. We call such designs rigidly foldable if each panel can rotate along the folding crease lines and remain rigid (without stretch or flexure) during the folding process. The classical Miura origami pattern [20] is the simplest example of this type, and its generalizations lead to the study of systems that are highly nonlinear and geometrically constrained. As a result, characterizing global properties of broad classes of origami structures—such as whether they are rigid, multi-stable or rigidly foldable—is a challenge that has attracted significant research interest. One way to study this problem is by using iterative algorithms that enforce a certain topology and foldability [19, 21–23]. Another approach is to focus on patterns consistent with a certain symmetry.

In this work, we follow the symmetry approach to characterize, in a quite general way, Helical Miura Origami (HMO). These are cylindrical type origami obtained by repeated application of a helical or rod group to a partially folded unit cell, which we call a Miura parallelogram. In this procedure, the parameters are kept completely general and on full display, and we are able to address the global problem of “closing the cylinder” by a straightforward numerical algorithm. As a result, we can completely characterize the phase-space of all HMO, i.e., all cylindrical origami consistent with helical or rod symmetry and the Miura parallelogram as the unit cell. By exhaustive numerical treatment, we find that HMO are generically rigid to deformations that preserve cylindrical symmetry, but multi-stable. This rigidity is not all that surprising; the well-known cylindrical origami are either rigid (for example the Yoshimura pattern [24, 25], Kresling pattern [26]) or they lose the cylindrical symmetry while folding [27]. Nevertheless, reconfigurability can be achieved. We discuss two strategies for doing so: one involving motion by slip and the other involving phase transformation.

Characterization of a Miura parallelogram. We begin by analyzing the kinematics of a parallelogram with a four-foil vertex satisfying the Kawasaki’s condition: “opposite sector angles sum to π”. This defines a Miura parallelogram unit cell (Fig. 1(a)) with \( \angle x_1x_0x_2 + \angle x_3x_0x_3 = \pi \), where \( \angle x_i x_j x_k \in (0, \pi) \) is the angle between \( x_k - x_j \) and \( x_i - x_j \) [41]. To characterize an isometric (distance preserving) folding of this crease pattern, we fix one of the panels by setting \( y_{0,1,2} = x_{0,1,2} \), respectively (and without loss of generality). The kinematics of this pattern (i.e., its deformation gradients) are then described by a composition of rotations \( R_i(\gamma_i) \) whose axes are tangent to the crease pattern \( x_i - x_0 \) in flat state [42]. Specifically, the necessary and sufficient conditions for isometric origami are that the panels deform as depicted in Fig. 1(a-b) and subject to the compatibility condition on the folding angles

\[
R_1(\gamma_1)R_2(\gamma_2)R_3(\gamma_3)R_4(\gamma_4) = I,
\]

which assures continuity of the deformation across the \( x_4 - x_0 \) crease. Note, a positive folding angle describes a valley and a negative a mountain here (red and blue, respectively, in Fig. 1(b)).

By solving this condition, we derive the full kinematics of the Miura parallelogram. Generically, the solutions...
are described by a continuous one-parameter family for which the four folding angles \((\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4)\) satisfy the following expression:

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_1 &= -\sigma \gamma_3^0(\omega), \quad \gamma_2 = \sigma \omega, \quad \gamma_3 = \gamma_3^0(\omega), \quad \gamma_4 = \omega, \\
\gamma_3^0(\omega) &= \text{sign}(c_\alpha - \sigma c_\beta) \omega \arccos \left( \frac{\sigma_1 - c_\alpha c_\beta} {\sigma_1 - c_\alpha c_\beta + s_\alpha s_\beta} \right), \\
\sigma \in \mathcal{A} &= \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } \alpha = \beta = \frac{\pi}{2} \\
\{-\} & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \neq \frac{\pi}{2} \\
\{+\} & \text{if } \alpha = \pi - \beta \neq \frac{\pi}{2} \\
\{\pm\} & \text{otherwise.} 
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

Here, \(\sigma \in \mathcal{A}\) denotes one of the (at most) two branches of solutions corresponding to different mountain-valley crease assignments, the folding angles are parameterized by \(\omega \in [\pi, \pi]\), and we employ the shorthand notation \(c_\theta = \cos(\theta), \ s_\theta = \sin(\theta), \ \alpha = \angle x_1 x_0 x_2\) and \(\beta = \angle x_2 x_0 x_3\). In addition to this family, there is a degenerate kinematics for certain Miura parallelograms—specifically, those characterized by \(\sigma \in \{\pm\} \setminus \mathcal{A}\) as the solution branch—which describes folding-in-half along a single crease:

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_{1,3} &= 0, \quad \gamma_{2,4} = \omega \in [\pi, \pi] & \text{if } \sigma = +, \alpha = \beta, \\
\gamma_{1,3} &= \omega \in [\pi, \pi], \quad \gamma_{2,4} = 0 & \text{if } \sigma = -, \alpha = \pi - \beta.
\end{align*}
\]

We provide a brief derivation of these results in the supplemental, and this viewpoint on the kinematics of origami is further developed in [21].

The folding angle parameterizations (2) and (3) are sufficient and (with a minor caveat [43]) necessary for solving (1) and, as such, completely characterize the folding of a Miura parallelogram. Importantly, the parameterizations highlight two universal features of kinematics: There are two branches of solutions \(\sigma \in \{\pm\}\) corresponding to the different mountain-valley crease assignments, and each branch is described by a single folding parameter \(\omega \in [\pi, \pi]\). Accordingly, the explicit folding deformation is a continuous piecewise affine isometry \(y^\sigma_\omega : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3\) with deformation gradients as shown in Fig. 1(a) for \(\gamma_{1,2,3,4} = \gamma_{1,2,3,4}(\omega, \sigma)\) satisfying one of the parameterizations in (2-3). This furnishes the deformed unit cell \(y^\sigma_\omega(\Omega)\) with corner positions \(y_i = y^\sigma_\omega(x_i), \ i = 1, 2, 3, 4\) after folding [44].

To construct the HMO, we will apply rotations and translations to \(y^\sigma_\omega(\Omega)\) that map one side of the deformed unit cell to its opposite side. Thus, as a final point of characterization for the unit cell, we require the parallelogram condition to hold (i.e., \(|x_4 - x_1| = |x_1 - x_2|\) and \(|x_1 - x_4| = |x_2 - x_3|\)). This condition, combined with Kawasaki’s condition, constrains the four creases \(x_1 - x_0\). We parameterize these two conditions up to a trivial rescaling, rotation and translation as follows: We assume \(|x_2 - x_1| = |x_4 - x_3| = 1\) without loss of generality [45], and we introduce the angle \(\eta \in (0, \pi]\) as the direction cosine angle between \(x_2 - x_1\) and \(x_4 - x_1\) and the length \(|x_4 - x_1| = |x_3 - x_2| = l\). This completely parameterizes the boundary of the parallelogram (Fig. 2(a)). Additionally, we show in the supplemental that the creases satisfy Kawasaki’s condition if and only if the vertex \(x_0\) lies on one of two curves in the interior of the parallelogram. These curves are parameterized as follows.

(i). Case \(l > 1\): The two curves are given by: \(x_0(\lambda) = x_1 + \lambda(x_2 - x_1) + f^\pm(\lambda)(x_4 - x_1), \ \lambda \in (0, 1)\) and the two functions \(f^\pm : (0, 1) \to \mathbb{R}\) satisfy

\[
f^\pm(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{\frac{1}{l^2} (\lambda - \frac{1}{2})^2 + \frac{1}{l^2} - 1}. \tag{4}
\]

(ii). Case \(l < 1\): The two curves are given by: \(x_0(\lambda) = x_1 + \lambda(x_4 - x_1) + g^\pm(\lambda)(x_2 - x_1), \ \lambda \in (0, 1)\) and the two functions \(g^\pm : (0, 1) \to \mathbb{R}\) satisfy

\[
g^\pm(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{(\lambda - \frac{1}{2})^2 + 1 - \frac{l^2}{4}}. \tag{5}
\]

(iii). Case \(l = 1\): The two curves are given by: \(x_0(\lambda) = \lambda x_2 + (1 - \lambda)x_4\) and \(x_0(\lambda) = \lambda x_1 + (1 - \lambda)x_3\) for \(\lambda \in (0, 1)\).

The geometry of these curves is sketched in Fig 2(b-d). As there is an underlying reflection symmetry to this geometry, we are free to restrict our attention to either the
FIG. 2: The reference geometry of a Miura parallelogram. (a) The boundary of the parallelogram is parameterized by \( \eta \) and \( \ell \) (up to a uniform rescaling). (b-d) The admissible curves on which the interior vertex satisfies Kawasaki’s condition are shown in red. There are three cases, each parameterized by a \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \).

Thus, one might worry that the aforementioned—and rather general—family of groups lacks meaningful structure. Strikingly though (and this is made precise in [28]), discrete and abelian isometry groups subject to the stated cylinder condition are quite restrictive. They must be described by a parameterization

\[ \mathcal{G} = \{ g_1^p g_2^q : (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \} \]  

in which the generators of the group \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) are two screw isometries

\[ g_i = (R_{\theta_i} | \tau_i \mathbf{e} + (I - R_{\theta_i}) \mathbf{z}), \quad i = 1, 2, \]  

with parameters \( R_{\theta_i} \in SO(3), \theta_i \in (-\pi, \pi], \tau_i \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{e} \in \mathbb{S}^2 \) and \( \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^3, \mathbf{z} \cdot \mathbf{e} = 0 \) characterizing the rotation, rotation angle, translation, rotation axis and origin of the isometry, respectively. These parameters are subject to a "discreteness condition"

\[
\begin{cases}
  p^* \tau_1 + q^* \tau_2 = 0 \\
  p^* \theta_1 + q^* \theta_2 = 2\pi
\end{cases}
\]  

for some \((p^*, q^*) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\). Technically, we should also enforce \( \tau_1^2 + \tau_2^2 > 0 \), as the violation of this condition results in a flattened ring structure rather than a cylinder. However, this flattened ring case may be of technological interest (the folded flat portion of the Kresling pattern in Fig. 7(d) is one example).

Finally, we should point out the groups \( \mathcal{G} \) in (6) are not uniquely described by a single parameterization satisfying (7-8), nor should this be unexpected. In periodic structures, there are many equivalent choices of lattice vectors which generate the same lattice. In fact, the degeneracy here—much like the 2-D lattice case—is fully characterized by a \( \mu \in GL(\mathbb{Z}^2) \). That is, for any \( \mathcal{G} \) satisfying (6-8), we can replace the parameters by a linear transformation \( (\theta_1, \theta_2) \mapsto (\mu(\theta_1, \theta_2), (\tau_1, \tau_2) \mapsto \mu(\tau_1, \tau_2), (p^*, q^*) \mapsto \mu^T(p^*, q^*) \) and generate the same structure (i.e., \( \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_\mu \)) if and only if \( \mu \in GL(\mathbb{Z}^2) \).

Thus, the aim in what follows is to characterize the sets of parameters \((\eta, \ell, \lambda, \omega, \sigma, \theta_{1,2}, \tau_{1,2}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{z}, p^*, q^*) \) (up to this trivial degeneracy \( \mu \in GL(\mathbb{Z}^2) \)) that lead to a fully compatible cylindrical origami structure. This then captures the phase-space of all HMO.

**Design equations for HMO.** These are obtained systematically by satisfying all compatibility conditions, i.e., the conditions under which the structure is a closed cylindrical surface without any holes. For developing these ideas, we find it convenient to introduce the tessellation \( T \Omega = \{ g(\Omega) : g \in \mathcal{T} \} \) for the translation group \( \mathcal{T} = \{ t_1 t_2 : (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \} \) such that \( t_1 = (I | x_1 - x_4) \) and \( t_2 = (I | x_2 - x_1) \). Since

\[
\begin{align*}
  t_1(x_4) &= x_1, & t_2(x_3) &= x_2, \\
  t_2(x_1) &= x_2, & t_2(x_4) &= x_3,
\end{align*}
\]  

+ or − case in (i-iii) without loss of generality. This fully defines the crease pattern.

To summarize, the parameters \((\eta, \ell, \lambda, \omega, \sigma)\) above completely characterize all possible Miura parallelograms—up to trivial rescaling, translation, rigid rotation, and reflection—and all possible ways of folding origami using these parallelograms.

**HMO are objective structures.** We now define precisely what it means for a structure to be HMO, and we discuss the implications of this definition as it relates to characterizing all such structures. The line of thinking here is based on a systematic and complete characterization of helical and rod symmetry that we developed for an analogous problem: describing all possible phases in nanotubes [28]. To avoid being overly redundant, we simply borrow (and state without proof) many ideas from this work that are natural to constructions herein.

Briefly, we define an HMO as any compatible origami structure obtained by a suitable group action \( \mathcal{G} \) on the partially folded Miura parallelogram \( y_\mu^*(\Omega) \). The groups we consider are discrete, abelian, contain only isometries, and have an orbit \( \{ g(x) : g \in \mathcal{G} \} \) for a point \( x \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) that gives a collection of points that all lie on a cylinder. This means that every Miura parallelogram in the structure has the same characteristic radius from a fixed axis and “sees the same environment” [29], which is the natural generalization of periodicity to cylindrical origami.

A generic isometry is simply a map \( g = (R | c), R \in O(3), c \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) that acts on points in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) via \( g(x) = Rx + c \). Additionally, the collection of all isometries is a group.
this gives a tessellated half-space on $\mathbb{R}^3$ of the Miura parallelogram prior to folding. Suitably defined strips of this tessellation will be used to build the HMO from this easy-to-manufacture flat state (e.g., Fig. 3).

