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Abstract. Consider a 2-nondegenerate constant Levi rank 1 rigid $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ in coordinates $(z, \zeta, w=u+i v)$ :

$$
u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

The Gaussier-Merker model $u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}$ was shown by Fels-Kaup 2007 to be locally CR-equivalent to the light cone $\left\{x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}-x_{3}^{2}=0\right\}$. Another representation is the tube $u=\frac{x^{2}}{1-y}$.

Inspired by Alexander Isaev, we study rigid biholomorphisms:

$$
(z, \zeta, w) \longmapsto(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \rho w+h(z, \zeta))=:\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)
$$

The G-M model has 7-dimensional rigid automorphisms group.
A Cartan-type reduction to an $\{e\}$-structure was done by Foo-Merker-Ta in arxiv.org/abs/1904.02562/. Three relative invariants appeared: $V_{0}, I_{0}$ (primary) and $Q_{0}$ (derived). In Pocchiola's formalism, Section 8 provides a finalized expression for $Q_{0}$.

The goal is to establish the Poincaré-Moser complete normal form:

$$
u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}+\sum_{\substack{a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N} \\ a+c \geqslant 3}} G_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}
$$

with $0=G_{a, b, 0,0}=G_{a, b, 1,0}=G_{a, b, 2,0}$ and $0=G_{3,0,0,1}=\operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1}$.
We apply the method of Chen-Merker arxiv.org/abs/1908.07867 to catch (relative) invariants at every point, not only at the central point, as the coefficients $G_{0,1,4,0}, G_{0,2,3,0}$, $\operatorname{Re} G_{3,0,1,1}$. With this, a complete brige Poincaré $\longleftrightarrow$ Cartan is constructed.

In terms of $F$, the numerators of $V_{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_{0}, \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}$ incorporate $11,52,824$ differential monomials.
[Message to the busy reader: Section 1 explains and summarizes all the ideas.]

[^0]
## 1. Introduction

The problem of equivalence for CR manifolds was begun by Poincaré in 1907, who, by a plain counting argument, pointed out that real hypersurfaces $M^{3} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2}$ must a priori possess infinitely many invariants under biholomorphic transformations.

Nous pourrons [...] supposer que $F$ est de la forme

$$
F=X-\Phi\left(Y, X, X^{\prime}\right)
$$

et il y a alors

$$
N^{\prime}=\frac{(n+1)(n+2)(n+3)}{6}-1
$$

coefficients arbitraires réels [...]. Enfin, les équations de la transformation peuvent s'écrire

$$
\begin{equation*}
Z=\psi\left(z, z^{\prime}\right), \quad Z^{\prime}=\psi_{1}\left(z, z^{\prime}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\psi$ et $\psi_{1}$ étant deux fonctions analytiques complexes développables suivant les puissances de $z$ et de $z^{\prime}$ : nous avons besoin des termes jusqu'au $n^{\mathrm{e}}$ ordre, ce qui fait

$$
2\left[\frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}-1\right]
$$

coefficients arbitraires complexes, ou, ce qui revient au même,

$$
N^{\prime \prime}=2 n^{2}+6 n
$$

coefficients arbitraires réels que nous appellerons les coefficients $C$.
[39, pp. 194-195]
Thus in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, there are more hypersurfaces, namely $\sim \frac{n^{3}}{6}$, than there are biholomorphisms, namely $\sim 2 n^{2}$, did argue Poincaré.

As in the theory that Lie erected in the end of the XIX ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Century with his students Engel, Scheffers, Kowalevski and others, the existence of (local) invariants creates a (local) classification problem, not even terminated nowadays for hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{3}$.

Analogously, given the action of a finite-dimensional Lie group on a manifold $M$ which induces an action on (local) graphs embedded in $M$, Lie discovered that prolongations of the $G$-action to jet bundles of sufficiently high order automatically create infinitely many differential invariants [20, 34], hence various classification problems can be undertaken.

Throughout all of this memoir, concentrated on CR geometry, all CR manifolds will be assumed real analytic $\left(\mathscr{C}^{\omega}\right)$. An elementary complex Frobenius theorem proved e.g. by Paulette Libermann in [19], guarantees embedabbility in some $\mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{N}}$. We will restrict ourselves to the definite class of hypersurfaces $M^{2 n+1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, which are automatically CR. Results for embedded hypersurfaces $M^{2 n+1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ of class $\mathscr{C}^{\infty}$ or $\mathscr{C}^{K}$ with $\mathrm{K} \gg 1$ sufficiently high can be formulated, and proofs easily adapted. In fact, only $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ hypersurfaces $M^{3} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2}$ and $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ will be studied here.

The interest of studying rigidly equivalent - in Alexander Isaev's terminology — rigid hypersurfaces was pointed out to us during his February 2019 stay in Orsay. In recent publications [11, 12, 13, 14], Alexander tackled to integrate Pocchiola's zero CR curvature equations $W=0=J$ of tube and rigid 2-nondegenerate constant Levi rank 1 hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ (more will be said later).

A local hypersurface $M^{2 n+1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ with coordinates $\mathrm{Z}=\left(\mathrm{Z}_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{Z}_{n+1}\right)$ is said to be rigid if there exists an infinitesimal CR automorphism, namely a vector field $T$ tangent to $M$ of the form $T=X+\bar{X}$ with a nonzero holomorphic vector field $X=\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} a_{i}(\mathrm{Z}) \partial_{Z_{i}}$, which is transversal to the complex tangent space $T^{c} M$ in the sense that $T M=T^{c} M \oplus \mathbb{R} T$. After a local biholomorphic straightening, one makes $X=i \frac{\partial}{\partial w}$ with $w=\mathrm{Z}_{n+1}$, and tangency of $X+\bar{X}=2 \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$ to $M$ shows that, restricting considerations to dimensions $n+1=2,3$, writing coordinates $\mathbb{C}^{2} \ni(z, w)$ and $\mathbb{C}^{3} \ni(z, \zeta, w)$, the right-hand side $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$
graphing functions:

$$
M^{3}: \quad u=F(z, \bar{z}), \quad \quad M^{5}: \quad u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

are independent of $v$, where $w=u+i v$ :
Alexander Isaev's concept of rigid biholomorphic transformation is less popular or widespread. In $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ and in $\mathbb{C}^{3}$, such are biholomorphisms of the form:

$$
(z, w) \longmapsto(f(z), \rho w+g(z)), \quad(z, \zeta, w) \longmapsto(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \rho w+h(z, \zeta)),
$$

where $f, g, h$ are holomorphic of their arguments, independently of $w$, and where $\rho \in$ $\mathbb{R}^{*}$. The interest is that rigid biholomorphisms trivially send rigid hypersurfaces to rigid hypersurfaces: they respect the pre-given CR symmetry, and much more will be explained later.

As Poincaré did, but without assuming that the origin is left fixed, for any integer $d \geqslant 1$, writing $f(z)=\sum_{0 \leqslant k \leqslant d} f_{k} z^{k}$ with $f_{k} \in \mathbb{C}$ and similarly $g(z)=\sum g_{k} z^{k}$, the (rough) "number" of rigid biholomorphisms of degree $\leqslant d$ is the number of incoming real parameters, namely $2(d+1)+1+2(d+1)=4 d+5 \sim 4 d$, while the (rough) "number" of rigid hypersurfaces $\left\{u=\sum_{j+k \leqslant d} F_{j, k} x^{j} y^{k}\right\}$ of degree $\leqslant d$ too, with $F_{j, k} \in \mathbb{R}$, is equal to $\binom{d+2}{2} \sim \frac{1}{2} d^{2}$, hence much larger as $d \longrightarrow \infty$.