We begin with local compatibility: Consider a partially folded Miura parallelogram $y^\omega_2(\Omega)$ with it corners denoted as $y_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ (Fig. 1(a)), consider a $G$ satisfying (6-8), and consider the structure $Gy^\omega_2(\Omega) = \{g^2g_1^2(y^\omega_2(\Omega)) : (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$. The nearest neighbors to $y^\omega_2(\Omega)$ on the structure are, therefore, obtained by the application of group elements to this domain. Without loss of generality [46], we assume the neighbor to the “left” of the unit cell is $g_1(y^\omega_2(\Omega))$ and the neighbor “above” the unit cell is $g_2(y^\omega_2(\Omega))$. Then, one condition of compatibility is that the unit cell is connected to its neighbors; particularly, to its neighbor on the left along the line $\ell_{23} = \{y_2 + (1 - \lambda)y_3 : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$ and to its neighbor up above along the line $\ell_{12} = \{\lambda y_1 + (1 - \lambda)y_2 : \lambda \in [0, 1]\}$. This gives four restrictions on the group elements:

\[
\begin{align*}
  g_1(y_4) &= y_1, & g_1(y_3) &= y_2, \\
  g_2(y_1) &= y_2, & g_2(y_4) &= y_3,
\end{align*}
\]

(10)

which we term local compatibility.

The reason for the terminology is that (10) is a discrete and symmetry-related version of the local curl-free and jump compatibility conditions that indicate whether a prescribed deformation gradient can describe a continuous deformation on a simply connected domain. Indeed, $g_1$ and $g_2$ are commutative (i.e., $g_1g_2 = g_2g_1$) under the multiplication rule $g_1g_2(x) = g_1(2g_2(x))$. This means that $g_1$ and $g_2$ satisfy the loop condition $g_1g_2(y_i) = g_2g_1(y_i)$. As a result, the four nearest neighbor Miura parallelograms $y^\omega_2(\Omega)$, $g_1(y^\omega_2(\Omega))$, $g_2(y^\omega_2(\Omega))$ and $g_1g_2(y^\omega_2(\Omega)) = g_2g_1(y^\omega_2(\Omega))$ fit together automatically whenever (10) holds. Combining (9) and (10), it then follows that the induced deformation $y : \Omega \to Gy^\omega_2(\Omega)$ given by

\[
y(t_1^2t_2^2(x)) = g_1^2g_2^2(y^\omega_2(x)), \quad \forall x \in \Omega, \quad (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2
\]

(11)
is a continuous isometric origami deformation that maps the tessellated half-space to the origami structure. This is a rather useful observation: it will enable us to concretely describe how to fold a flat tessellation to an HMO whenever the parameters furnish such allowances.

In this direction, we have solved the conditions of local compatibility in (10) explicitly and completely in the supplementary. To introduce the parameterization, we assume the Miura parallelogram is neither flat nor folded flat (i.e., we assume $\omega \in (-\pi, 0) \cup (0, \pi)$), and we let the side length vectors be given by $u_a = y_3 - y_4$, $u_b = y_2 - y_1$, $v_a = y_1 - y_4$ and $v_b = y_2 - y_3$. We can then always define the right-hand orthonormal frame $\{f_1, f_2, f_3\}$,

\[
f_1 = \frac{u_a + u_b}{|u_a + u_b|}, \quad f_2 = \frac{u_a \times u_b}{|u_a \times u_b|}, \quad f_3 = \frac{u_a - u_b}{|u_a - u_b|}
\]

(12)

(since $\omega \notin \{0, \pm\pi\}$ implies $u_a \times u_b \neq 0$), and the necessary and sufficient conditions for local compatibility in this setting are as follows:

\[
e \equiv e^\omega(\omega, \varphi) = c_\varphi f_1 + s_\varphi f_2,
\]

\[
\theta_1 \equiv \theta_1^\omega(\omega, \varphi) = \text{sign}(e \cdot (u_a \times u_b)) \arccos \left(\frac{u_a \cdot P_e u_b}{|P_e u_b|^2}\right),
\]

\[
\theta_2 \equiv \theta_2^\omega(\omega, \varphi) = \text{sign}(e \cdot (v_a \times v_b)) \arccos \left(\frac{v_a \cdot P_e v_b}{|P_e v_b|^2}\right),
\]

\[
\tau_1 \equiv \tau_1^\omega(\omega, \varphi) = e \cdot v_a, \quad \tau_2 \equiv \tau_2^\omega(\omega, \varphi) = e \cdot u_a,
\]

\[
z \equiv z^\omega(\omega, \varphi) = (I - R_{\theta_1} + e \otimes e)^{-1}P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2}y_3).
\]

(13)

where $P_e = I - e \otimes e$ denotes the linear transformation that projects vectors onto the plane with normal $e$, the angle $\varphi \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2)$ (describing the axis $e$) is a free parameter [47]. For completeness, note that the fully folded cases $\omega \in \{-\pi, \pi\}$ and fully unfolded case $\omega = 0$ do have solutions, but with a distinctly different character than those described by the formulas in (13) (see the supplementary for details). In the remainder, we will focus mainly on the solutions governed by (13). Examples of the exceptional cases are fully degenerate cylinders ($\omega = 0$) or flattened ring structures ($\omega = \pi$). We will discuss these only in passing.

Importantly, the corners $y_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ (and thereby $u_{a,b}, v_{a,b}$, and $f_{1,2,3}$ above) depend only on the folding parameter $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$ and the mountain-valley assignment $\sigma \in \{\pm\}$. Moreover, this dependence is left unrestricted by the parameterization in (13). Consequently, the kinematic freedom consistent with helical or rod symmetry in this system is $(\omega, \varphi, \sigma) \in (-\pi, \pi) \times \{0\} \times \{\pm\}$ after satisfying local compatibility. We utilize this freedom to solve the discreteness condition (8). This, in turn, is equivalent to closing the cylinder.

Indeed, we take $(p^*, q^*) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}$ as given and observe that the latter discreteness condition (i.e., $p^*\tau_1 + q^*\tau_2 = 0$) uniquely prescribes $\varphi \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ under the parameterization (13). The explicit form is

\[
\varphi \equiv \varphi_0^\omega(\omega) = \arctan \left(\frac{-f_1 \cdot (p^*v_a + q^*u_a)}{f_2 \cdot (p^*v_a + q^*u_a)}\right).
\]

(14)

(Note, $\varphi \equiv \varphi_0^\omega(\omega) = \pi/2$ if $f_2 \cdot (p^*v_a + q^*u_a) = 0$, and $p^*v_a + q^*u_a$ is never parallel to $f_3$ for $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$. So the parameterization is always well-defined.) We then substitute this formula into (13), which makes apparent that the final discreteness condition demands

\[
p^*\theta_1^\omega(\omega, \varphi_0^\omega(\omega)) + q^*\theta_2^\omega(\omega, \varphi_0^\omega(\omega)) = 2\pi
\]

(15)

for some $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$. This we evaluate numerically by cycling through the folding parameter $\omega$. The solutions then correspond to parameters that give a HMO structure. Specifically, consider the chiral vector $C_h = p^*a_1 + q^*a_2$ (see Fig. 3(a)), i.e., the widely used descriptor for chirality in carbon nanotubes [30, 31]. In
substituting \( \varphi = \varphi^*(\omega) \) into the group parameters (13), and using these to generate an origami structure (11) from the flat tessellation, we make the striking observation related to \( C_h \): as \( \omega \) monotonically increases (or decreases) from zero, the structure is simply “rolling up” as rigidly foldable origami, with the line traced by \( C_h \) deforming effectively as a singly curved arc. Further, the points of \( \omega \) at which \( \omega = \omega^*_\sigma \) such that (15) holds. Finally, because of the underlying symmetry of the group \( G \), the boundaries of a suitable \( C_h \) tessellated strip (Fig. 3(b-c)) connect perfectly if and only if (15) holds. Thus, (15) is the necessary and sufficient condition on the kinematic parameters for closing the cylinder and generating a HMO with \( C_h \) chirality.

The phase-space of HMO. The design equations above lead to a concrete recipe to completely determine all HMO:

1. Fix the reference geometry of the Miura parallelogram and chirality by assigning \((\eta, l, \lambda) \in (0, \pi) \times \mathbb{R}^+ \times (0, 1)\) and \((p^*, q^*) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{0\}\).

2. Assign the group parameters by the design equations in (13-14).

3. Cycle through all \( \omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\} \) and \( \sigma \in \{\pm\} \) to numerically compute all solutions \( \omega = \omega^*_\sigma \) to the final design equation (15). This closes the cylinder and generates an HMO with the parameters \( \eta, l, \lambda, p^*, q^* \) and group parameters (13-14) for \( \omega = \omega^*_\sigma \).

4. Cycle through the reference geometry \((\eta, l, \lambda)\) and chirality \((p^*, q^*)\) in Step 1 and repeat Steps 2 and 3 for each case to determine all HMO structures.

A natural way to view the phase-space is to fix topology (i.e., the discreteness \((p^*, q^*)\)) and cycle through reference parameters \((\eta, l, \lambda)\) to create a three dimensional phase diagram of HMO solutions. We highlight this through two examples in Fig. 4.

The first is a generic helical case in which \((p^*, q^*) = (3, 7)\). We see that in Fig. 4(a-b), if the reference parameters furnish a HMO with a non-zero folding parameter \( \omega \) for this discreteness, then the structure is typically bistable with \( \omega \in \{\omega^+_\sigma, \omega^-_\sigma\} \) corresponding to different mountain-valley assignments for the Miura parallelogram [48]. There are also special cases—in particular at the boundary (in red)—that defy this categorization [49]. In general though, we find by fairly exhaustive numerical treatment that bistability is ubiquitous when both \( p^* \) and \( q^* \) are non-zero. In particular, we do not find any rigidly-foldable motions that preserves helical symmetry for these closed cylindrical structures.

The characterization is of a slightly different nature in the case that either \( p^* \) or \( q^* \) are zero. Such HMO are described by a closed ring of Miura parallelograms repeated along the axis e in a periodic fashion, and these inherit a richer set of kinematics for a certain range of reference parameters. For example, the case \((p^*, q^*) = (8, 0)\) in Fig. 4(c-d) has a region of reference parameters \((\eta, l, \lambda)\) that generate quadrastable solutions. By stress induced twist and extension (or contraction), the structure can bifurcate from one solution \( \omega^*_\sigma \) to another solution \( \omega^*_\sigma \neq \omega^*_\sigma \), while preserving mountain-valley assignment. This is true for both mountain-valley assign-
FIG. 4: Phase diagrams of HMO structures parameterized by the three parameters \((\eta, l, \lambda)\) of the Miura parallelogram unit cell. (a-b) The topology given by \((p^*, q^*) = (3, 7)\): Dark-green indicates bistability, in the sense that both mountain-valley assignments generate a HMO structure with this topology and chirality. Purple indicates inadmissibility, in the sense that no HMO solutions can be achieved for this topology by folding a reference Miura parallelogram with these parameters. The curve in yellow indicates a degenerate HMO that is achieved for a fully unfolded Miura parallelogram. As such, it is independent of \(\lambda\) since the creases are not being utilized. Further, it always corresponds to a vertical interface. Finally, the boundary in red should always be checked carefully, as there are examples at this boundary that defy the aforementioned characterization. (c-d) An example of ring-like structures given by fixing the topology \((p^*, q^*) = (8, 0)\): The characterization is as before, except there is also a large region of reference Miura parallelograms that gives quadstability, as highlighted in light-green in the \((\eta, l, \lambda)\) phase-space.

ments \(\sigma \in \{\pm\}\), and so these describe quadstable HMO. Again, our exhaustive numerical treatment beyond this example suggests that there are no rigidly-foldable motions for these ring structures, and rather that large regions of bistability and quadstability are ubiquitous.

Another way to view this phase-space is to fix a tesselated strip and classify all the HMO that can be obtained from this strip by the “rolling up” process (Fig. 3). For example, consider the tessellation in the top-left corner of Fig. 5. This has a width of \(|q^*| = 7\) Miura parallelograms that are repeated along the length of the strip. The boundaries of this tessellation can fit together to form a HMO in different ways; particularly, in all the ways \((p^*, \pm 7)\) for \(p^* \in \mathbb{Z}\) that solve the discreteness conditions in (14) and (15). This corresponds to different points \(A_i\) on the boundary that connect to \(O\) on the opposite boundary.

To clarify this viewpoint, we have completely evaluated the phase-space—in this particular sense—for the example tessellation shown. Strikingly, this tessellation is bistable for all \((p^*, \pm 7)\), meaning that it can be isometrically rolled up to form a HMO of arbitrary chirality for either choice of mountain-valley assignment. This is highlighted graphically in Fig. 5. Starting at \(p^* = 0\), the solutions for increasing integer values of \(|p^*|\) are plotted in the \((\omega, \varphi)\) phase-space. Physically, this integer increase describes a shift in the structure by one Miura parallelogram along the helical interface corresponding to the boundary of the tessellation—a process completely encapsulated by a change in both the folding parameter \(\omega\) of the Miura parallelogram and axis orientation \(\varphi\). We find it instructive to elaborate on this diagram in detail, as it is a natural lead-in to a mechanism for reconfigurability in HMO structures.

Briefly: For the trajectory describing increasing \(|p^*|\) in blue, the shift simultaneously involves widening the radius and contracting along the axis. Interestingly, the helical interface traced out by this shift is gradually flattening out as \(|p^*| \to \infty\). However, for topological reasons, it cannot go completely flat since a horizontal interface can only exist for \(p^* = 0\) [50]. Instead, we see the emergence of an accumulation point (limit as \(|p^*| \to \infty\)) at roughly \(\pi^{-1}(\omega, \varphi) \approx (0, 0.13)\). In contrast, the trajectory in purple is also for increasing integer values of \(|p^*|\), starting from zero, but describes a shift along the helical interface in the opposite sense, which takes the interface ever more vertical. This involves extension along the axis and contraction of the radius; a process that, evidently, cannot continue indefinitely. Instead, there is a transi-
FIG. 5: A diagram describing all the ways the reference tessellation, i.e., an infinite strip with width $|q^*| = 7$ Miura parallelogram in the top left corner, can be rolled up to form a HMO. These solve (14) and (15) for $(p^*, q^*) \in \{(4, \ldots, 22), -7\}$ in red, and $(p^*, q^*) \in \{(23, \ldots, 150), -7\}$ in green. The purple solutions depicted are obtained differently for aesthetic reasons: First, we solve (14) and (15) for $(p^*, q^*) \in \{(1, 2, 3), -7\}$. This yields the axis orientation $\varphi = \varphi^*(\omega^*) < 0$. We then notice that, by replacing the axis orientation with $\varphi = \varphi^*(\omega^*) + \pi$ and the discreetness $(p^*, q^*)$ with its minus, we achieve exactly the same structure. For all these solutions (blue/purple/red/green), there are also trivial solutions of mirrored chirality which correspond to $(p^*, q^*, \omega, \varphi) \rightarrow -(p^*, q^*, \omega, \varphi)$. We did not bother to plot these, as they do not provide any additional information. Finally, we did not calculate the solutions beyond $|p^*| = 150$ since the accumulation points along the blue and green trajectories as $|p^*| \rightarrow \infty$ are evident.