Similarly in $\mathbb{C}^{3}$, the (rough) "space" of rigid biholomorphisms of degree $\leqslant d$ is of real dimension:

$$
2\binom{d+2}{2}+2\binom{d+2}{2}+1+2\binom{d+2}{2}=3(d+2)(d+1)+1 \sim 3 d^{2},
$$

much smaller than the dimension of the "space" of hypersurfaces of degree $\leqslant d$ too:

$$
\binom{d+4}{4} \sim \frac{1}{24} d^{4} .
$$

To classify CR manifolds, two methods exist in the supermarket: that of Cartan, and that of Moser.

Cartan devised a quite sophisticated and proteiform method of equivalence. Given a manifold $M$ equipped with a certain class of geometric, say CR here, structures, Cartan's method of equivalence consists in constructing a bundle $\pi: P \longrightarrow M$ together with an absolute (co)parallelism on $P$, namely a coframe of everywhere linearly independent 1forms $\theta^{1}, \ldots, \theta^{\operatorname{dim} P}$ on $P$ such that:


- every local CR diffeomorphism $\Phi: M \longrightarrow M^{\prime}$ between two CR manifolds lifts uniquely as a diffeomorphism $\Pi: P \longrightarrow P^{\prime}$ satisfying $\Pi^{*} \theta^{\prime i}=\theta^{i}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant \operatorname{dim} P$, with $P^{\prime}$ and the $\theta^{\prime i}$ similarly constructed;
- conversely, every diffeomorphism $\Pi: P \longrightarrow P^{\prime}$ commuting with projections $\pi$, $\pi^{\prime}$ whose horizontal part is a diffeomorphims $M \longrightarrow M^{\prime}$ and which satisfies $\Pi^{*} \theta^{\prime i}=\theta^{i}$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant$ $\operatorname{dim} P$, has a horizontal part which is Cauchy-Riemann diffeomorphism (or, more generally, a diffeomorphism respecting the considered geometric structure).
[Beyond, there can exist Cartan connections associated to (modifications of) $P \longrightarrow M$, but we will not need this concept.]

Rexpressing the exterior differentials $d \theta^{i}$ and $d \theta^{i}$ from both sides in terms of the basic 2 -forms provided by the two ambient coframes:

$$
d \theta^{i}=\sum_{j<k} T_{j, k}^{i}(p) \theta^{j} \wedge \theta^{k} \quad \text { and } \quad d \theta^{i}=\sum_{j<k} T_{j, k}^{i}\left(p^{\prime}\right) \theta^{\prime j} \wedge \theta^{\prime k}
$$

certain structure functions appear, defined for $p \in P$ and for $p^{\prime} \in P^{\prime}$, and the exact pullback relations $\Pi^{*} \theta^{\prime i}=\theta^{i}$ force individual invariancy of all them:

$$
T_{j, k}^{\prime i}(\Phi(p))=T_{j, k}^{i}(p) \quad(\forall p \in P)
$$

As is known, Cartan's method is computationally extremely intensive, especially in CR geometry, where several normalizations and prolongations are required. Explicit expressions of intermediate torsion coefficients which conduct to the final $T_{j, k}^{i}(p)$ grow dramatically in complexity.

One reason for such a complexity is the presence of large isotropy groups for the CR automorphisms groups of (standard) models, which imposes a great number of steps. Another reason is the nonlinear character of differential algebraic polynomial expressions that must be handled progressively. The last reason is that Cartan's method studies geometric structures at every point of the base manifold, and there is a price to pay for this generality.

In most existing references ( $c f$. the bibliography), the trick that Cartan himself devised to avoid nonlinear complications while retaining anyway some essential information, is the so-called Cartan Lemma. It is explicit only at the level of linear algebra. Even admitting to only deal with linear algebra computations, as Chern always did, Cartan's method is often long and demanding.

> In his works, Moser usually searched for wisdom rather than simply knowledge, and thus he strongly emphasized developments of methods and insights over pushing a specific result to the limit. Accordingly, he sometimes described the outcome of his own work as methods rather than theorems.

Moser's method is more 'down to Earth', computationally speaking, since it usually proceeds at only one point, often the origin, of a manifold, manipulating power series expanded at that point. Hence it needs geometric objects of class $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$, while adaptations to the $\mathscr{C}^{\infty}$ or $\mathscr{C}^{\mathrm{K} \gg 1}$ classes can concern only formal Taylor expansions at the point.

Coming from problems and techniques in Dynamical Systems and Celestial Mechanics, Moser's method consists in constructing certain normal forms for the objects studied, in order to simplify them and hence to enable one to rapidly determine whether two given objects are the same, up to equivalence.

For instance, for our rigid toy hypersurfaces $\{u=F(z, \bar{z})\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, assuming that they are Levi nondegenerate at the origin:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)=z \bar{z}+\sum_{j+k \geqslant 3} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k},
$$

Moser's game consists in applying several local rigid biholomorphisms in order to obtain a simpler graphing function $F(z, \bar{z})$, e.g. with as many as possible coefficients $F_{j, k}=0$ disappearing, so that the equation becomes closest as possible to the model Heisenberg sphere $\{u=z \bar{z}\}$.

It is not difficult to realize that the isotropy subgroup of the origin, namely the group of rigid biholomorphisms fixing $(0,0) \in \mathbb{C}^{2}$, is 2 -dimensional, and consists of weighted scalings coupled with 'horizontal rotations':

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime}=\rho^{1 / 2} e^{i \varphi} z, \quad w^{\prime}=\rho w \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{*}$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$. Then Section 2 will elementarily show that one can annihilate all $F_{j, 0}=0=F_{0, k}$ and all $F_{j, 1}=0=F_{1, k}$ as well, except of course $F_{1,1}=1$, bringing any two rigid hypersurfaces in $M \subset \mathbb{C}^{2}$ and $M^{\prime} \subset \mathbb{C}^{\prime 2}$ to the normalized forms:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} \quad \text { and } \quad u^{\prime}=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k}^{\prime} z^{\prime j} \bar{z}^{\prime k}
$$

and then an analysis of what freedom remains in the group of rigid biholomorphisms will (easily) show that only two real parameters remain free to send $M$ in normal form to $M^{\prime}$ also in normal form, namely $(\rho, \varphi)$ above. Moreover, it will follows that $M$ and $M^{\prime}$ are rigidly biholomorphically equivalent if and only if they exchange through such a trivial scaling-rotation transformation, hence if and only if there exist $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{*}$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$
F_{j, k}=\rho^{\frac{j+k-2}{2}} e^{i \varphi(j-k)} F_{j, k}^{\prime} \quad(j \geqslant 2, k \geqslant 2)
$$

Thus, once two normal forms are constructed, whether $M \sim M^{\prime}$ or not can be straightforwardly seen.

What is true of the toy will be true of higher dimensional CR objects. In particular, crude normal forms cannot be made unique, they are defined only up to the action of a certain finite-dimensional Lie group, namely the isotropy sugroup of the (always transitive) model.

Beyond, in most circumstances, e.g. when $F_{2,2} \neq 0$ above, one can push further Moser's method, and obtain normal forms for which all remaining coefficients $F_{j, k}$ are uniquely defined, so that $F_{j, k}=F_{j, k}^{\prime}$ exactly, with no isotropy ambiguity. This is analog to what one can do in Cartan's method when some curvature torsion coefficients are nonvanishing: one can indeed normalize some group parameters present in some $T_{j, k}^{i}$ further and further, and thereby decrease the dimension of the bundle $P \longrightarrow M$, reducing it to smaller subbundles $P \supsetneqq P_{1} \varsubsetneqq P_{2} \supsetneqq \cdots$.

In comparison to Cartan's method, we repeat that one drawback of Moser's method is that it seems to capture invariants only at one point. Fortunately, Moser's method can be applied simultaneously to all nearby points, especially to determine all homogeneous models of a given class of geometries, and in a CR context, this was done e.g. in Loboda's works [21, 22, 23].