In summary, we have a completely general framework to investigate the phase-space of HMO structures. Our numerical efforts in this direction suggest that rigidly foldable motions that preserve helical symmetry are impossible in such structures. Nevertheless, as the examples in Fig. 4 and 5 highlight, multi-stability for a fixed topology (i.e., fixed $(p^*, q^*)$) is an ubiquitous feature, and a rich variety of topologies can generically be achieved by rolling up a reference tessellation in different ways. In what follows, we exploit these two features to discuss approaches for making these structures reconfigurable.

Motion by slip. One such means of reconfigurability is suggested by the diagram in Fig. 5: A variety of HMO are achieved from the same underlying tessellation by solving the discreteness conditions (14) and (15) for different discrete values of $p^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ (with $|q^*| = \text{const.}$ a fixed integer describing the number of unit cells along
the width of the tessellated strip of interest). However, notice that the parameterizations also make sense when treating $p^*$ as a continuous parameter and solving these equations. We simply “connect the dots” along a continuous curve in the $(\omega, \varphi)$ phase-space. While this continuation does not give a HMO for non-integer values of $p^*$, it does describe a rigidly foldable isometric origami motion of this tessellation. Precisely, consider any continuous curve $(\omega^p_\mathcal{F}, \varphi^p_\mathcal{F}(\omega^p_\mathcal{F}))$ that solves (14-15) for $p^*$ in some connected interval of $\mathbb{R}$. Substituting this curve into the group parameters (13) and then all the parameters into (11), we observe that the deformation must describe rigidly foldable origami as a function of $p^*$ due to the underlying continuity and distance preserving nature of all of these maps. In fact, there is a quite simple physical interpretation; this is nothing but motion by slip along the helical interface that connects the boundaries of the tessellation.

An example to this effect is provided in Fig. 6. For the same underlying tessellation, we vary $p^*$ continuously from 2 to 5 to generate a continuous curve of solutions to (14) and (15) in the $(\omega, \varphi)$ phase-space. The origami structures (obtained by substituting solutions on this curve into (13) and (11)) are displayed at integers and half-integers. Notice at the half-integers $p^* \in \{2.5, 3.5, 4.5\}$, the misfit (in red) is along a single helical interface and exactly halfway between two HMO structures $p^* \pm 1/2$ (in blue). This clearly indicates motion by slip along the helical interface.

We should point out that this slip motion is by no means special to the particular example shown but rather generic to these origami structures. Thus, it would seem a natural means of reconfigurability in engineering design: For example, we speculate that one could design a slider mechanism that attaches to the two boundaries of the underlying tessellation. For the design, we envision that, once the two sides are connected to form a HMO, this slider would allow for easy motion along the helical interface but would otherwise act as a linear spring for distortion in the radial direction and be (ideally) rigid for distortion normal to the radial and helical tangent directions. In this sense then, the square of the max misfit displacement (e.g., $\Delta^2$ for $\Delta$ in the example Fig. 6) would provide a reasonable proxy to the energy barrier to motion up to, say, a constant depending only on the design of the slider. Since the motion is otherwise rigidly foldable origami—and, particularly, involves no change in the mountain-valley assignment in most instances—we tend to think that all other sources of energy in the system (e.g., a “bending energy” of the folds) would be negligible by comparison. As a result, we expect such designs to achieve equilibrium states at exactly each discrete value of $p^*$ that admits a HMO along a continuous path in the $(\omega, \varphi)$ phase-space. We also expect a modest energy barrier for transitioning between these discrete states. Thus, reconfigurability here would presumably involve an actuation or loading that exceeds the energy barrier; thereby, allowing the structure to “jump” from one HMO to its neighbor. We plan to investigate this further in a follow up work. For now though, we introduce another potential means of reconfigurability in these systems.

**Motion by phase transformation.** Multistability is ubiquitous in mechanical systems [32, 33], and one can often leverage this to obtain overall motion by transforming the system from one stable state to another. In HMO, we have a generically bistable (sometimes quasistable) mechanical system for a fixed topology due to the underlying constraints imposed by cylindrical origami; there is a plus-phase and minus-phase (sometimes two each) corresponding to the two different mountain-valley assignments for the Miura parallelogram (Fig. 4). We exploit this feature to study coexistence of phases, i.e., whether the two phases can exist as mixtures that result in cylindrical origami, with the potential to produce overall motion. The line of thinking here is inspired by geometric compatibility in martensitic phase transformations [34–36] and its direct analog for discrete helical structures [28].

To address coexistence of phases, the naive idea is to transform one of the phases generating a HMO to another via the propagation of geometrically compatible interfaces, but there is admittedly some subtlety. We begin by considering two locally compatible origami structures generated by the same underlying tessellation: $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{F}}(\Omega) = \{g_1, g_2(\mathcal{F}(\Omega)) : (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$ and

![FIG. 6: By treating $p^*$ as a continuous parameter in the design equations, a rigidly foldable motion corresponding to slip along a helical interface is achieved (left). This induces a misfit displacement in the radial direction at the boundaries of the tessellation for non-discrete values of $p^*$ (right).](image-url)
\( \hat{\mathbf{y}}_\Omega(y_\Omega) = \{ \hat{g}_i, \hat{g}_j(y_\Omega) : (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \} \), where \( \hat{g}_i \) (respectively, \( \hat{g}_j \)) have group parameters as in (13) with \( (\omega, \varphi, \sigma) = (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \) (respectively, \( (\omega, \varphi, \sigma) = (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \)) on the domain \( (-\pi, \pi) \times \{0\} \times (-\pi/2, \pi/2) \times \{\pm\} \). Notice, we are not enforcing the discreteness condition (14-15), as this will be relaxed since the origami here can involve more than one phase. In fact, by arguing rigorously in the supplemental, we are able to show that the necessary and sufficient conditions for a closed cylindrical origami of these (potentially) two phases are:

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) &= \tau^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}), \\
\theta^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) &= \theta^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}), \\
p^* \tau^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) + \hat{q} \tau^\Delta_2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tau^\Delta_2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) &= 0, \tag{16} \\
p^* \theta^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) + \hat{q} \theta^\Delta_2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) + (q^* - \hat{q}) \theta^\Delta_2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) &= 2\pi,
\end{align*}
\]

for some \( p^*, \hat{q}, q^* \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( |\hat{q}| \leq |q^*| \) and \( q^* \hat{q} \geq 0 \), or we can also exchange the roles of \( (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \) above to generate the cylindrical origami. We focus on the system in (16) without loss of generality.

This system of equations, when solved, admits three types of cylindrical origami depending on the values of the various parameters: HMO (i.e., single-phased cylindrical origami), those with horizontal interfaces, and those with helical interfaces. The former is obvious; if we set \( (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) = (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \), then the system in (16) degenerates to the original discreteness condition (8), which is solved via the procedure in (14-15). Alternatively, horizontal interfaces correspond to \( q^* = \hat{q} = 0 \) and \( (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \neq (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \). Finally, helical interfaces correspond to everything else, i.e., \( p^* \hat{q} \neq 0 \) and \( (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \neq (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \). In particular, the latter two formulas for helical interfaces describe a \( \rho \)-averaged discreteness condition given the former two. That is, these formulas can be written as \( p^* (\tau_1) + q^* (\tau_2) = 0 \) and \( p^* (\theta_1) + q^* (\theta_2) = 2\pi \) with \( \rho = \hat{q}/q^* \) being the density of \( (\cdot) \)-phase. In this sense, we will show that \( |\hat{q}| \) and \( |q^*| - |\hat{q}| \) are the number of rows of the \( (\cdot) \)-phase and \( (\cdot) \)-phase, respectively, for this type of cylindrical origami.

Focusing first on simpler case of a horizontal interface (i.e., \( q^* = \hat{q} = 0 \)), we see that (16) reduces to

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) &= \tau^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = 0, \\
p^* \theta^\Delta_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) &= p^* \theta^\Delta_2(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = 2\pi. \tag{17}
\end{align*}
\]

As a consequence, the complete characterization of the solutions here is rather trivial. Specifically, any set of parameters which generates a ring-type HMO (i.e., solves (14-15) with \( q^* = 0 \)) can evidently be connected to any other along a horizontal interface, and these are the only types of solutions in this case. This is quite striking: As large regions of bistability and quasistability are ubiquitous to ring structures (Fig. 4(c-d)), it is evidently a generic fact that such structures can form mixtures of the two (or four) phases along horizontal interfaces.

One example in the bistable regime of Miura parallelograms is provided in Fig 7(a). Notice that, when a ring is transformed, it produces an overall twist and extension of the structure: The parameters \( \theta_1 \) and \( \tau_1 \) for the generators \( \hat{g}_1 \) and \( \hat{g}_1 \) are identical (as they solve (17)), but their analogs \( \theta_2 \) and \( \tau_2 \) in \( \hat{g}_2 \) and \( \hat{g}_2 \) need not be. The overall twist and extension is simply the manifestation of this difference. That is, whenever a single ring is transformed, the magnitudes of twist and extension are given by \( \Delta\theta = |(\theta_2 - \theta_2)| \) and \( \Delta\tau = |\tau_2 - \tau_2| \), respectively [51].

As these quantities are often figures of merit in design, it seems quite natural to address what ring-structures \( (q^* = 0) \) give the maximal overall twist or maximal overall extension when a layer is transformed. This can be done systematically. We first fix the boundary of Miura parallelogram. Then, as a function of the crease parameter \( \lambda \in (0, 1) \) defining the interior vertex, we compute the parameters that give a bistable or quasistable HMO and find the maximum difference \( \Delta\theta \) and \( \Delta\tau \) for this \( \lambda \)-dependence (Fig. 7(b)). Finally, we cycle through the boundary parameters \( (l, \eta) \) and repeat. The results of this procedure for \( p^* = 8 \) are highlighted graphically in Fig. 7(c-d) and are quite illuminating for design. For ring-type HMO with horizontal interfaces, we can evidently conclude:

1. The transforming twist is largest in the triangular region depicted in Fig. 7(c). These involve a twist with angle \( \pi \) per transforming layer.

2. The maximal extension is unambiguously achieved as \( (l, \eta, \lambda) \to (0.414, \pi/2, 0) \), which exactly corresponds to a special Kresling pattern.

A transformation inducing the maximal twist (i.e., on in the triangular region) and the special Kresling pattern are also provided in the figures. The latter has the feature that the Miura parallelogram—actually, the limit \( \lambda \to 0 \) of Miura parallelograms—generates a HMO in the completely unfolded and the fully folded-in-half states. Hence, the extension achieved is as large as can ever be expected, as it is the full height of the layer itself. The former is one of many examples for which a nearly degenerate HMO can transform along the same mountain-valley assignment, inducing a twist-per-layer that is essentially half the circumference of the cylinder.

We end the discussion of compatible interfaces by briefly introducing an example corresponding to the helical case (Fig. 7(e)). This is obtained by solving the system of equations in (16) with \( \hat{q} = 3 \), \( q^* = 8 \) and \( p^* = 8 \). Unfortunately, we have no general strategy for solving this class of problems. Instead, the solution is achieved by an iterative procedure involving slight perturbations of both plus-phase and minus-phase HMO with this topology. Observe that the perturbed phases are such that a three layered plus-phase can connect to a five layered minus-phase in such a way to be perfectly
FIG. 7: Phase transforming HMO. (a) Overall twist and extension obtained by transformation via a compatible horizontal interface. (b) The twist $\Delta \theta$ and extension $\Delta \tau$ with $(l, \eta) = (1.5, \pi/4)$ for $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. (c-d) The maximal twist and extension as a function of the reference parameters $(l, \eta, \lambda)$. Each point in the phase space indicates the twist and extension after maximizing with respect to $\lambda$. For a more detailed diagram that highlights the $\lambda$ dependence, see the supplemental. (e) An example of cylindrical origami with helical interfaces.

compatible along two infinitely long helical interfaces. Additional perturbations are required to propagate the geometrically compatible helical interfaces (i.e., solve the system with different $q$) and induce an overall motion (twist and extension). Such change in solutions is significant, as it avoids the issue of rigidity we observed with helical interfaces of two phases in atomic structures [28].

Discussion. In this work, we have presented a thorough—if not complete—characterization of the phase-space of Helical Miura Origami. The results are mostly explicit and quantitative, but otherwise involve only the simplest of numerical implementation. As such, this characterization should make for an efficient design tool for the myriad of applications seeking multi-functional and tunable structures: The motion by slip, which induces expansion (or contraction) radially in the structure, would seem a natural mechanism in the design of medical stents. The quadstable ring structures—really their “fold-in-half” analogs—are already being explored as a concept for deployable space structures [18]. And the helical symmetry, which is on full display in this methodology, has the potential to be exploited for the design of novel electro-magnetic antennas [52]; particularly, since discrete symmetries can interact with Maxwell’s equations to produce highly directionized electro-magnetic profiles [37]. In fact, the helical interfaces are an interesting example in this setting, as they involve both a short-wavelength helical symmetry (the unit cell) and a long-wavelength symmetry (e.g., a shift and potential twist of the eight layers along the axis in Fig 7(e)).