Recently, Chen-Merker [1] found an alternative (probably known) method to capture differential invariants at all points while working only at one point. This method avoids then to move the origin everywhere nearby by translations, and it works most of the times, namely when the group of transformations is only assumed transitive, either finite or infinite dimensional, see especially [1, Sec. 12]. Hence this method clearly applies to the group of rigid biholomorphisms. Chen-Merker studied mainly parabolic (real) surfaces $S^{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ under the group of special affine transformations of $\mathbb{R}^{3}$, and developed an analog of Moser's method in this context.

Links between Affine Geometry and CR geometry have been studied in depth by Alexander Isaev in his monograph [10]. Here, to a given a parabolic surface $\{u=F(x, y)\}$, namely a surface whose graphing function $F$ satisfies everywhere:

$$
F_{x x} \neq 0 \equiv\left|\begin{array}{ll}
F_{x x} & F_{x y} \\
F_{y x} & F_{y y}
\end{array}\right|,
$$

one can associate the tube hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ defined as $M^{5}:=S^{2} \times(i \mathbb{R})^{3}$. The paper [28] shows that Pocchiola's invariant $W$ associated to $M^{5}$ produces a seemingly new
affine invariant $W_{\text {aff }}$ for parabolic $S^{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$. During Alexander Isaev's stay in Orsay, and after fruitful exchanges with Peter Olver, it became clear that an independent study of affine differential invariants of parabolic surfaces $S^{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ should be endeavoured, and this was pushed to an end in [1].

There, by keeping memory of all terms in the power series that lie above those coefficients that are progressively normalized, Chen-Merker obtained certain (complicated) differential-algebraic expressions made from Taylor coefficients at the origin, from which one can straightforwardly recover differential invariants at every point. But traditionally instead, people only look at lowest order currently normalized coefficients in each step, so that computations remain simple.

Since the technique of [1] seems not to have been well developed or understood by CR geometers up to now, we decided to write up the present memoir. Its main goal is to construct a bridge:

Cartan's method


Moser's method,
and exhibit how differential invariants pass from one side of the river to the other side, computationally. Reading the toy Section 2 below is enough to understand the key archideas of such a bridge. We indeed first focus on the toy case of rigid equivalences of rigid hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ (easily reached results), before passing to the not so simple case of rigid equivalences in the rigid class denoted $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ by Alexander Isaev which consists, as written above, of 2-nondegenerate constant Levi rank 1 hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ with $0 \in M$.

In $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, on the Cartan side of the bridge, we construct in Section 2 an absolute parallelism on $P^{5}:=M^{3} \times \mathbb{C}$ equipped with coordinates $(z, \bar{z}, v, \mathrm{c}, \overline{\mathrm{c}})$ consisting of 5 differential 1forms:

$$
\{\rho, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}, \pi, \bar{\pi}\}
$$

$$
(\bar{\rho}=\rho),
$$

which satisfy invariant structure equations of the shape:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \rho & =(\pi+\bar{\pi}) \wedge \rho+i \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}, & & \\
d \zeta & =\pi \wedge \zeta, & & d \bar{\zeta}=\bar{\pi} \wedge \bar{\zeta} \\
d \pi & =\frac{1}{c \bar{c}} R \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}, & & d \bar{\pi}=-\frac{1}{c \bar{c}} \bar{R} \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}
\end{aligned}
$$

where there is only invariant function:

$$
R:=\frac{F_{z z \overline{z z}} F_{z \bar{z}}-F_{z z \bar{z}} F_{z \overline{z z}}}{\left(F_{z \bar{z}}\right)^{2}} .
$$

We show that $M$ is rigidly equivalent to $\{u=z \bar{z}\}$ if and only if $R(F) \equiv 0$.
On the Moser side of the bridge, starting from a given $u=\sum_{j+k \geqslant 1} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k}$ passing by the origin, we perform as said above a few normalizing biholomorphisms in order to reach:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
0=F_{j, 0}=F_{0, k} & (j \geqslant 1, k \geqslant 1), \\
1=F_{1,1}, & (j \geqslant 2, k \geqslant 2),
\end{array}
$$

and the key feature of the method is to keep track of all performed rigid biholomorphic transformations, which will give us at the end:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\left[\frac{F_{2,2} F_{1,1}-F_{2,1} F_{1,2}}{F_{1,1}^{3}}\right] z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}+z^{2} \bar{z}^{3}(\cdots)+z^{3} \bar{z}^{2}(\cdots)
$$

and from this rational expression of the final $F_{2,2}^{\prime}$ coefficient at the origin, it is easy to recognize/reconstitute/translate Cartan's invariant $R(F)$ at every point (up to a nowhere vanishing factor const $\cdot F_{z \bar{z}}$ ). Why this is so has already been explained in [1, Sec. 12] and will not be repeated here.

Principle 1.3. In all $C R$ equivalence problems (and outside $C R$ geometry too), there exists a way of computing with power series at only one point which generates all Cartan-like invariants together with their syzygies.

In fact, relations (syzygies) require the theory of recurrence relations, developed for infinite-dimensional Lie groups by Olver-Pohjanpelto [36, 37], but we will not touch this aspect here.

Because such a 'bridge-principle' has neither been constructed nor really noticed in CR geometry, a joint forthcoming publication will tackle to build it also for nonrigid $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ that are 2-nondegenerate and have constant rank 1 Levi form, thereby recovering the full explicit expressions of Pocchiola's invariants $W$ and $J$ at every point, not only as numbercoefficients at one given point as in [17, Thm. 2].

The first question is: what is the appropriate local graphed model for 2-nondegenerate constant Levi rank 1 hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ ? Of course, it is known from the recent Cartan-theoretic achievements in [15, 24, 31] that the local model is any neighborhood of any smooth point of the tube in $\mathbb{C}^{3}$ over the light cone in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ having equation $x_{2}^{2}-x_{3}^{2}=x_{1}^{2}$. But it is not graphed! We claim that in different notations, this cone has local graphed equation:

$$
u=\frac{x^{2}}{1-y}
$$

with $x, y, u$ being the real parts of three complex coordinates on $\mathbb{C}^{3} \ni(z, \zeta, w)$. As we agreed orally with Alexander Isaev, this is the best, most compact existing graphed equation. It happens to also be the central model of parabolic surface $S^{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ occurring in [1].

The claim is easy. By CR-homogeneity, one can recenter at any smooth point, e.g. at $(0,1,1)$, write $\left(1+x_{2}\right)^{2}-\left(1+x_{3}\right)^{2}=x_{1}^{2}$, factor, divide, get $x_{2}-x_{3}=\frac{x_{1}^{2}}{2+x_{2}+x_{3}}$, and linearly change coordinates.

However, this tube graphed equation contains many pluriharmonic terms:

$$
\frac{w+\bar{w}}{2}=\frac{(z+\bar{z})^{2}}{4-2 \zeta-2 \bar{\zeta}}=\frac{1}{8} z^{2} \zeta+\frac{1}{8} \bar{z}^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\cdots
$$

that Moser's method would compulsorily kill at the very beginning. Thus, $u=\frac{x^{2}}{1-y}$ is not the right start. Similarly, $u=x^{2}=\frac{1}{2} z^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2}+\cdots$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ is not the right start from Moser's point of view.

The right graphed equation for the model light cone $M_{\mathrm{LC}} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ in $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ was discovered by Gaussier-Merker in [8]:

$$
M_{\mathrm{LC}}: \quad u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}=: m(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

and before commenting about very funny zig-zag errors made in the field at that time, we review the naive reasoning. Here, the letter $m$ is from $m$ odel. By luck, $M_{\mathrm{LC}}$ is rigid!