On the theoretical front, the abstraction underlying all the results here is: discrete and abelian groups of isometries interact naturally with origami unit cells to produce complex—hopefully interesting—structures. While we have chosen to focus our attention on one type of unit cell (the Miura parallelogram), the approach applies much more broadly. For instance, Kawasaki’s condition can certainly be relaxed [21] and still yield an origami unit cell. In addition, advances in 3-D/4-D printing and manufacturing make it sensible to also consider: 1) origami that is absent a flat configuration, and 2) simple building blocks of nonisometric origami [38, 39] made of active materials. In all such cases, as long as the unit cell has four and only four corners, the design equations
for the group parameters (i.e., the equations (13-15)) directly apply to construct any Helical Origami. Thus, the group theoretic approach to origami design would seem to have a broad and remarkable scope.
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Kawasaki condition is necessary and sufficient for the flat and rigid foldability of a four-fold origami.

Specifically, $R_i(\gamma_i)$ is the unique the right-hand rotation of angle $\gamma_i$ that satisfies $R_i(\gamma_i)(x_i - x_0) = x_i - x_0$

Technically, for the Miura parallelogram with crease sector angles as in (3), we can “fold-in-half” again. But this observation will not be used in what follows; hence, its absence in the formula.

Explicitly, $y_{1,2} = x_{1,2}$, $y_3 = y_0 + R_2(\gamma_2)(x_3 - x_0)$ and $y_4 = y_0 + R_1(-\gamma_1)(x_4 - x_0)$ under one of the parameterizations in (2-3).

Any Miura parallelogram $\Omega$ can be rescaled by a $\lambda > 0$ such that the four corners of $\lambda\Omega$ satisfy $1 = |x_2 - x_1| = |x_4 - x_3|$.

As this assumption is equivalent to alleviating the degeneracy discussed above by fixing a $\mu \in GL(\mathbb{Z}^2)$.

Technically, $\varphi \in (-\pi, \pi]$ is the necessary condition, not $\varphi \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2]$. However, there is an additional degeneracy related to the axis: if $e \mapsto -e$ (i.e., $\varphi \mapsto \varphi + \pi$), then $(\theta_{1,2}, \tau_{1,2}, z) \mapsto (-\theta_{1,2}, -\tau_{1,2}, z)$ due to the formulas (13), but this does not change the generators $g_1$ and $g_2$.

By bistability, we mean two distinct solutions of the same chirality: for a given solution, there is always a solution of mirrored chirality that is obtained by rolling up the tessellation (e.g., Fig. 3) in exactly the opposite sense. We ignore this trivial degeneracy here.

At the boundary between bistability and inadmissibility, we observe some instances of unistability (i.e., one of the mountain-valley assignments does not possess a solution. We also have found one example (highlighted in the supplemental) where the structure is bistable for the same mountain-valley assignment and has no solutions for the other assignment.

This is proved in the supplemental.

Here, we define $\theta_2 = \theta_2^s(\vec{\omega}, \vec{\varphi})$ and the other parameters likewise.

Presumably also acoustic metamaterials...
A. On the parameterization of a Miura parallelogram.

Let \( \{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \) denote the standard basis on \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), and let \( x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) denote the corner points of the Miura parallelogram, which in the flat state is represented by a domain \( \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \) (a two-dimensional domain embedded into \( \mathbb{R}^3 \)). To parameterize these points, we choose \( x_1 = 0 \), \( x_2 = e_1 \), \( x_4 = l(\cos \eta e_1 + \sin \eta e_2) \), and \( x_3 = x_2 + x_4 - x_1 \) for \( \eta = \angle x_2 x_1 x_4 \in (0, \pi) \) and \( l > 0 \).

This is a general parameterization of a parallelogram up to translation, rotation and uniform rescaling. The four creases of the Miura parallelogram merge to a point on the interior, which we denote with \( x_0 \). This has the form

\[
x_0 = x_1 + \lambda_1 (x_2 - x_1) + \lambda_2 (x_4 - x_1), \quad \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, 1),
\]

where \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) are chosen so that the sector angles satisfy the well-known Kawasaki’s condition for flat foldability, i.e., that opposite angles sum to \( \pi \).

To characterized \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \), note that Kawasaki’s condition \( \angle x_1 x_0 x_4 = \angle x_2 x_0 x_3 = \pi \) is equivalent to

\[
\frac{(x_4 - x_0) \cdot (x_1 - x_0)}{|x_4 - x_0||x_1 - x_0|} + \frac{(x_3 - x_0) \cdot (x_2 - x_0)}{|x_3 - x_0||x_2 - x_0|} = 0 \tag{S2}
\]

by the law of cosines. A necessary condition is thus

\[
((x_4 - x_0) \cdot (x_1 - x_0)) (x_3 - x_0) |x_2 - x_0| = 0, \tag{S3}
\]

With our parameterizations \( x_i \equiv x_i(\eta, l, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \) for \( i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 \), the latter can be expressed as

\[
p_1 p_2 = 0,
\]

\[
p_1 = \left(2\lambda_1 - 1 + \frac{2(\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1 (2\lambda_2 - 1) \cos(\eta)}{(1-1)\lambda_1 + (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2}\right), \tag{S4}
\]

\[
p_2 = (\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1 - (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2,
\]

after some algebra that uses the fact that \( (\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1 + (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 \neq 0 \) and \( \sin^2(\eta) l^2 \neq 0 \). From this point, we can actually argue that the necessary and sufficient condition for (S2) is, in fact, only \( p_2 = 0 \).

Indeed, suppose this is not necessary. Then there is a solution to (S2) with \( p_2 \neq 0 \). Evidently then \( p_1 = 0 \) is necessary by (S4). But this is solved if and only if \( \lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 1/2 \) with \( l = 1 \) or

\[
\cos(\eta) = (1 - 2\lambda_1)(\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1 + (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2) \tag{S5}
\]

The former gives \( p_2 = 0 \), so we need only focus on the latter. In this case, we observe that \( (x_4 - x_0) \cdot (x_1 - x_0) \) in (S2) simplifies to

\[
\frac{(\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1 - (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2}{2(\lambda_1 - 1)} \tag{S6}
\]

by substituting the formula for \( \cos(\eta) \). Likewise, \( (x_3 - x_0) \cdot (x_2 - x_0) \) in (S2) simplifies to

\[
\frac{(\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2 - (\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1}{2\lambda_1} \tag{S7}
\]

by the same substitution. But again, these observations lead to the conclusion that

\[
p_2 = (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2 - (\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1 = 0 \tag{S8}
\]

since, if not, (S6) and (S7) have the same sign which violates (S2). Thus, \( p_2 = 0 \) is necessary.

For the sufficiency of \( p_2 = 0 \), we observe that (S3) holds since \( p_2 = 0 \) solves (S4). This means that either (S2) is solved or \( (x_4 - x_0) \cdot (x_1 - x_0) \) is non-zero and has the same sign as \( (x_3 - x_0) \cdot (x_2 - x_0) \). We show that the latter is false, and, as such, the former is true. Indeed, since \( x_i \equiv x_i(\eta, l, \lambda_1, \lambda_2) \) for \( i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4 \), we find that

\[
(x_4 - x_0) \cdot (x_1 - x_0) = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_1(2\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2 + (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2,
\]

\[
(x_3 - x_0) \cdot (x_2 - x_0) = (\lambda_1 - 1)^2 + (\lambda_1 - 1)(2\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2 + \lambda_2 l^2.
\]

By making the substitution \( (\lambda_2 - 1)\lambda_2 l^2 = (\lambda_1 - 1)\lambda_1 \) (which is \( p_2 = 0 \), the two equations in (S9) can be written as

\[
(x_4 - x_0) \cdot (x_1 - x_0) = \lambda_1((2\lambda_1 - 1) + l(2\lambda_2 - 1)\cos(\eta)),
\]

\[
(x_3 - x_0) \cdot (x_2 - x_0) = (\lambda_1 - 1)(2\lambda_1 - 1) + l(2\lambda_2 - 1)\cos(\eta)).
\]

Thus clearly, \( (x_4 - x_0) \cdot (x_1 - x_0) \) and \( (x_3 - x_0) \cdot (x_2 - x_0) \) have opposite signs or they are both zero. This is all that is required to show that (S8) implies (S2).

In summary, \( p_2 = 0 \) is necessary and sufficient for a solution to (S2), which is the condition that the crease pattern satisfies Kawasaki’s condition. This furnishes a \((\lambda_1, \lambda_2)\): If \( l > 1 \), the solutions of (S8) are

\[
\lambda_2 = \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{l^2}(\lambda_1 - 1)^2 + \frac{1 - l^2}{4}}. \tag{S11}
\]
If \( l < 1 \), the solutions are
\[
\lambda_1 = \frac{1}{2} \pm \sqrt{l^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} - l \right)^2 + \frac{1 - l^2}{4}}.
\]
Finally, the case \( l = 1 \) is solved by
\[
\lambda_2 = \lambda_1 \text{ or } 1 - \lambda_1.
\]
This is the complete parameterization for \((S8)\) and gives the stated results (i-iii) in the main text.

**B. Kinematics of a four-fold origami satisfying Kawasaki’s condition**

We define the four tangent and normal vectors to the crease pattern of the Miura parallelogram by
\[
t_i = \frac{x_i - x_0}{|x_i - x_0|}, \quad n_i = -\left( t_i \cdot e_2 \right) e_1 + \left( t_i \cdot e_1 \right) e_2
\]
for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). In addition, we denote two of the sector angles with \( \alpha = \angle x_1x_0x_2 = \arccos(t_2 \cdot t_1) \) and \( \beta = \angle x_2x_0x_3 = \arccos(t_3 \cdot t_2) \). Since the interior vertex of the Miura parallelogram satisfies Kawasaki’s condition, the other two are prescribed (i.e., \( \angle x_3x_0x_4 = \arccos(t_4 \cdot t_3) = \pi - \alpha \) and \( \angle x_4x_0x_1 = \arccos(t_1 \cdot t_4) = \pi - \beta \)). Finally, we introduce the right-hand rotations
\[
R_i(\gamma_i) = t_i \otimes t_i + \cos(\gamma_i)(n_i \otimes n_i + e_3 \otimes e_3)
\]
sin(\gamma_i)(e_3 \otimes n_i - n_i \otimes e_3),
\]
for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \), and we introduce the sets
\[
S_{\alpha_i} = \{ x \in \text{Conv} \{ x_i, x_0, x_1 \} \}
\]
\[
S_{\beta_i} = \{ x \in \text{Conv} \{ x_i, x_0, x_{i-1} \} \}, \quad i = 2, 3, 4.
\]
Observe that the rotation satisfy \( R_i(\gamma_i) t_i = t_i \) for all angles \( \gamma_i \). In addition, the sets \( S_{\alpha_i} \) describe the convex hull of two corner points and the interior vertex. As such, each gives a triangular region with sector angle \( \alpha_i \), and their union gives the domain of the entire Miura parallelogram, i.e., \( \cup_{i=1,2,3,4} S_{\alpha_i} = \Omega \).

With the notation now set, we note that, up to rotation and translation, a general isometric origami deformation of the Miura parallelogram is given by \( y: \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3 \) such that
\[
y(x) = \begin{cases} x, & \text{if } x \in S_{\alpha_2} \\
R_2(\gamma_2)(x-x_0) + x_0, & \text{if } x \in S_{\alpha_3} \\
R_2(\gamma_2)R_3(\gamma_3)(x-x_0) + x_0, & \text{if } x \in S_{\alpha_4} \\
R_1(-\gamma_1)(x-x_0) + x_0, & \text{if } x \in S_{\alpha_1}, \end{cases}
\]
and subject to compatibility conditions that the jump in the deformation gradient along each of the four tangents \( t_i \) is zero, i.e.,
\[
\begin{align*}
(I - R_1(-\gamma_1)) t_1 &= 0 \\
(R_2(\gamma_2) - I) t_2 &= 0 \\
(R_2(\gamma_2)R_3(\gamma_3) - R_2(\gamma_2)) t_3 &= 0 \\
(R_1(-\gamma_1) - R_2(\gamma_2)R_3(\gamma_3)) t_4 &= 0.
\end{align*}
\]
These compatibility conditions are necessary and sufficient for continuity of the deformation \( y \), and thus, ensure that \( y \) is a continuous isometric origami deformation of the Miura parallelogram. The angles are restricted to the interval \(-\pi \leq \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \leq \pi \). This natural physical restriction avoids paper passing through itself but allows the structure to be folded flat \( (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3 = \pm \pi) \).

As it happens, the first three compatibility conditions are solved trivially since \( R_i(\gamma_i) t_i = t_i \). The fourth can be rewritten as
\[
R_1(\gamma_1)R_2(\gamma_2)R_3(\gamma_3) t_4 = t_4.
\]
In turn, this demands that a product of rotations \( R = R_1(\gamma_1)R_2(\gamma_2)R_3(\gamma_3) \) satisfy \( R t_4 = t_4 \). Since this product is clearly also a rotation, it must be that \( R = R_4(\gamma_4) \) for some \( \gamma_4 \in [-\pi, \pi] \). Thus, we can write the final compatibility condition—really, the only one that is not solved trivially—as
\[
\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4 \in [-\pi, \pi], \quad \text{s.t.} \quad R_1(\gamma_1)R_2(\gamma_2)R_3(\gamma_3)R_4(\gamma_4) = I.
\]
This is the condition of compatibility stated in the main text.

We now introduce a theorem on the kinematics of a Miura four-fold intersection, which simply characterizes all solutions to \((S20)\) when the tangents (and therefore, the rotations) are related by Kawasaki’s condition. A generalized version of this theorem, in which Kawasaki’s condition is relaxed, is introduced in \([S1]\). For the result at hand, we find it convenient to employ the shorthand notation \( e_\theta = \cos(\theta) \) and \( s_\theta = \sin(\theta) \).