Start with $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$, with $0 \in M$, rigid, graphed as:

$$
u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

Constant Levi rank 1 means, possibly after a linear transformation in $\mathbb{C}_{z, \zeta}^{2}$, that:

$$
F_{z \bar{z}} \neq 0 \equiv\left|\begin{array}{ll}
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{\zeta \bar{z}}  \tag{1.4}\\
F_{z \bar{\zeta}} & F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right|=: \operatorname{Levi}(F),
$$

while 2-nondegeneracy means that:

$$
0 \neq\left|\begin{array}{cc}
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{z}}  \tag{1.5}\\
F_{z z \bar{\zeta}} & F_{z z \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right| .
$$

By direct symbolic computations, Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 will establish invariancy of these vanishing/nonvanishing properties under rigid changes of holomorphic coordinates.

At the origin, $M_{\mathrm{LC}}$ of equation:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(4)
$$

is obviously 2 -nondegenerate, thanks to the cubic monomial $\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}$ which gives that 1.5 ) at $(z, \zeta)=(0,0)$ becomes $\left|\begin{array}{l}1 \\ *\end{array} 1\right|=1$. As for constant Levi rank 1 , order two terms $u=$ $z \bar{z}+\cdots$ show that this condition is true at the origin, and simple computations show that (1.4) is identically zero:

$$
\left|\begin{array}{cc}
\frac{1}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} & \frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} \\
\frac{z+\overline{z \zeta}}{(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} & \frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})(\bar{z}+\bar{z})}{(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{3}}
\end{array}\right| \equiv 0
$$

(- indeed!).

So how to easily produce one simple example? How $M_{\mathrm{LC}}$ was born?
Normalizing the Levi form at the origin, one can assume $F=z \bar{z}+\cdots$. Hence the 2nondegeneracy determinant $\sqrt{1.5}$ becomes at the origin $\left|{ }_{* F_{z z \bar{\zeta}}(0)}^{0}\right|=1$. Thus, a monomial like $\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}$ must be present. Since $F$ is real, its conjugate $\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta$ also comes:

$$
u=F=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\sum_{k \geqslant 4} F^{k}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

here of course, the $F^{k}$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree $k$. Without remainders, i.e. with all $F^{k}=0$, the cubic equation is not of constant Levi rank 1 (exercise).

The idea of Gaussier-Merker was to take the simplest possible successive $F^{4}, F^{5}$, $F^{6}, \ldots$ in order to guarantee Levi $(F) \equiv 0$. Thus, plug all this in:

$$
0 \stackrel{?}{=}\left|\begin{array}{rr}
1+F_{z \bar{z}}^{4}+F_{z \bar{z}}^{5}+F_{z \bar{z}}^{5}+\cdots & \bar{z}+F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{4}+F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{5}+F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{6}+\cdots \\
z+F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{4}+F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{5}+F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{6}+\cdots & F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{4}+F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{5}+F_{\bar{\zeta}}^{6}+\cdots
\end{array}\right| .
$$

At first, look at terms of order 2, get $0=F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{4}-z \bar{z}$, integrate as the simplest possible $F^{4}:=z \bar{z} \zeta \bar{\zeta}$. Next, plug this $F^{4}$ in, chase only homogeneous terms of degree 3, get $F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{5}=$
$z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\bar{z}^{2} \zeta$, and integrate most simply as $F^{5}:=\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}(\zeta \bar{\zeta})+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta(\zeta \bar{\zeta})$. Next, plug this $F^{5}$ in, get $F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{6}=4 z \bar{z} \zeta \bar{\zeta}$, integrate $F^{6}:=z \bar{z}(\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}$, and so on.

An easy induction then shows that powers $(\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{k}$ appear, and a geometric summation reconstitutes the denominator $\frac{1}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}$ in the Gaussier-Merker model.

Gaussier-Merker made an error when computing (by hand) the Lie algebra of infinitesimal CR automorphisms of $M_{\mathrm{LC}}$, and found a 7-dimensional Lie algebra. This looked 'coherent' with a paper published by Ebenfelt in the Duke Mathematical Journal (year 2000), which pretended to bound by 7 the dimension of the CR automorphism group of any $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ - but due to an incorrect expression of the initial $G$-structure, Ebenfelt's paper appeared later to be wrong. Experts of Cartan theory know how sensitive can be any little error in normalizations/reductions of $G$-structures.

Then the masters Fels-Kaup of Lie transformation groups cleaned up the subject, showing in [4], inter alia, that the Gaussier-Merker model is locally biholomorphically equivalent to the tube over the light cone, so that everybody was wrong before. They proceeded as follows.

Let $S_{2 \times 2} \equiv \mathbb{R}^{3} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$ be the space of all real symmetric $2 \times 2$ matrices. The open set $\Omega \mathrm{C}^{+} \subset S_{2 \times 2}$ consisting of positive definite matrices has boundary the future light cone, which may be represented as:

$$
\mathrm{LC}^{+}=\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc}
t+x_{1} & x_{2} \\
x_{2} & t-x_{1}
\end{array}\right) \in S_{2 \times 2}: t^{2}=x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}, t>0\right\} .
$$

The objects of study are the following tube domain - Siegel's upper half plane up to the factor $i$ - and its boundary hypersurface:

$$
\mathrm{H}:=\Omega \mathrm{C}^{+} \times i S_{2 \times 2} \quad \text { and } \quad \mathrm{T}:=\mathrm{LC}^{+} \times i S_{2 \times 2}
$$

The global CR automorphism group of $T$ consists of just affine transformations, while the global biholomorphic transformation $\operatorname{group} \operatorname{Aut}(\mathrm{H})$ of the domain H is known for a long time to consist of the 10 -dimensional group of all biholomorphic transformations $z \longmapsto$ $(a z+i b)(i c z+d)^{-1}$, where $z=\left(\begin{array}{cc}w & z_{1} \\ z_{1} & z_{2}\end{array}\right)$ with $\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, w\right) \in \mathbb{C}^{3}$, and where $\left(\begin{array}{ll}a & b \\ c & d\end{array}\right)$ belongs to the real symplectic subgroup $\mathrm{SP}_{2}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathrm{SL}_{4}(\mathbb{R})$.

Differentiating this action yields that the algebra of infinitesimal automorphisms $\mathfrak{a u t}(\mathrm{H})$ of the domain is equal to $\mathfrak{s p}(2, \mathbb{R}) \cong \mathfrak{s o}_{2,3}(\mathbb{R})$, also 10 -dimensional.

Fels-Kaup then asked how such automorphisms could be inherited by (transmitted to) the boundary $\mathbf{T}=\partial \mathbf{H}$.


$$
\zeta_{1}:=2 w \partial_{w} \quad \text { and } \quad \zeta_{2}:=z_{1} \partial_{z_{1}}+2 z_{2} \partial_{z_{2}}
$$

and they showed that any hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ whose graphing function starts as $w+\bar{w}=$ $2 z_{1} \bar{z}_{1}+z_{1}^{2} \bar{z}_{2}+\bar{z}_{1}^{2} z_{2}+\mathrm{O}(4)$ such that $\mathfrak{h o l}(M, 0)$ includes $\zeta_{1}$ and $i \zeta_{2}$ is locally homogeneous if and only if $\mathfrak{h o l}(M, 0)$ also contains the two further infinitesimal transformations:

$$
\left(1-z_{2}\right) \partial_{z_{1}}+2 z_{1} \partial_{w} \quad \text { and } \quad-z_{1} z_{2} \partial_{z_{1}}+\left(1-z_{2}^{2}\right) \partial_{w}
$$

Analyzing further structure-theoretic features of the simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{s o}_{2,3}(\mathbb{R})$, they showed that this holds if and only if the graphed equation reads as the Gaussier-Merker
model (up to a factor 2):

$$
\begin{equation*}
w+\bar{w}=\frac{2 z_{1} \bar{z}_{1}+z_{1}^{2} \bar{z}_{2}+\bar{z}_{1}^{2} z_{2}}{1-z_{2} \bar{z}_{2}} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

thus giving another natural way to produce this model. The main thing was that $\mathfrak{a u t} \mathfrak{t}_{\mathrm{CR}}$ is 10 -dimensional, not 7 !

Fels-Kaup also deduced an explicit rational biholomorphism from this model 1.6) onto a subdomain of T :

$$
\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, w\right) \longmapsto \frac{1}{1+z_{2}}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
w+w z_{2}+z_{1}^{2} & \sqrt{2} z_{1} \\
\sqrt{2} z_{1} & 1-z_{2}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

At about the same time, Fels-Kaup in Acta Mathematica made the breakthrough of classifying all homogeneous models $M \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$. They showed that, excepting the light cone, all such $M$ are in fact simply homogeneous - isotropy Lie subgroup reduced to identity - and necessarily tube, namely biholomorphically equivalent to $S^{2}+(i \mathbb{R})^{3}$, for some surface $S^{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ which is simply homogeneous with respect to the affine group $\mathrm{A}_{3}(\mathbb{R})$. Fels-Kaup's complete classification is:
(1) $S=\left\{x_{1}^{2}+x_{2}^{2}=x_{3}^{2}, x_{3}>0\right\}$ the future light cone;
(2a) $S=\left\{r\left(\cos t, \sin t, e^{\omega t}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}: r \in \mathbb{R}^{+}\right.$and $\left.t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$ with $\omega>0$ arbitrary;
(2b) $S=\left\{r\left(1, t, e^{t}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}: r \in \mathbb{R}^{+}\right.$and $\left.t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$;
(2c) $S=\left\{r\left(1, e^{t}, e^{\theta t}\right) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}: r \in \mathbb{R}^{+}\right.$and $\left.t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$ with $\theta>2$ arbitrary;
(3) $S=\left\{c(t)+r c^{\prime}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{3}: r \in \mathbb{R}^{+}\right.$and $\left.t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$, where $c(t):=\left(t, t^{2}, t^{3}\right)$ parametrizes the twisted cubic $\left\{\left(t, t^{2}, t^{3}\right): t \in \mathbb{R}\right\}$ in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$ and $c^{\prime}(t)=\left(1,2 t, 3 t^{2}\right)$.

The limit case $\omega=0$ in (2a) regives the future light cone (1), while the limit case $\theta=2$ in (2c) gives $\left\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{3}: x_{1} x_{3}=x_{2}^{2}\right.$ and $\left.x_{1}, x_{2}>0\right\}$ which is locally linearly (but not globally) equivalent to (1). These five (families of) surfaces are known to be pairwise locally inequivalent under affine transformations ([2, 3]).

As spectacular as they were, the Fels-Kaup articles did not treat the equivalence problem for all hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ in the class $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$. Indeed, like in Riemannian geometry, it is well known that homogeneous CR manifolds are rather rare in the set of all CR manifolds. Although Lie-theoretic methods seem to be undoubtedly the best to determine homogeneous structures, they lose their power when dealing with generic, non-homogeneous, structures. Only Cartan's and Moser's methods of equivalence are able to handle all geometric objects of a given kind.

Thus, it was only in the years 2010's that the three papers [15, 24, 31] achieved the construction of 10 -dimensional $\{e\}$-structure bundles (or Cartan connections) $P^{10} \longrightarrow$ $M^{5}$.

Among these, only Pocchiola's Ph.D. [38], published as [31], really performed sufficiently advanced computations to determine what are the primary curvature invariants, he called $W$ and $I$. Let us review Pocchiola's results. We also follow the article [6], written because Alexander Isaev insisted that all details be made public, while Pocchiola intensively used his computer.

Recall that we denote the class of (local) hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ passing by the origin $0 \in M$ that are 2-nondegenerate and whose Levi form has constant rank 1 as:

$$
\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}^{2}
$$

Consider therefore a not necessarily rigid hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ which belongs to this class $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$, and which is graphed as:

$$
u=F\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}, v\right) .
$$

The two natural generators of $T^{1,0} M$ and $T^{0,1} M$ are:

$$
\mathscr{L}_{1}:=\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{1}}-i \frac{F_{z_{1}}}{1+i F_{v}} \frac{\partial}{\partial v} \quad \quad \text { and } \quad \mathscr{L}_{2}:=\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{2}}-i \frac{F_{z_{2}}}{1+i F_{v}} \frac{\partial}{\partial v}
$$

in the intrinsic coordinates $\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}, v\right)$ on $M$. We will use the abbreviations:

$$
A^{1}:=-i \frac{\boldsymbol{F}_{z_{1}}}{1+i \boldsymbol{F}_{v}} \quad \text { and } \quad A^{2}:=-i \frac{\boldsymbol{F}_{z_{2}}}{1+i \boldsymbol{F}_{v}}
$$

Clearly, the real differential 1-form:

$$
\varrho_{0}:=d v-A^{1} d z_{1}-A^{2} d z_{2}-\bar{A}^{1} d \bar{z}_{1}-\bar{A}^{2} d \bar{z}_{2}
$$

has kernel:

$$
\left\{\varrho_{0}=0\right\}=T^{1,0} M \oplus T^{0,1} M
$$

At various points:

$$
p=\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}, v\right) \in M
$$

and in terms of $\varrho_{0}$, the hypothesis that $M$ has everywhere degenerate Levi form writes as:

$$
0 \equiv=\left|\begin{array}{ll}
\varrho_{0}\left(i\left[\mathscr{L}_{1}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\right]\right) & \varrho_{0}\left(i\left[\mathscr{L}_{2}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\right]\right) \\
\varrho_{0}\left(i\left[\mathscr{L}_{1}, \mathscr{L}_{2}\right]\right) & \varrho_{0}\left(i\left[\mathscr{L}_{2}, \mathscr{L}_{2}\right]\right)
\end{array}\right|(p) .
$$

The hypothesis that the Levi form has constant rank equal to 1 - not to 0 ! - expresses as the fact that the real CR-transversal vector field:

$$
\mathscr{T}:=i\left[\mathscr{L}_{1}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\right]=i\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\bar{A}^{1}\right)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(A^{1}\right)\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial v}=: \ell \frac{\partial}{\partial v},
$$

has nowhere vanishing real coefficient:

$$
\ell:=i\left(\bar{A}_{z_{1}}^{1}+A^{1} \bar{A}_{v}^{1}-A_{\bar{z}_{1}}^{1}-\bar{A}^{1} A_{v}^{1}\right) \neq 0
$$

The Levi kernel bundle $K^{1,0} M \subset T^{1,0} M$ is then generated by:

$$
\mathscr{K}:=k \mathscr{L}_{1}+\mathscr{L}_{2},
$$

where:

$$
k:=-\frac{\mathscr{L}_{2}\left(\bar{A}^{1}\right)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(A^{2}\right)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\bar{A}^{1}\right)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(A^{1}\right)}
$$

is the fundamental slant function. As is known from [32, 38, 31], the hypothesis of 2nondegeneracy is then equivalent to the nonvanishing:

$$
0 \neq \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)
$$

Also, the conjugate field $\overline{\mathscr{K}}$ generates the conjugate Levi kernel bundle $K^{0,1} M \subset$ $T^{0,1} M$. There also is a second fundamental function:

$$
P:=\frac{\ell_{z_{1}}+A^{1} \ell_{v}-\ell A_{v}^{1}}{\ell}
$$

Pocchiola conducted in [38] the Cartan equivalence method for such $M^{5} \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ under general (local) biholomorphic transformations. Reduction to an explicit $\{e\}$-structure was later done in [6], after Alexander Isaev insisted through e-mail exchanges to do this as was
done in [15], though in a non-explicit way. However, such a task is not essential from the point of view of Cartan's theory, as was well understood by Pocchiola, and as we will explain in a while.