**Theorem B.1.** For a four-fold vertex satisfying Kawasaki’s condition, the compatibility condition \((S20)\) holds if and only if:

- **The folding angle belong to the four-fold families**
  \[
  \gamma_1 = -\sigma \gamma_3^2(\omega), \quad \gamma_2 = \sigma \omega, \quad \gamma_3 = \gamma_3^2(\omega), \quad \gamma_4 = \omega,
  \]
  \[
  \gamma_5^2(\omega) = \text{sign}(\sigma \omega + \sigma \omega) \arccos\left(\frac{\sigma \omega + \sigma \omega}{\sigma \omega + \sigma \omega}\right),
  \]
  \[
  \sigma \in A = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha = \beta = \pm \frac{\pi}{2} \\
0 & \text{if } \alpha = \beta \neq \pm \frac{\pi}{2} \\
+ & \text{if } \alpha = \pi - \beta \neq \pm \frac{\pi}{2} \quad \text{for } \omega \in [-\pi, \pi]. \\
\pm & \text{otherwise (S21)}
\end{cases}
  \]
  
- **The folding angle belong to the fold-in-half families**
  \[
  \begin{cases} \gamma_1, \gamma_3 = 0, \gamma_2, \omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \quad \text{if } \sigma = +, \alpha = \beta \\
\gamma_1, \omega \in [-\pi, \pi], \gamma_2, \omega = 0 \quad \text{if } \sigma = -, \alpha = \pi - \beta; \\
\gamma_1 = -\gamma_3, \omega \in [-\pi, \pi], \gamma_2, \omega = \pm \pi \quad \text{if } \sigma = +, \alpha = \beta \\
\gamma_1, \omega = \pm \pi, \gamma_2 = -\gamma_4, \omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \quad \text{if } \sigma = -, \alpha = \pi - \beta.
\end{cases}
\]
Proof. A necessary condition for (S20) is

\[ t_3 \cdot \left( R_3(\gamma_3) R_4(\gamma_4) - R_2^T(\gamma_2) R_1^T(\gamma_1) \right) t_1 = 0 \quad (S23) \]

By a direct calculation and since \( R_i(\theta) t_i = t_i \), we observe that

\[
t_3 \cdot \left( R_3(\gamma_3) R_4(\gamma_4) - R_2^T(\gamma_2) R_1^T(\gamma_1) \right) t_1 = t_3 \cdot \left( R_4(\gamma_4) - R_2^T(\gamma_2) \right) t_1 = (c_{\gamma_2} - c_{\gamma_4}) s_{\alpha} s_{\beta}.
\]

(S24)

Consequently, (S23) is solved if and only if \( \gamma_2 = \pm \gamma_4 \) since \( \alpha, \beta \in (0, \pi) \). Thus, from herein, we set \( \gamma_4 = \omega \) and \( \gamma_2 = \omega \sigma \) for \( \sigma \in \{\pm\} \) and \( \omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \), as this necessary.

Another necessary condition is simply

\[
\left( R_3(\gamma_3) R_4(\omega) - R_2^T(\omega \sigma) R_1^T(\gamma_1) \right) t_1 = 0.
\]

(S25)

The left-hand side can be rewritten in a form that is more revealing. For instance, we have already solved for the \( t_3 \) component of this equation (by (S23) and (S24)) and can project the equation onto the plane normal to \( t_3 \) and use the identity \( R_i(\theta)t_i = t_i \). These two observations give the identities

\[
\left( R_3(\gamma_3) R_4(\omega) - R_2^T(\omega \sigma) R_1^T(\gamma_1) \right) t_1 = P_3 \left( R_3(\gamma_3) R_4(\omega) - R_2^T(\omega \sigma) R_1^T(\gamma_1) \right) t_1 = 0 \quad (S26)
\]

where \( P_3 = I - t_3 \otimes t_3 \). Note that \( P_3 \) and \( \overrightarrow{R_3(\gamma_3) R_4(\omega) - R_2^T(\omega \sigma) R_1^T(\gamma_1)} \) commute, which gives the last identity.

Now, since trivially \( \overrightarrow{R_4(\omega)t_1} = \overrightarrow{R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1} = 1 \) and since \( t_3 \cdot R_4(\omega)t_1 = t_3 \cdot \overrightarrow{R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1} \) (by (S23) and (S24)), we have \( |P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1| = |P_3 R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1| \). Combining this with (S26), we observe that the needed identity in (S25) is solved in exactly one of two ways:

1. If \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 = 0 \), then (S25) holds trivially for all \( \gamma, \omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \).

2. Otherwise, \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 \neq 0 \). Consequently, this case is solved by letting \( \gamma_3 \in [-\pi, \pi] \) be the angle that takes the vector \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 \) to the vector of equal (and non-zero) magnitude \( P_3 R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1 \).

(Solutions in Case 1.) For this case, we characterize the \( (\omega, \alpha, \beta) \) such that \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 = 0 \). Clearly, we must have \( R_4(\omega)t_1 \in \{ \pm t_3 \} \). Further, since \( t_1, t_3 \) and \( t_4 \) are all in the same plane and \( t_1 \cdot t_4 = \cos(\pi - \beta) \neq 0 \), we must also have \( \omega \in (0, \pi) \). Consequently, the solution for \( \omega = 0 \) is evidently \( t_1 = -t_3 \) since \( t_1 \) cannot equal \( t_3 \). In other words, one solution is

\[
\omega = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = \pi - \beta.
\]

(S27)

For the other case, \( \omega \in \{ \pm \pi \} \), we evidently must have \( R_4(\pm \pi)t_1 = t_3 \). This is solved if and only if \( t_4 t_1 = t_4 t_3 \). In other words, the other solution in this case is

\[
\omega \in \{ \pm \pi \} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha = \beta.
\]

(S28)

The results (S27) and (S28) provide a complete parameterization of \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 = 0 \).

(Solutions in Case 2.) We now assume \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 \neq 0 \); equivalently, \( (\omega, \alpha, \beta, \sigma) \) do not belong to the parameterizations in (S27) and (S28). It follows that \( \gamma_3 \in [-\pi, \pi] \) obeys the parameterization

\[
\begin{align*}
\cos(\gamma_3) &= \frac{R_4(\omega)t_1 \cdot P_3 R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1}{|P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1|^2}, \\
\sin(\gamma_3) &= \frac{t_3 \cdot (R_4(\omega)t_1 \times R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1)}{|P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1|^2}.
\end{align*}
\]

(S29)

using the geometric definitions of the dot product and cross product, as well as several identities that we have either justified previously or can be easily shown: \( |P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1| = |P_3 R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1| \), \( P_3 P_3 = P_3 \), and \( t_3 \cdot (R_4(\omega)t_1 \times R_2(\omega \sigma)t_1) = t_3 \cdot (P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 \times R_3(\omega \sigma)t_1) \) since \( t_3 \cdot (R_4(\omega)t_1) = t_3 \cdot R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1 \).

Now, we should point out that it is always possible to find an angle \( \gamma_3 \in [-\pi, \pi] \) which obeys the relation (S29) when \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1 \neq 0 \). In fact, this relation uniquely determines the angle (up to a minor caveat [S2] that we will disregard in what follows, as it is of no physical consequence).

To describe the explicit function for this relation, we first note that Kawasaki’s condition furnishes the identity

\[
\frac{R_4(\omega)t_1 \cdot P_3 R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1}{|P_3 R_4(\omega)t_1|^2} = \frac{(\sigma - c_0 c_3) c_\omega + s_\alpha s_\beta}{(\sigma - c_0 c_3) + s_\alpha s_\beta c_\omega}.
\]

(S30)

by explicit verification. There are evidently two special cases to (S29) made apparent by this formula,

\[
\begin{cases}
\gamma_3 = 0 & \forall \omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \quad \text{if} \quad \sigma = +, \alpha = \beta \\
\gamma_3 \in \{ \pm \pi \} & \forall \omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{if} \quad \sigma = -, \alpha = \pi - \beta.
\end{cases}
\]

(S31)

(Remember, \( P_3 R_4(\omega)t_4 \neq 0 \) for this characterization; hence, the restrictions on the domain for \( \omega \).) However, if \( (\omega, \alpha, \beta, \sigma) \) do not belong to one of these two sets, then it is straightforward to observe that \( \cos(\gamma_3) = 1 \) if and only if \( \omega = 0 \) and \( \cos(\gamma_3) = -1 \) if and only if \( \omega \in \{ \pm \pi \} \). This means that \( \sin(\gamma_3) \), as given in (S29), does not change signs on the interval \( \omega \in (0, \pi) \) and \( \omega \in (-\pi, 0) \). Thus, since the magnitude of \( \gamma_3 \) is determined by taking the arccos of (S30), we need only determine the sign by, for instance, approximating the parameterization for \( \sin(\gamma_3) \) for \( \omega \ll 1 \). In this direction, we observe that, to leading order in \( \omega \),

\[
\begin{align*}
t_3 \cdot (R_4(\omega)t_1 \times R_2^T(\omega \sigma)t_1) & \approx \begin{cases}
\frac{2(c_\omega - c_3)}{s_\alpha + s_\beta} \omega & \text{if} \quad \sigma = +, \\
\frac{2(c_\omega + c_3)}{s_\alpha + s_\beta} \omega & \text{if} \quad \sigma = -.
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]

(S32)

Note that \( (c_\alpha s_\beta)^2 > 0 \) since \( 0 < \alpha + \beta < 2\pi \), and \( (s_\alpha + s_\beta)^2 > 0 \) since \( \alpha = \pi - \beta \) for \( \sigma = - \) is not relevant by (S31). Thus, as we only really require the sign
from the formula, we conclude that
\[
\gamma_3 = \bar{\gamma}_3^\sigma(\omega) = \text{sign} (c_\alpha - \sigma c_\beta) \omega_3 \arccos \left( \frac{(\sigma - c_\alpha c_\beta) c_\omega + s_\alpha s_\beta}{\sigma - c_\alpha c_\beta + s_\alpha s_\beta} \right) \tag{S33}
\]
whenever \((\omega, \alpha, \beta, \sigma) \in [-\pi, \pi] \times (0, \pi)^2 \times \{\pm}\) do not satisfy the parameterizations in (S27), (S28) or (S31). At this point, we notice that the formula here is also valid for all \(\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]\) and \(\sigma \in \mathcal{A}\), as asserted in (S21). That is, the singularity \(P_4 R_4(t) = 0\) disappears under the simplification in (S30) when \(\sigma = +, \omega = 0\) and \(\alpha = \pi - \beta\) and when \(\sigma = -, \omega \in \{\pm \pi\}\) and \(\alpha = \beta\). Thus, (S33) for \(\sigma \in \mathcal{A}\) and the special cases in (S31) provide a complete parameterization for case 2.

To summarize, we have completely solved the necessary condition in (S25) by the parameterizations outlined. To complete the proof, we focus first on the case that \(\sigma \in \mathcal{A}\), which gives that \(\gamma_3 = \bar{\gamma}_3^\sigma(\omega)\) for all \(\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]\). Since the necessary condition (S25) holds for this parameterization, we conclude that
\[
R_2(\sigma \omega) R_3(\bar{\gamma}_3^\sigma(\omega)) R_4(\omega) t_1 = t_1. \tag{S34}
\]
Consequently, there exists a \(\gamma_1 \in [-\pi, \pi]\) such that \(R_1(\gamma_1) R_2(\sigma \omega) R_3(\bar{\gamma}_3^\sigma(\omega)) R_4(\omega) = I\). To determine it explicitly, we notice that we must have \(\gamma_1 \equiv \gamma_3(\omega)\) by an argument similar to that of (S23) and (S24). In addition, since all the folding angles are engaged in this parameterization, Maekawa’s theorem tells us that the folding angles (when each has magnitude \(|\gamma_i| \in (0, \pi)|\)) should correspond to the three mountain angles and a valley or three valleys and a mountain. In other words, \(\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_3 \gamma_4 \leq 0\) under this parameterization. In combination, we obtain \(\gamma_1 = -\sigma \bar{\gamma}_3^\sigma(\omega)\) [S3]. This completes the proof for the four-fold solutions. The other solutions (i.e., those indicated by the special cases (S27), (S28) or (S31)) are simply describing the process of folding-in-half and folding-in-half again. It is thus straightforward to confirm that (S22) gives the complete parameterization for this case. \(\square\)

### C. On HMO as objective structures.

An objective structure is the orbit of a point (or a collection of points) under a discrete group of isometries. An isometry is any map \(g = (R(c))\) such that \(g(x) = Rx + c\) for \(R \in SO(3)\) and \(c \in \mathbb{R}^3\) [S4]. A proper rotation is any \(R \in SO(3)\) that is not \(I\), and it is characterized by a unique (up to a change in sign) axis given by \(e \in \mathbb{S}^2\) such that \(Re = e\). We will always define the axis \(e\) such that a proper rotation \(R\) is a right-hand rotation about this axis by an angle \(\theta \in (0, \pi)\). We say that two proper rotations \(R_1\) and \(R_2\) have distinct axes \(e_1\) and \(e_2 \in \mathbb{S}^2\) whenever \(e_1 \neq \pm e_2\). We have the following classification theorem on the abelian groups:

**Theorem C.1.** The complete enumeration of the discrete and abelian groups of isometries is as follows.

(i). Those that do not contain a proper rotation:
- “Points” \(- G = \{id\}\)
- “Lines” \(- G = \{t_p : p \in \mathbb{Z}\}\)
- “2D Lattices” \(- G = \{t_1 t_2^p : p, q \in \mathbb{Z}\}\)
- “3D Lattices” \(- G = \{t_1 t_2^p t_3^r : p, q, r \in \mathbb{Z}\}\).

Here, \(t_i = (I(c_i)) \), \(i = 1, 2, 3\), and span\{\(c_1, c_2, c_3\)\} \(= \mathbb{R}^3\).