For now, introducing the five 1 -forms:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\rho_{0} & =\frac{d v-A^{1} d z_{1}-A^{2} d z_{2}-\bar{A}^{1} d \bar{z}_{1}-\bar{A}^{2} d \bar{z}_{2}}{\ell}, \\
\kappa_{0} & =d z_{1}-k d z_{2}, \\
\zeta_{0} & =d z_{2} \\
\bar{\kappa}_{0} & =d \bar{z}_{1}-\bar{k} d \bar{z}_{2}, \\
\bar{\zeta}_{0} & =d \bar{z}_{2},
\end{aligned}
$$

after very, very intensive computations, redone manually by Foo-Merker in [6] all along $\sim 50$ pages, Pocchiola obtained modifications $\{\rho, \kappa, \zeta, \bar{\kappa}, \bar{\zeta}\}$ of these 1 -forms $\left\{\rho_{0}, \kappa_{0}, \zeta_{0}, \bar{\kappa}_{0}, \bar{\zeta}_{0}\right\}$, together with four complicated 1-forms $\pi^{1}, \pi^{2}, \bar{\pi}^{1}, \bar{\pi}^{2}$ which satisfy structure equations of the specific concise shape:

$$
\begin{align*}
d \rho= & \left(\pi^{1}+\bar{\pi}^{1}\right) \wedge \rho+i \kappa \wedge \bar{\kappa} \\
d \kappa= & \pi^{2} \wedge \rho+\pi^{1} \wedge \kappa+\zeta \wedge \bar{\kappa} \\
d \zeta= & \left(\pi^{1}-\bar{\pi}^{1}\right) \wedge \zeta+i \pi^{2} \wedge \kappa+  \tag{1.7}\\
& +R \rho \wedge \zeta+i \frac{1}{\overline{\mathrm{c}}^{3}} \bar{J}_{0} \rho \wedge \bar{\kappa}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{c}} W_{0} \kappa \wedge \zeta,
\end{align*}
$$

in which $R$ is a secondary invariant:

$$
R:=\operatorname{Re}\left[i \frac{\mathrm{e}}{\mathrm{cc}} W_{0}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{cc}}\left(-\frac{i}{2} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(W_{0}\right)+\frac{i}{2}\left(-\frac{1}{3} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+\frac{1}{3} \bar{P}\right) W_{0}\right)\right]
$$

expressed in terms of Pocchiola's two primary invariants whose explicit expressions have been confirmed in [6] (and also after [38] by Alexander Isaev in [11] assuming $M$ is rigid):

$$
\begin{aligned}
W_{0}:= & -\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{2}}+\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{3}}+ \\
& +\frac{2}{3} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\right)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}+\frac{2}{3} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+\frac{i}{3} \frac{\mathscr{T}(k)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}, \\
\bar{J}_{0}:= & \frac{1}{6} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-\frac{5}{6} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{2}}-\frac{1}{6} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} \bar{P}^{2}+ \\
& +\frac{20}{27} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{3}}+\frac{5}{18} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{2}} \bar{P}+\frac{1 \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\bar{P})}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-\frac{1}{9} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)} \bar{P} \bar{P}- \\
& -\frac{1}{6} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\bar{P})\right)+\frac{1}{3} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\bar{P}) \bar{P}-\frac{2}{27} \bar{P} \bar{P} \bar{P} .
\end{aligned}
$$

When $M$ is assumed to be rigid for simplicity, the numerator of $W_{0}$ contains 52 differential monomials. When $M$ is not assumed rigid, it contains hundreds of thousands of differential monomials instead! Furthermore, the numerator of $J_{0}$ is even huger!

Thus, as is known, the complexity increases spectacularly from rigid to nonrigid CR manifolds. This justifies, in a way, to devote some mathematical works to rigid CR manifolds, as Alexander Isaev did, and as we do in the present memoir.

The full $\{e\}$-structure obtained by Foo-Merker in [6] for nonrigid $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ shows that a unique prolongation of $G$-structure is needed, introducing one further parameter $\mathrm{t} \in \mathbb{R}$, together with a (very complicated) real modified Maurer-Cartan form $\Lambda=d \mathrm{t}+\cdots$ and that all appearing torsion coefficients are secondary invariants. The constructed bundle $P^{10} \longrightarrow M^{5}$ is equipped with ten coordinates:

$$
\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}, v, \mathrm{c}, \overline{\mathrm{c}}, \mathrm{e}, \overline{\mathrm{e}}, \mathrm{t}\right)
$$

with $c \in \mathbb{C}^{*}, e \in \mathbb{C}, \mathrm{t} \in \mathbb{R}$, together with a collection of ten complex-valued 1-form which make a frame for $T P^{10}$, denoted:

$$
\left\{\rho, \kappa, \zeta, \bar{\kappa}, \bar{\zeta}, \pi^{1}, \bar{\pi}^{1}, \pi^{2}, \bar{\pi}^{2}, \Lambda\right\} \quad(\bar{\rho}=\rho, \bar{\Lambda}=\Lambda)
$$

and which satisfy 10 invariant structure equations; however, we will not write the structure equations for $d \pi^{1}, d \bar{\pi}^{1}, d \pi^{2}, d \bar{\pi}^{2}, d \Lambda$, because they are not simple, and anyway, they incorporate only secondary invariants.

Thus quite unexpectedly, Pocchiola discovered that all primary invariants appear before prolongation of the equivalence problem, that is to say, they already appear at the beginning of the story, in the structure equations (1.7).

This phenomenon is in some sense 'counter-intuitive' to CR geometers, since for Levi nondegenerate CR structures $M^{2 n+1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, and for the corresponding second order PDE systems, no curvatures appear after absorption before prolongation (summation convention holds):

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \omega & =\omega^{\alpha} \wedge \omega_{\alpha}+\omega \wedge \varphi \\
d \omega^{\alpha} & =\omega^{\beta} \wedge \varphi_{\beta}^{\alpha}+\omega \wedge \varphi^{\alpha} \\
d \omega_{\alpha} & =\varphi_{\alpha}^{\beta} \wedge \omega_{\beta}+\omega_{\alpha} \wedge \varphi+\omega \wedge \varphi_{\alpha}
\end{aligned}
$$

while primary and secondary invariants appear afterwards, e.g. like $S_{\beta \rho}^{\alpha \sigma}$ and $R_{\beta \gamma}^{\alpha}, T_{\beta}^{\alpha \gamma}$ in:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \varphi_{\beta}^{\alpha}= & \frac{1}{2} \delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} \psi \wedge \omega-\varphi_{\beta}^{\gamma} \wedge \varphi_{\gamma}^{\alpha}-\varphi_{\beta} \wedge \omega^{\alpha}-\varphi^{\alpha} \wedge \omega_{\beta}+\delta_{\beta}^{\alpha} \omega^{\gamma} \wedge \varphi_{\gamma}+ \\
& +S_{\beta \rho}^{\alpha \sigma} \omega^{\rho} \wedge \omega_{\sigma}+R_{\beta \gamma}^{\alpha} \omega^{\gamma} \wedge \omega+T_{\beta}^{\alpha \gamma} \omega_{\gamma} \wedge \omega .
\end{aligned}
$$