(ii). Those that contain a proper rotation but do not contain two proper rotations of distinct axes:
- “Rings” \(- G = \{g_0^p : p \in \mathbb{Z}\}\)
- “Cylinders” \(- G = \{g_1^p g_2^q : p, q \in \mathbb{Z}\}\).

Here, \(g_i = (R_{\theta_i} (I - R_{\theta_i})) z + \tau \cdot e\), \(i = 0, 1, 2\), for some axis of rotation \(e \in \mathbb{S}^2\) and some origin \(z \in \mathbb{R}^3\) and \(z \cdot e = 0\). In addition, the extension \(\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}\) and twist \(\tau_i \in (0, \pi)\) satisfy

\[
\text{(for rings)}: \quad \tau_0 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad r^* \theta_0 = 2\pi,
\]

\[
\text{(for cylinder):} \quad \begin{cases} \tau_1^2 + \tau_2^2 > 0 \\ p^* \tau_1 + q^* \tau_2 = 0 \\ p^* \theta_1 + q^* \theta_2 = 2\pi, \end{cases} \tag{S35}
\]

for some \(p^*, q^*, r^* \in \mathbb{Z}\).

(iii). Those that contain at least two proper rotations of distinct axes:
- “Tetrahedron” \(- \{h_1^p h_2^q : p, q \in \{0, 1\}\}\)

Here, \(h_i = (R_i(c_i)) \), \(i = 1, 2\) satisfy

\[
R_1 = 2e_1 \otimes e_1 - I, \quad i = 1, 2, \\
R_2 = \eta e_2 + \xi e_3, \quad \mathbf{c}_2 = \mu e_1 + \xi e_3, \tag{S36}
\]

for an orthonormal basis \(\{e_1, e_2, e_3\} \subset \mathbb{R}^3\) and an \((\eta, \xi, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}^3\).

This is proved elsewhere [S5].

In this work, we focus on how the partially folded Miura parallelogram unit cell interacts with the so-called “cylinder group” above. In particular, we provide a complete classification of the compatible structures generated by such an interaction and thus, a complete characterization of HMO structures.

### D. On the HMO design equations

We assume the reference Miura parallelogram \(\Omega\) is partially folded by a deformation \(y = \phi_0^\sigma\) parameterized by (S17) with folding angles \(\gamma_i = \gamma_i(\omega, \sigma)\) for \(i = 1, 2, 3, 4\) that satisfy either (S21) or the first fold-in-half parameterization in (S22) for some \(\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]\) and \(\sigma \in \{\pm\}\).

As such, we denote this partially folded Miura parallelogram with \(\phi_0^\sigma(\Omega)\) and thereby determine the corners of
the parallelogram by $y_i = y_e^e(x_i)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. With the corners, we suppress the dependence on $\omega$ and $\sigma$ to simplify the notation, but it is always implicit in what follows.

We consider two screw transformations $g_i = (R_\theta_i | \tau_i \cdot e + (I - R_\theta_i)z)$ ($i = 1, 2$) with parameters $R_\theta_i \in SO(3)$, $\theta_i \in (-\pi, \pi)$, $\tau_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $e \in \mathbb{S}^2$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $z \cdot e = 0$ characterizing the rotation, rotation axis, translation, rotation axis and origin of the isometry, respectively. These operate on a point $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ in the standard way $g_i(x) = R_\theta_i(x - z) + \tau_i e_i + z$.

To construct HMO structures, we apply these transformations to the corners of the Muira parallelogram, but there are restrictions. As discussed in the main text, the parameters of these transformations must satisfy local compatibility and the non-degeneracy condition, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
  g_1(y_1) &= y_1, & g_1(y_3) &= y_2, \\
  g_2(y_1) &= y_2, & g_2(y_4) &= y_3. & \quad \text{(S37)}
\end{align*}
$$

Below, we derive all possible solutions to this system of equations.

To consolidate the notation in what follows, we define the side length vectors

$$
\begin{align*}
  u_a &= y_3 - y_4, & u_b &= y_2 - y_1, \\
  v_a &= y_1 - y_4, & v_b &= y_2 - y_3. & \quad \text{(S38)}
\end{align*}
$$

We claim the following under the stated hypotheses on the parameters: If $\theta_1 \neq 0$, then (S37) is equivalent to

$$
\begin{align*}
  \tau_1 &= v_a \cdot e, & \tau_2 &= u_a \cdot e, & \quad (u_a - u_b) \cdot e &= 0, \\
  R_\theta_1 P_e u_a &= P_e u_a, & R_{\theta_2} P_e v_a &= P_e v_b, & \quad (I - R_\theta_i) z &= P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2} y_3), \quad \text{(S39)}
\end{align*}
$$

where $P_e = I - e \otimes e$. Note, in this system there are nine equations for local compatibility, whereas in (S37), there are twelve. Thus, by this equivalence, we are exposing the redundancies in the original characterization of local compatibility. For the case $\theta_1 = 0$, (S39) is necessary for (S37) but not sufficient. This special case is treated separately below.

**Proof.** ((S37) $\Rightarrow$ (S39)). We begin with the easier direction. The first equation $\tau_1 = v_a \cdot e$ is obtained by dotting $g_1(y_1) = y_1$ with $e$ and using the stated properties of the parameters. The second equation $\tau_2 = u_a \cdot e$ is obtained, in similar fashion, by dotting $g_2(y_4) = y_3$ with $e$. For the third, we first dot $g_2(y_1) = y_2$ with $e$ to obtain $\tau_2 = u_a \cdot e$ (just like the other cases), and we combine this with $\tau_2 = u_a \cdot e$ to get $(u_a - u_b) \cdot e = 0$. Moving on to the second line, we obtain $R_{\theta_1} P_e u_a = P_e u_b$ by first taking the difference between $g_1(y_3) = y_1$ and $g_1(y_2) = y_2$. We then premultiply this difference by $P_e$ and use the fact that $P_e R_{\theta_1} = R_{\theta_1} P_e$ to get the result. We obtain $R_{\theta_2} P_e v_a = P_e v_b$ by a similar manipulation with the two equations $g_2(y_3) = y_2$ and $g_2(y_4) = y_3$. Finally, for the third line, we obtain $(I - R_\theta_i) z = P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2} y_3)$ by premultiplying the equation $g_1(y_3) = y_2$ by $P_e$ and rearranging.

$\text{(S37)} \iff \text{(S39)}$ when $\theta_1 \neq 0$. For this direction, we first observe the following equivalences:

$$
\begin{align*}
  g_1(y_3) - g_1(y_4) &= y_2 - y_1 \iff R_{\theta_1} u_a = u_b, & \quad \text{(S40)} \\
  g_2(y_1) - g_2(y_4) &= y_2 - y_3 \iff R_{\theta_2} P_e v_a = v_b, & \quad \text{(S41)}
\end{align*}
$$

Consequently, (S39) implies $g_1(y_3) - g_1(y_4) = y_2 - y_1$. In similar fashion, we observe that

$$
\begin{align*}
  g_1(y_3) &= y_2 \iff (I - R_{\theta_1}) z + (\tau_1 - v_b \cdot e) e = P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2} y_3). & \quad \text{(S42)}
\end{align*}
$$

In addition, (S39) implies $\tau_1 = v_b \cdot e$ since it gives $(u_a - u_b) \cdot e = 0$ and $\tau_1 = v_a \cdot e$ since $(v_a - v_b) \cdot e = (u_a - u_b) \cdot e$. In combination with the equivalence (S42), we conclude that (S39) implies $g_1(y_3) = y_2$.

In summary, we have shown so far that (S39) implies

$$
\begin{align*}
  g_1(y_3) &= y_2, & g_1(y_4) &= y_1, & \quad \text{(S43)} \\
  g_2(y_1) - g_2(y_4) &= y_2 - g_2(y_3). & \quad \text{(S44)}
\end{align*}
$$

We can say more. Observe that $g_i(x - y) = g_i(x) - g_i(y) + g_i(0)$ for any $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $i = 1, 2$. In addition, the groups are abelian, i.e., $g_1 g_2(x) = g_2 g_1(x)$. Thus, from (S43), we evidently have the identity:

$$
\begin{align*}
  g_1(g_2(y_1) - y_2) &= g_1(g_2(y_4) - y_3) \\
  &= g_2(y_1) - g_1(y_3) + g_1(0) & \quad \text{(S44)} \\
  &= g_2(y_4) - y_2 + g_1(0) \\
  &= g_2(y_1) - y_2 + g_1(0). & \quad \text{(S45)}
\end{align*}
$$

By subtracting $g_1(0)$ from both sides and expanding out the $g_1(\cdot)$ terms, the above identity takes on the revealing form

$$
\begin{align*}
  R_{\theta_1} (g_2(y_1) - y_2) &= g_2(y_1) - y_2, & \quad \text{(S45)}
\end{align*}
$$

especially given that

$$
\begin{align*}
  (v_b - u_b) \cdot e = 0 & \quad \text{(S46)}
\end{align*}
$$

from (S39). In particular, since $g_2(y_1) - y_2 \perp e$ since the identity (S44) is evidently implied by (S43), we can infer that one of the two possibilities must be true: (a) $\theta_1 = 0$ or (b) $g_2(y_1) = y_2$. As we have assumed $\theta_1 \neq 0$ for this characterization, we have $g_2(y_1) = y_2$. It therefore follows from (S43) that $g_2(y_4) = y_3$, and thus (S37) holds as desired. \qed
We now turn to the case that $\theta_1 = 0$. In this direction, consider the following system of equations:

$$
\begin{align*}
\theta_1 &= 0, \quad u_a = u_b, \quad \tau_2 = u_a \cdot e, \\
v_a &= v_b = \tau_1 e, \\
(I - R_{\theta_2})z &= P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2}y_1), \quad \theta_2 \neq 0.
\end{align*}
$$

(S47)

We claim that

$$
(S37) \text{ with } \theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 \neq 0 \iff \text{(S47).}
$$

(S48)

Proof. From the previous result, we have that (S37) \Rightarrow (S39) in general. Therefore, the implication holds for $\theta_1 = 0$. Thus, $\tau_2 = u_a \cdot e$ is trivial. Further, by substituting $\theta_1 = 0$ into (S39), we easily deduce the $u_a = u_b$ and $v_a = v_b$. By substituting the latter back into (S39), we have $R_{\theta_2}P_e v_b = P_e v_b$. Notice if $P_e v_b \neq 0$, then evidently $\theta_2 = 0$. We therefore have $P_e v_b = 0$, as $\theta_2 \neq 0$ is assumed. Since additionally $\tau_2 = e \cdot v_a$ in (S39), we conclude $v_b = \tau_2 e$. Thus, for this direction, the only result in (S47) that remains to be justified is $(I - R_{\theta_2})z = P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2}y_1)$. This identity is obtained from (S37) by projecting the identity $g_2(y_1) = y_2$ onto the plane with normal $e$.

(\Leftarrow) We observe that (S47) is a solution to (S39). (Note, $(I - R_{\theta_2})z = 0$, and also $P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2}y_3) = 0$ in this case.) Thus, the previous analysis yields the three identities in (S43). We claim also that $g_2(y_1) = y_2$. Indeed, this follows by combining three identities from (S47): $(I - R_{\theta_2})z = P_e(y_2 - R_{\theta_2}y_1), u_a = u_b$ and $\tau_2 = u_a \cdot e$. Thus, (S37) follows by combining (S43) with $g_2(y_1) = y_2$.

Note, we do not include the equivalence for the case $\theta_1 = \theta_2 = 0$, as such parameterizations of local compatibility in (S37) can never satisfy the discreteness condition.

We aim now to fully parameterize the two possible solutions to local compatibility and non-degeneracy given by (S39) and (S47). In order to do this, we make several useful observations through a series of propositions:

**Proposition D.1.** The corner points of the Miura parallelogram (denoted by $y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4$) lie on the same plane if and only if $\omega \in \{0, \pm \pi\}$.

Proof. The result is geometrically obvious for the two fold-in-half families given by the first parameterization in (S22). We therefore turn our attention to the four-fold family. From the deformation (S17) and from (S21), we have $y_3 = R_2(\sigma_2)(x_2 - x_0) + x_0$. We firstly assume $y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4$ are on the same plane. Then we have $y_3 \cdot e_3 = 0$ since $y_1 = x_1 \perp e_3$ and $y_2 = x_2 \perp e_3$ with $x_2$ not parallel to $x_1$. This implies $\sin(\beta)\sin(\omega) = 0$ by direct calculation. Since $\sin(\beta) \neq 0$, we obtain $\omega \in \{0, \pm \pi\}$. The opposite direction is trivial since $\omega = 0$ gives the unfolded state and $\omega \in \{\pm \pi\}$ gives the folded flat state.

**Proposition D.2.** $u_a = u_b \iff v_a = v_b \iff \omega = 0$.

Proof. The first equivalence trivially follows from the identity $u_a - u_b = v_a - v_b$. For the third, notice that the vectors $u_a = u_b$ and $v_a = v_b$ represent the side lengths corresponding to the boundary of the Miura parallelogram $\partial(y_2^0(\Omega))$. Therefore, this boundary belongs to a plane on $R^3$, and it is also easy to see that it must inscribe a parallelogram. From Proposition D.1, $\omega \in \{0, \pm \pi\}$ is necessary. For sufficiency, it is trivial that $\partial(y_2^0(\Omega))$ inscribes a parallelogram, and it is clear that $\partial(y_2^0(\Omega))$ cannot inscribe a parallelogram.

**Proposition D.3.** If $\omega \in (0, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$, then $u_a \parallel u_b$ and $v_a \parallel v_b$. Alternatively, if $\omega \in \{\pm \pi\}$, then at least one of the following is true: $u_a \parallel u_b$ or $v_a \parallel v_b$.

Proof. The first statement follows from Proposition D.1. That is, $u_{a,b}$ and $v_{a,b}$ are vectors representing the side lengths at the boundary of the Miura parallelogram. Since the boundary is not in a plane, these vectors cannot be parallel. For the second statement, notice these vector are now in a plane since $\omega \in \{\pm \pi\}$. Assume $u_a = -u_b$ (which is equivalent to $u_a \parallel u_b$ since $|u_a| = |u_b|$ and $u_a \neq u_b$ by Proposition D.2). Under this assumption, it is easy to show pictorially that $v_a \parallel v_b$ given their definition. By the same argument, if $v_a = -v_b$, then $u_a \parallel u_b$.

The degenerate cases. One such case is that $\theta_1 = 0$ and $u_a = u_b$. It follows from Proposition D.2 that $\omega = 0$, i.e., $y_i = x_i$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. Consequently, a complete parameterization of (S47) (and by equivalence (S37) with $\theta_1 = 0$) is thus

$$
\begin{align*}
\theta_1 &= 0, \quad \omega = 0, \quad e = \pm \frac{x_2 - x_3}{|x_2 - x_3|}, \\
\tau_1 &= \pm |x_2 - x_3|, \quad \tau_2 = (x_3 - x_1) \cdot e, \\
z &= (I - R_{\theta_2} + e \otimes e)^{-1}P_e(x_2 - R_{\theta_2}x_1),
\end{align*}
$$

(S49)

for $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$.

Here, to obtain the inversion for $z$ (compare the $z$ equations in (S47) to (S49)), we used the fact that $z \cdot e = 0$ to introduce $e \otimes e$ on the left-hand side in (S47). The quantity $(I - R_{\theta_2} + e \otimes e)$ is always invertible for $\theta_2 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$. Notice also that $\theta_2$ is a free parameter here and there is a degeneracy in the choice of sign of $e$.

A second degenerate case is obtained by solving the parameterization (S39) for case $\omega = 0$ and $\theta_1 \neq 0$. We have $u_a = u_b$ and $v_a = v_b$ by Proposition D.2 for $\omega = 0$. It follows from (S39) that $u_a = u_b = \tau_2 e$ (i.e., we simply reverse the “1” and “2” dependence in the parameterization (S49)). The complete parameterization in this case is

$$
\begin{align*}
\theta_2 &= 0, \quad \omega = 0, \quad e = \pm \frac{x_4 - x_1}{|x_4 - x_1|}, \\
\tau_2 &= \pm |x_3 - x_4|, \quad \tau_1 = (x_2 - x_3) \cdot e, \\
z &= (I - R_{\theta_1} + e \otimes e)^{-1}P_e(x_2 - R_{\theta_1}x_3),
\end{align*}
$$

(S50)

for $\theta_1 \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$.
Here, $\theta_1$ is a free parameter and there is again a degeneracy in the choice of sign of $e$.

**The generic cases.** These cases solve (S39) (and by equivalence (S37) with $\theta_1 \neq 0$) for $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \setminus \{0\}$. To introduce the parameterization, we first choose a convenient coordinate system:

- For $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$, $u_a \parallel u_b$ by Proposition D.3. In the case, we define the orthonormal coordinates
  \[ f_1 = \frac{u_a + u_b}{|u_a + u_b|}, \quad f_2 = \frac{u_a \times u_b}{|u_a \times u_b|}, \quad f_3 = \frac{u_a - u_b}{|u_a - u_b|}. \tag{S51} \]

- For $\omega \in \{ \pm \pi \}$, we let $f_{1,2,3}$ as above if $u_a \parallel u_b$. Otherwise, $v_a \parallel v_b$ by Proposition D.3, and we define the orthonormal coordinates
  \[ f_1 = \frac{v_a + v_b}{|v_a + v_b|}, \quad f_2 = \frac{v_a \times v_b}{|v_a \times v_b|}, \quad f_3 = \frac{v_a - v_b}{|v_a - v_b|}. \tag{S52} \]

With the coordinate system set, the complete parameterization for (S39) is thus

\[
e \equiv e^\tau(\omega, \varphi) = c_\varphi f_1 + s_\varphi f_2,
\]

\[
\theta_1 \equiv \theta_1^p(\omega, \varphi) = \text{sign}(e \cdot (u_a \times u_b)) \arccos \left( \frac{|u_a \cdot P_e u_b|}{|P_e u_a|^2} \right),
\]

\[
\theta_2 \equiv \theta_2^p(\omega, \varphi) = \text{sign}(e \cdot (v_a \times v_b)) \arccos \left( \frac{|v_a \cdot P_e v_b|}{|P_e v_a|^2} \right),
\]

\[
\tau_1 \equiv \tau_1^p(\omega, \varphi) = e \cdot v_a, \quad \tau_2 \equiv \tau_2^p(\omega, \varphi) = e \cdot u_a,
\]

\[
z \equiv z^p(\omega, \varphi) = \begin{pmatrix} I - R_{\theta_1} + e \otimes e^{-1} P_e (y_2 - R_{\theta_1} y_3) \end{pmatrix},
\]

for: $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \setminus \{0\}, \varphi \in (-\pi, \pi)$.

(S53)

**The discreteness conditions.** In the case of the first degenerate parameterization in (S49), the discreteness conditions reduce to

\[
\theta_2 = \frac{2\pi}{q^*}, \quad \cos(\eta/l) = \frac{p^*}{q^*} \tag{S54}
\]

for some $p^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $q^* \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Here, we recall the definitions of the parameters $l$ and $\eta$ (see Fig. 2 in the main text). The second degenerate parameterization (S50) is similar. The discreteness conditions reduce to

\[
\theta_1 = \frac{2\pi}{p^*}, \quad \cos(\eta/l) = \frac{q^*}{p^*} \tag{S55}
\]

for some $p^* \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $q^* \in \mathbb{Z}$ in this case. Finally, in the case of the parameterization in (S53), we first take the axis angle $\varphi \in (-\pi/2, \pi/2]$ without loss of generality (since $(e, \theta_1, 2, \tau_1, 2) \rightarrow (-e, \theta_1, 2, \tau_1, 2)$ generates the same structure). Then the first discreteness condition $p^* \tau_1^p(\omega, \varphi) + q^* \tau_2^p(\omega, \varphi) = 0$ is equivalent to

\[
\varphi \equiv \varphi^p(\omega) = \arctan \left( \frac{-f_1 \cdot (p^* v_a + q^* u_a)}{f_2 \cdot (p^* v_a + q^* u_a)} \right) \tag{S56}
\]

\[
\text{FIG. S1. This example has reference parameters } (l, \eta, \lambda) = (22/15, 7\pi/30, 0.2) \text{ and chirality corresponding to } (p^*, q^*) = (3, 7). \text{ On the left, the function } f(\omega) = p^* \theta_1^p(\omega, \varphi^p(\omega)) + q^* \theta_2^p(\omega, \varphi^p(\omega)) - 2\pi \text{ is plotted for } \omega \in [-\pi, \pi] \setminus \{0\} \text{ and } \sigma \in \{\pm\}. \text{ The two solutions (right) correspond to } f(\omega) = 0, \text{ and these occur for the } \sigma = + \text{ case (i.e., the same M-V assignment).}
\]

(E. On the phase diagram for HMO)

For most chiralities of HMO $(p^*, q^* \neq 0)$, we generally observe bi-stability, with the solutions to (S57) corresponding to different Mountain-Valley assignments. On the other hand, for ring-type HMO $(p^* \text{ or } q^* = 0)$, we often observe quad-stability. That is, there are large region in the phase-space where two solutions to each Mountain-Valley assignment exist. One therefore might conjecture multi-stability along the same Mountain-Valley assignment can only occur for the ring-type topology (i.e., that this property is purely topological in nature). This conjecture is false. In Figure S1, we highlight an example where the chirality corresponds to $(p^*, q^*) = (3, 7)$, but the $\sigma = +$ branch has two solutions whereas the $\sigma = -$ branch has zero. These special cases occur at the boundary between bi-stability and inadmissibility.

(F. The Kresling pattern)

A common tubular structure made of an origami unit cell is the Kresling pattern. These are the limiting cases of HMO corresponding to the crease pattern parameter...
\( \lambda \to 0 \) or \( \to 1 \) (described in (i-iii) in the main text). For the case of a ring-type Kresling pattern, Cai et al. [6] derived the geometrical relation for this pattern as:

\[
(C_3)^2 = \frac{1}{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n} + \arcsin\frac{b}{a} \cos \delta \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)\right)^2 \\
+ \left(\frac{b}{a} \sin \delta\right)^2,
\]

(S58)

where \( a = |y_1 - y_4|, b = |y_1 - y_2|, c = |y_1 - y_3|, \) \( \delta \) is the angle between \( y_3 - y_4 \) and the horizontal axis, \( \omega \) is the number of elements in a horizontal role (see Fig. S2(b)). The function

\[
f(\delta) = \frac{1}{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n} + \arcsin\frac{b}{a} \cos \delta \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)\right)^2 \\
+ \left(\frac{b}{a} \sin \delta\right)^2 - \left(\frac{C_3}{a}\right)^2
\]

(S59)

has 0, 1, or 2 roots for \( \delta \in [0, \pi/2] \) depending on parameters \( b/a, c/a, n \) (see, for instance, the examples in Fig. S2(a)). This implies that the Kresling pattern is either inaccessable, monostable, or bistable. For the special Kresling pattern that gives the maximal transforming extension with \( n = 8 \) (Fig. 7(d) in the main text), the equation (S58) holds for both \( \delta = 0 \) and \( \delta = \pi/2 \), i.e., this particular Kresling pattern is stable when the unit cell is fully unfolded or fully folded. In substituting \( \delta = 0, \pi/2 \) and then subtracting the equations, we have

\[
\left[\frac{1}{\sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n} + \arcsin\frac{b}{a} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{n}\right)\right)\right]^2 = \left(\frac{b}{a}\right)^2 + 1,
\]

(S60)

which has a solution for the geometric parameters \( (\frac{C_3}{a}, \frac{C_4}{a}) = (2.414, 2.613) \) when \( n = 8 \). This corresponds exactly to the reference parameters \( (l, n) = (|x_1 - x_4|, |x_4x_1x_2|) = (0.414, \pi/2) \) since \( b = |y_2 - y_1| = 1 \) has been assumed throughout.

G. On compatibility for the coexistence of two phases

Though we already have the design equations for the HMO, it is not obvious that different phases can fit together and remain cylindrical. Here, we derive the compatibility conditions for the co-existence of two phases. Local compatibility for the two phases (i.e., (S37)) is certainly necessary. Thus, we consider two locally compatible origami structures generated by the same underlying tessellation: \( \mathcal{G}_0(\Omega) = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2(\mathcal{Y}_0(\Omega)) : (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\} \) and \( \mathcal{G}_0(\Omega) = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2(\mathcal{Y}_0(\Omega)) : (p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\} \), where \( g_i \) (respectively, \( g_i \)) have group parameters as in (S53) with \( (\omega, \varphi, \sigma) = (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}, \hat{\sigma}) \) (respectively, \( (\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}, \bar{\sigma}) \)) on the domain \( (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\} \times (-\pi/2, \pi/2) \times \{\pm\} \). We claim that the necessary and sufficient conditions for a closed cylindrical origami of these (potentially) two phases are:

\[
\tau^\theta(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = \tau^\theta(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}),
\]

\[
\theta^\sigma(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = \theta^\sigma(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}),
\]

\[
p^\ast \tau^\theta(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) + q^\ast \tau^\theta(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) + (q^\ast - q^\ast) \tau^\theta(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = 0,
\]

\[
p^\ast \theta^\sigma(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) + q^\ast \theta^\sigma(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) + (q^\ast - q^\ast) \theta^\sigma(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = 2\pi,
\]

(S61)

for some \( p^\ast, q^\ast \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( |q^\ast| \leq |q^\ast| \) and \( q^\ast \geq 0 \), or we can also exchange the roles of \( (\cdot)_2 \) and \( (\cdot)_1 \) above to generate the cylindrical origami. We focus on the system in (S61) without loss of generality.

We justify this claim through a series of propositions. The first proposition gives that, if the first two identities hold in (S61), then the radius of the cylinders generated by the two phases are the same. To make this precise, note that the radiiuses of the cylinders are

\[
\bar{r} = |P_e(y_3 - \bar{z})|, \quad \bar{r} = |P_e(y_4 - \bar{z})|
\]

(S62)

where \( e = \mathcal{G}_0(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) \), etc., from (S53). We establish the following result:

Proposition G.1. If \( \bar{r}_1 \equiv \bar{r}_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = \bar{r}_1(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) \equiv \bar{r}_1 \) and \( \bar{r}_1 \equiv \bar{r}_1(\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = \bar{r}_1(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) \equiv \bar{r}_1 \), then \( \bar{r} = \bar{r} \).

Proof. We calculate \( \bar{r} \) first. By substituting the formula
of $\bar{z} \equiv z^a (\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi})$ into the radius equation, we obtain
\[
\bar{r} = |P_{e}(y_3 - (I - \bar{R}_{\bar{\theta}_1} + e \otimes e)^{-1}P_{e}(y_2 - \bar{R}_{\bar{\theta}_1}y_3))|
= |(I - \bar{R}_{\bar{\theta}_1} + e \otimes e)^{-1}P_{e}(y_2 - \bar{R}_{\bar{\theta}_1}y_3)|
= \sqrt{|x_3 - x_2|^2 - (\bar{\tau}_1)^2}
= \frac{|2\sin(\bar{\theta}_1/2)|}{2\sin(\bar{\theta}_1/2)}.
\] (S63)

Here, the first equality is by definition, the second uses commutativity of the transformations, and the third follows from the substitution $\bar{\tau}_1 = e \cdot (y_2 - y_3)$. Finally, since $y_2 - y_3 - \bar{\tau}_1 e$ is on the plane perpendicular to $e$, we derive that
\[
(I - \bar{R}_{\bar{\theta}_1} + e \otimes e)^{-1}(y_2 - y_3 - \bar{\tau}_1 e)
= (2\sin(\bar{\theta}_1/2))^{-1}R_{\bar{\theta}_1}^{-1}(y_2 - y_3 - \bar{\tau}_1 e),
\] (S64)

by an explicit calculation. The final identity in (S63) then easily follows. Analogously, the radius of the other phase is
\[
\bar{r} = \frac{\sqrt{|x_3 - x_2|^2 - (\bar{\tau}_1)^2}}{|2\sin(\bar{\theta}_1/2)|}.
\] (S65)

Thus, $\bar{\theta}_1 = \bar{\theta}_1$ and $\bar{\tau}_1 = \bar{\tau}_1$ gives $\bar{r} = \bar{r}$.

\[\square\]

**Remark G.1.** If $\bar{r} = \bar{r}$, then actually $|P_{e}(\bar{g}_1^p \bar{g}_2^p (y_3) - \bar{z})| = |P_{e}(\bar{g}_1^p \bar{g}_2^p (y_3) - \bar{z})| > 0$ for all $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$.