Next, in the 'flat case' where both $J_{0} \equiv 0 \equiv W_{0}$ vanish identically, which implies $R \equiv 0$ too, Pocchiola's structure equations reduce to constant coefficients:

$$
\begin{align*}
d \rho & =\left(\pi^{1}+\bar{\pi}^{1}\right) \wedge \rho+i \kappa \wedge \bar{\kappa} \\
d \kappa & =\pi^{2} \wedge \rho+\pi^{1} \wedge \kappa+\zeta \wedge \bar{\kappa}  \tag{1.8}\\
d \zeta & =\left(\pi^{1}-\bar{\pi}^{1}\right) \wedge \zeta+i \pi^{2} \wedge \kappa
\end{align*}
$$

Then a key point is to show that after prolongation, precisely the structure equations of the Gaussier-Merker model pop up, namely (conjugate equations are unwritten):

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \rho & =\pi^{1} \wedge \rho+\bar{\pi}^{1} \wedge \rho+i \kappa \wedge \bar{\kappa} \\
d \kappa & =\pi^{1} \wedge \kappa+\pi^{2} \wedge \rho+\zeta \wedge \bar{\kappa} \\
d \zeta & =i \pi^{2} \wedge \kappa+\pi^{1} \wedge \zeta-\bar{\pi}^{1} \wedge \zeta \\
d \pi^{1} & =i \kappa \wedge \bar{\pi}^{2}+\zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}+\Lambda \wedge \rho \\
d \pi^{2} & =\pi^{2} \wedge \bar{\pi}^{1}+\zeta \wedge \bar{\pi}^{2}+\Lambda \wedge \kappa \\
d \Lambda & =i \pi^{2} \wedge \bar{\pi}^{2}+\Lambda \wedge \pi^{1}+\Lambda \wedge \bar{\pi}^{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

and not the structure equations of any other kind of hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$. This was done by Pocchiola at the very end of [38], not published in [31] for reasons of space.

In the meanwhile, Wei Guo Foo found that Pocchiola missed the presence of a purely imaginary function $h=i H$ with $\bar{H}=H$ in computations starting from 1.8, which could have destroyed Pocchiola's main result (!), because some (phantom) primary invariants could have then existed in the structure equations for $d \pi^{1}, d \bar{\pi}^{1}, d \pi^{2}, d \bar{\pi}^{2}, d \Lambda$, exactly as in Cartan-Chern-Moser's computations!

Fortunately, this function $h=i H$ could be shown to vanish, hence phantoms remained phantoms, and the correction to the (unpublished) end of [38] will appear as [30], prepublished at the end of [6]. Maybe Pocchiola just did not type a proper presentation, and was anyway right in his manuscripts.

Lastly, we recall that Cartan adopted Lie's principle of thought ([20, Chap. 1]), as we do too, which admits that either a given differential invariant, call it $P$, is identically zero, or is assumed to be nowhere zero, after restriction to an appropriate open subset:


Mixed cases where some invariant is nonzero on some nonempty open subset and vanishes on a nonempty closed subset are excluded from exploration.

Therefore there is essentially no necessity to set up an $\{e\}$-structure when $W_{0} \equiv 0 \equiv J_{0}$, because when either $W_{0} \not \equiv 0$, hence $W_{0} \neq 0$ after restriction, or $J_{0} \not \equiv 0$, hence $J_{0} \neq 0$ after restriction, Cartan's method commands to continue the group parameter normalizations!

Pocchiola indeed listened to captain Cartan, and was able to prove the
Theorem 1.9. [38, 31, 6, 30] Only two primary invariants, $W_{0}$ and $J_{0}$, occur for biholomorphic equivalences of $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ real analytic hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$, and:

$$
0 \equiv W_{0} \equiv J_{0} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad M \text { is equivalent to the Gaussier-Merker model. }
$$

Furthermore, when either $W_{0} \neq 0$ or $J_{0} \neq 0$, the equivalence problem reduces to a 5dimensional $\{e\}$-structure on $M^{5}$.

As a corollary known from general Cartan theory, every non-flat $M^{5} \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ has CR automorphisms group of dimension $\leqslant 5$. This confirmed the same dimensional gap estimate $10 \downarrow 5$ obtained by Fels-Kaup in [5], who assumed $M$ to be homogeneous from the beginning.

Now, as said, we will work with rigid hypersurfaces, which is easier. Only in a future publication will we complete the views of [17] by comparing them with Pocchiola's results in a deeper way, inspired by the present article.

We start by presenting the Moser side of the river. But before we really treat $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$, let us explain first how we can get rid of infinity in the local Lie group of rigid biholomorphisms by performing what we will call as in [17] a prenormalization, which is here, as we already saw, to reach:

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=z \bar{z}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k}, \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\overline{F_{k, j}}=F_{j, k}$.
How can we do this? Simple! First, starting from a general $u=\sum_{j+k \geqslant 1} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k}$, we get rid of all harmonic terms $F_{j, 0} z^{j}, F_{0, k} \bar{z}^{k}$ in the graphing function by setting:

$$
z^{\prime}:=z, \quad w^{\prime}:=w-2 \sum_{j \geqslant 1} F_{j, 0} z^{j}
$$

and we get a new graphed equation of the form (dropping primes):

$$
u=\sum_{\substack{j \geqslant 1 \\ k \geqslant 1}} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k}
$$

By this, we have erased an infinite number of coefficients $F_{j, 0}, F_{0, k}$, which was possible thanks to the infinite dimensionality of the group of rigid biholomorphisms. More precisely, we have consumed 1 function of 1 complex variable.

Next, assuming Levi nondegeneracy at the origin, making an elementary linear transformation (exercise), we can assume:

$$
\begin{aligned}
u & =z \bar{z}+\sum_{\substack{j+k \geqslant 3 \\
j, k \geqslant 1}} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} \\
& =z \bar{z}+\bar{z}\left(\sum_{j \geqslant 2} F_{j, 0} z^{j}\right)+z\left(\sum_{k \geqslant 2} F_{0, k} \bar{z}^{k}\right)+\sum_{\substack{j \geqslant 2 \\
k \geqslant 2}} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, the presence of the monomial $z \bar{z}$ is very advantageous in that it enables to capture all monomials $\bar{z} z^{j}$ and their conjugates $z \bar{z}^{k}$ in a tricky but simple factorization, in which we abbreviate $\Lambda(z):=\sum_{j \geqslant 2} F_{j, 0} z^{j}$ :

$$
u=(z+\Lambda(z))(\bar{z}+\bar{\Lambda}(\bar{z}))-\Lambda(z) \bar{\Lambda}(\bar{z})+\sum_{\substack{j \geqslant 2 \\ k \geqslant 2}} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k}
$$

The same factorization idea will work soon for $M^{5} \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$. Then by making the biholomorphism:

$$
z^{\prime}:=z+\Lambda(z)=z+\mathrm{O}_{z}(2), \quad w^{\prime}:=w
$$

it is not difficult to see (details in Section 2) that we come to the prenormalized form (1.10). Observe that we have consumed a second infinity, again 1 function of 1 complex variable.

Why do we call this prenormal form? Firstly, because it is in a sense easily and almost freely got from the assumptions. Secondly, because one key aspect of power series normal forms is the progressive reduction of stability groups, not well emphasized in [18, 17]. The reader is referred to Sections 13 and 16 of Chen-Merker [1] to see examples of curves $C^{1} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2}$ and surfaces $S^{2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{3}$ modulo the group of special affine transformations for which successive stability groups are explicitly described.

The presence of group structure reduction also in Moser's theory of normal forms is in surprising homology, not to say harmony, with Cartan's method of equivalence, whose main gist is group structure reduction.

Plato's Philosophy states that Mathematical objects are one and the same in their World. Various theories elaborate different concept to grasp these Ideas. The more adequate the concepts are, the more unitary they are. What we are claiming is again a good sign of Unity in Mathematics.