*Proof.* It is easy to see that $\bar{r} = |P_{e}(\bar{g}_1^p \bar{g}_2^p (y_3) - \bar{z})|$ and $\bar{r} = |P_{e}(\bar{g}_1^p \bar{g}_2^p (y_3) - \bar{z})|$ for all $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$. So the equality follows. The inequality also holds. For otherwise, given (S37), this would imply that the plane of partially folded Miura parallelogram lie on the line $z + \lambda e : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ or $\{z + \lambda e : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$, respectively. This is impossible given Proposition D.1.

\[\square\]

**Proposition G.2.** Fix some $\bar{x} = \bar{y}_1^p(y_3)$ and $\bar{x} = \bar{g}_1^p(y_3)$ for $q \in \mathbb{Z}$. There exists a rotation $\bar{R} \in SO(3)$ and translation $\bar{t} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that
\[
\bar{R}\bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x}) + \bar{t} = \bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x}) \quad \text{for all } p \in \mathbb{Z}
\] (S66)

if and only if $\bar{\tau}_1 = \tau_1^p(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) = \tau_1^p(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) \equiv \bar{\tau}_1$ and $\bar{\theta}_1 = \theta_1^p(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) = \theta_1^p(\bar{\omega}, \bar{\varphi}) \equiv \bar{\theta}_1$.

*Proof.* We first note that, by a general result elucidated in [S7], the only types of compatible interfaces in helical structures that do not involve a fixed radius of the two phases are vertical interfaces. A vertical interface implies that $v_a \parallel v_b \parallel e$ or $u_a \parallel u_b \parallel e$. Due to Proposition D.3, this is not possible for the locally compatible parameterizations we are considering in this framework since we assume $\omega \in (-\pi, \pi) \setminus \{0\}$, i.e., a partially folded configuration. We therefore have the necessary condition that $\bar{r} = \bar{r}$.

Let us assume that the parameters of the two phases are such that $\bar{r} = \bar{r}$, By the multiplication rule of generators, we have
\[
\bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x}) = R_{\bar{\rho}_1}(\bar{x} - \bar{z}) + p\bar{\tau}_1\bar{e} + \bar{z},
\]
\[
\bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x}) = \bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}_1}(\bar{x} - \bar{z}) + p\bar{\tau}_1\bar{e} + \bar{z}.
\] (S67)

Let $R_{e \times e}$ be a rotation about $e \times \bar{e}$ satisfying $R_{e \times e} e = e$. Since $\bar{r} = |P_{e}(\bar{x} - \bar{z})| = |P_{e}(\bar{x} - \bar{z})| = \bar{r}$ (Remark G.1), there exists $R_{e} \in SO(3)$, $R_{e} e = e$ and $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ such that
\[
\bar{x} - \bar{z} = R_{e} e \times e (\bar{x} - \bar{z}) + \rho e.
\] (S68)

Let $\bar{R} = R_{e} e \times e \in SO(3)$ and $\bar{t} = \bar{z} - R_{e} e \times e \bar{z} + \rho e$. Using the identity $R_{\bar{\rho}_1} R_{e} e \times e = R_{e} e \times e R_{\bar{\rho}_1}$ and (S68), we obtain
\[
\bar{R}\bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x}) + \bar{t} = R_{e} e \times e \left(R_{\bar{\rho}_1}(\bar{x} - \bar{z}) + p\bar{\tau}_1\bar{e} + \bar{z} + \rho e\right)
= R_{\bar{\rho}_1}(\bar{x} - \bar{z}) + p\bar{\tau}_1\bar{e} + \bar{z}.
\] (S69)

Since $\bar{r} = \bar{r}$ is necessary for the parameterization herein, the statement (S66) is evidently equivalent to
\[
Q \left(\bar{R}\bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x}) + \bar{t}\right) + Qc = \bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x})
\] (S70)

for some $Q \in SO(3)$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. By taking the norm of both sides, we deduce that $c$ satisfies
\[
c = \left(\bar{R}_{\rho_1} - \bar{R}_{\bar{\rho}_1}\right)(\bar{x} - \bar{z}) + p(\bar{\tau}_1 - \bar{\tau}_1)\bar{e}.
\] (S71)

But also, $c$ has to be independent of $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. Notice that $c \cdot e = p(\bar{\tau}_1 - \bar{\tau}_1)$. Thus for $p$-independence, we conclude that $\bar{\tau}_1 = \bar{\tau}_1$. Now notice that $p = 0$ gives $c = 0$. Thus again for $p$-independence, we must have $R_{\bar{\rho}_1}(\bar{x} - \bar{z}) = R_{\bar{\rho}_1}(\bar{x} - \bar{z})$ for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $|P_{e}(\bar{x} - \bar{z})| > 0$ (Remark G.1), the latter is solved if and only if $\bar{\theta}_1 = \bar{\theta}_1$. Consequently, necessary conditions for (S68) are $\bar{r} = \bar{r}$, $\bar{\tau}_1 = \bar{\tau}_1$ and $\bar{\theta}_1 = \bar{\theta}_1$. By Proposition G.1, $\bar{\tau}_1 = \bar{\tau}_1$ and $\bar{\theta}_1 = \bar{\theta}_1$ gives $\bar{r} = \bar{r}$. This means that the formula in (S69) is valid with the substitution $\bar{\tau}_1 = \bar{\tau}_1$ and $\bar{\theta}_1 = \bar{\theta}_1$. In making this substitution, we conclude
\[
\bar{R}\bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x}) + \bar{t} = \bar{g}_1^p(\bar{x})
\] (S72)

for all $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence, $\bar{R}$ and $\bar{t}$ are the rotation and translation, respectively, that yields (S68). \[\square\]

**Remark G.2.** Proposition G.1 and G.2 are also true if we exchange the roles of $(\cdot)_1$ and $(\cdot)_2$.

We are now able to justify the formula in (S61). First note, the case of a horizontal interface is $\bar{q} = \bar{q}^* = 0$, and this is treated completely in the main text of the paper. Therefore, we focus on the justification in the case of a...
helical interface. That is, we assume \( q^* > \hat{q} > 0 \). By Proposition G.2, we have

\[
\mathbf{R}_q \vec{g}_1^q \vec{g}_2^q (\hat{y}_3) + t_q = \vec{g}_1^q \vec{g}_2^q (\hat{y}_3) \tag{S73}
\]

for all \( p \in \mathbb{Z} \) if and only if \( \tilde{\tau}_1 = \hat{\tau}_1 \) and \( \tilde{\theta}_1 = \hat{\theta}_1 \). We therefore introduce the tessellated strip (for instance, see Fig. S3) \( T^* \Omega = \{ \tilde{t}_q^* \}: p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \{ 1, \ldots, q^* \} \) for \( \tilde{t}_1 = (\mathbb{I} \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_4) \) and \( \tilde{t}_2 = (\mathbb{I} \mathbf{x}_2 - \mathbf{x}_1) \). As a consequence of the identity (S73), the map \( y: T^* \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^3 \) defined by

\[
y(t_q^* \tilde{t}_q^3(x)) = \begin{cases} 
\vec{g}_1^q \vec{g}_2^q (\hat{y}_3^q(x)) & p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \{ 1, \ldots, \hat{q} \} \\
\mathbf{R}^T (\vec{g}_1^p \vec{g}_2^p (\hat{y}_3^p(x)) - \vec{i}) & p \in \mathbb{Z}, q \in \{ \hat{q} + 1, \ldots, q^* \}
\end{cases} \tag{S74}
\]

is a continuous isometric origami deformation of the tessellated strip \( T^* \Omega \) if and only if \( \tilde{\tau}_1 = \hat{\tau}_1 \) and \( \tilde{\theta}_1 = \hat{\theta}_1 \).

It remains to enforce that the cylinder closes. In this direction, we note that a vertex \( \mathbf{x}_3 \) is on the bottom boundary of tessellation and is deformed via \( \hat{y}_3 = \vec{g}_1^\hat{q} \vec{g}_2^\hat{q} (\hat{y}_3) \). Similarly, the vertices \( t_q^* \tilde{t}_q^3(\mathbf{x}_3) \) are on the top boundary of the tessellation and are deformed by \( \mathbf{R}^T (\vec{g}_1^p \vec{g}_2^p (\hat{y}_3) - \vec{i}) \) for \( p \in \mathbb{Z} \) (see Fig. S3). The closure condition is equivalent to specifying that one vertex on the top boundary is equal to \( \hat{y}_3 \) since the rest of the cylinder will close due to the underlying symmetry. Consequently, continuity and the closure condition are equivalent to

\[
\begin{cases}
\hat{y}_3 = \mathbf{R}^T (\vec{g}_1^{p^*} \vec{g}_2^{p^*} (\hat{y}_3) - \vec{i}) & \text{for some } p^* \in \mathbb{Z}, \\
\tau_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = \tau_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) \\
\theta_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) = \theta_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}).
\end{cases} \tag{S75}
\]

in this setting.

This reduces, in a suitable way, to the formula in (S61). Indeed, we first observe that the rotation \( \mathbf{R} \) and translation \( \vec{t} \) satisfy

\[
\vec{t} = \hat{z} - \mathbf{R} \hat{z} + \rho \hat{e} \tag{S76}
\]

for some \( \rho \in \mathbb{R} \) in light of Proposition G.2 (and, in particular, the equation (S68) in this proposition). Thus,

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{y}_3 & = \vec{g}_1^{p^*} \vec{g}_2^{p^*} (\hat{y}_3) - \vec{i} \\
& \begin{aligned}
& = \mathbf{R}^* \mathbf{R}_p \tilde{t}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{t}_2 \\
& + (p^* \tilde{\tau}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{\tau}_2) \hat{e} + \mathbf{R} \hat{z} \\
\end{aligned} \\
& \begin{aligned}
& = \mathbf{R}^* \mathbf{R}_p \tilde{t}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{t}_2 \\
& + (p^* \tilde{\tau}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{\tau}_2) \hat{e} + \mathbf{R} \hat{z}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S77}
\end{align*}
\]

We then combine this observation with the fact that \( \mathbf{R}^T \mathbf{R}_p \tilde{t}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{t}_2 = \mathbf{R}_p \tilde{t}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{t}_2 \) and \( \mathbf{R}^T \hat{e} = \hat{e} \) to obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{y}_3 & = \mathbf{R}^T (\vec{g}_1^{p^*} \vec{g}_2^{p^*} (\hat{y}_3) - \vec{i}) - \hat{z} \\
& \begin{aligned}
& = \mathbf{R}^* \mathbf{R}_p \tilde{t}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{t}_2 \\
& + (p^* \tilde{\tau}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{\tau}_2) \hat{e} \\
\end{aligned} \\
& \begin{aligned}
& = \mathbf{R}^* \mathbf{R}_p \tilde{t}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{t}_2 \\
& + (p^* \tilde{\tau}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{\tau}_2) \hat{e}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S78}
\end{align*}
\]

Consequently, the formula in (S75) is equivalent to

\[
\begin{align*}
\tilde{\tau}_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) & = \tau_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) \\
\tilde{\theta}_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) & = \theta_1^q (\hat{\omega}, \hat{\varphi}) \\
\end{align*} \tag{S79}
\]

By dotting this with \( \hat{e} \), we observe that we require \( p^* \tilde{\tau}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{\tau}_2 = 0 \). As \( |\mathbf{e}_p (\hat{y}_3 - \hat{z})| > 0 \), we evidently also require that \( \mathbf{R}_p \tilde{t}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{t}_2 \in \{ \pm 2\pi \} \). These two conditions are also sufficient to solve (S79); thus yielding the identity (S75).

To relate this characterization exactly to (S61), we recall the assumption \( q^* > \hat{q} > 0 \) at the start of this analysis. Thus, if we find a \( p^* \in \mathbb{Z} \) such that

\[
p^* \tilde{\tau}_1 + (q^* - \hat{q}) \tilde{\tau}_2 + \tilde{\theta}_2 = -2\pi, \quad \text{we can always make the transformation} \quad (p^*, q^*) \mapsto (p^*, q^*, q^*) \quad \text{to yield exactly (S61), which thus justifies the formula.}
\]

Finally, it is clear by symmetry that we can exchange the roles of \( (\cdot)_1 \) and \( (\cdot)_2 \) in all of the result above (see Remark G.2), and thus justify another compatibility condition akin to (S61) with the roles of \( (\cdot)_1 \) and \( (\cdot)_2 \) exchanged.
There is a degeneracy in rotations $R_i(\pi) = R_i(-\pi)$. This means that when $\cos(\gamma_3) = -1$ and $\sin(\gamma_3) = 0$, we are free to choose $\gamma_3 = \pi$ or $-\pi$. Nevertheless, physically a rotation by $\pi$ folds a region on top of another and a rotation by $-\pi$ folds that same region underneath the other. In another sense, it is well-know that the four-fold setting corresponds to three mountains and a valley or three valleys and a mountain (Maekawa’s theorem). We will preserve this formalism in the case that a folding angle attains the magnitude of $\pi$ to overcome this degeneracy.

One could, of course, also deduce this result by direct calculation without resorting to Maekawa’s theorem.

Technically, one should also include reflections in the definition of an isometry, but the reflections are not relevant to this work. Hence, their exclusion here.