Indeed, once a prenormalization is obtained, in order to normalize $F(z, \bar{z})$ further, it is natural to assume that the next rigid biholomorphic transformations $(z, w) \longmapsto\left(z^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$ to be used should keep unchanged the 'shape' of the prenormalization, namely send:

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=z \bar{z}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} \quad \text { to } \quad u^{\prime}=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k}^{\prime} z^{\prime j} \bar{z}^{\prime k} \tag{to}
\end{equation*}
$$

This of course imposes many contraints on the map $(z, w) \longmapsto\left(z^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$. And in the rigid context, it is easy to see (in Section 2), that only a finite-dimensional Lie group remains. Thus, after prenormalization is performed, one is led back to Lie's original theory [20, 34] in jet spaces for finite-dimensional continuous groups, which can be safely and naturally applied, to finish.

Next, what about $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ rigid hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ ? Quite the same!
In coordinates $(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \in \mathbb{C}^{3}$, we start at the origin with:

$$
u=\sum_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 1} F_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d} .
$$

Abbreviating $\chi(z, \zeta):=\sum_{a+b \geqslant 1} F_{a, b, 0,0} z^{a} \zeta^{b}$, we similarly get rid of pluriharmonic terms thanks to $z^{\prime}:=z, \zeta^{\prime}:=\zeta, w^{\prime}:=w-2 \chi(z, \zeta)$, receiving, after dropping primes, a righthand side graphing function $F$ which satisfies:

$$
0=F_{a, b, 0,0}=F_{0,0, c, d} .
$$

Next, since $M$ is 2-nondegenerate and has Levi form of rank 1 at the origin, it is not difficult (see Section 5 ) to bring its cubic approximation to:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\sum_{\substack{a+b+c+d \geqslant 4 \\ a+b>1 \\ c+d \geqslant 1}} F_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}
$$

And now, the same idea of absorption by factorization pops up. But compared to $M^{3} \subset$ $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, there is a difference: two nontrivial monomials $z \bar{z}$ (self-conjugate) and $\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta$ (with its equivalent conjugate) can be used to absorb infinities. Writing them as $\bar{z}(z)$ and $\bar{z}^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} \zeta\right)$, we may therefore capture all holomorphic monomials behind $\bar{z}(\cdots)$ and behind $\bar{z}^{2}(\cdots)$,
by making the rigid biholomorphism:

$$
\begin{aligned}
z+\sum_{a+b \geqslant 1} F_{a, b, 1,0} z^{a} \zeta^{b} & =: z^{\prime}, \\
\frac{1}{2} \zeta+\sum_{a+b \geqslant 2} F_{a, b, 2,0} z^{a} \zeta^{b} & =: \zeta^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

with unchanged $w^{\prime}:=w$. The true story is a little more subtle, requires more care, and will be told with rigorous details in Section 5 .

Therefore, after having consumed three holomorphic functions of the two complex variables $(z, \zeta)$, we end up with a graph $u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ which is prenormalized in the sense that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0=F_{a, b, 0,0}=F_{0,0, c, d}, \\
& 0=F_{a, b, 1,0}=F_{1,0, c, d}, \\
& 0=F_{a, b, 2,0}=F_{2,0, c, d},
\end{aligned}
$$

except of course $F_{1,0,1,0}=1$ and $F_{2,0,0,1}=\frac{1}{2}=F_{0,1,2,0}$. An equivalent way to express prenormalization is to write that (exercise):

$$
u=F=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)
$$

The next task is to normalize $F$ beyond prenormalization.
Because in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ a general rigid hypersurface $u=F=z \bar{z}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$ is naturally represented as a perturbation of the (flat) model $u=z \bar{z}$, we represent a general rigid $M \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ as a perturbation of the Gaussier-Merker model:

$$
u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=m(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})+G(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

but - warning! -, the remainder function $G$ here cannot be arbitrary, it must be so that $\operatorname{Levi}(m+G) \equiv 0$.

Next, inspired by [17], we show in the key Proposition 5.7 that in prenormalized coordinates, one necessarily has:

$$
G=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)
$$

Since the Gaussier-Merker function:

$$
m(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}
$$

is homogeneous of degree 2 in $(z, \bar{z})$, this conducts us, as in [17], to assign the following weights to the coordinate variables:

$$
[z]:=1=:[\bar{z}], \quad[\zeta]:=0=:[\bar{\zeta}], \quad[w]:=2=:[\bar{w}]
$$

Similarly as for rigid $M^{3} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2}$, we next ask: which rigid transformations stabilize prenormalization?, and we will again realize that only a finite-dimensional Lie group remains.

Thus we take $M$ in $\mathbb{C}^{3} \ni\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, w\right)$ graphed as $u=F=m+G$ and $M^{\prime}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{3} \ni$ $\left(z_{1}^{\prime}, z_{2}^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$ graphed as $u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}=m^{\prime}+G^{\prime}$, with $G$ prenormalized:

$$
\begin{equation*}
G=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3) \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

(none condition implies the other), and the same about $G^{\prime}$. The goal is to normalize further $G^{\prime}$.

Without waiting, we expand $G$ in weighted homogeneous parts:

$$
G=\sum_{\nu \geqslant 3} G_{\nu}, \quad G_{\nu}=\sum_{a+c=\nu} z^{a} \bar{z}^{c} G_{a, c}(\zeta, \bar{\zeta}),
$$

and the same for $G^{\prime}$, with, unlike in Moser's theory for Levi nondegenerate hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{n+1}$, coefficient-functions $G_{a, c}$ which are analytic, not polynomial.

The elementary Proposition 5.11 shows that, composing in advance with some element of the 2-dimensional isotropy group (1.2) of the origin for the Gaussier-Merker model, we can assume that the normalizing map has weighted expansion of the form:
$f=z+f_{2}+f_{3}+\cdots, \quad g=\zeta+g_{1}+g_{2}+\cdots, \quad h=w+h_{3}+h_{4}+\cdots$,
where, for $\nu=3,4,5, \ldots$, the appearing holomorphic functions $f_{\nu-1}, g_{\nu-2}, h_{\nu}$ are weighted homogeneous. Keeping good memory of this pre-composition, there will remain at the end a 2-dimensional ambiguity in the obtained normal form.

As in Jacobowitz's [18, Ch. 3] presentation of Moser's method, with increasing weights $\nu=3,4,5, \ldots$, we shall perform successive holomorphic rigid transformations of the shape:

$$
z^{\prime}:=z+f_{\nu-1}, \quad \quad \zeta^{\prime}:=\zeta+g_{\nu-2}, \quad w^{\prime}:=w+h_{\nu}
$$

Then in the main Proposition 6.2, we will show that through any such biholomorphism (1.12) which transforms:
$u=m+G_{3}+\cdots+G_{\nu-1}+G_{\nu}+\mathrm{O}(\nu+1) \quad$ into $\quad u^{\prime}=m+G_{3}^{\prime}+\cdots+G_{\nu-1}^{\prime}+G_{\nu}^{\prime}+\mathrm{O}^{\prime}(\nu+1)$, homogeneous terms are kept untouched up to order $\leqslant \nu-1$ :

$$
G_{\mu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=G_{\mu}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \quad(3 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu-1)
$$

while:
$G_{\nu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=G_{\nu}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})-2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} f_{\nu-1}(z, \zeta)+\frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2}}{2(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} g_{\nu-2}(z, \zeta)-\frac{1}{2} h_{\nu}(z, \zeta)\right\}$.
Here, the freedom, which consists of a triple $\left\{f_{\nu-1}, g_{\nu-2}, h_{\nu}\right\}$ of holomorphic functions of the two complex variables $(z, \zeta)$, can be used to simplify/normalize $G_{\nu}^{\prime}$ in comparison with $G_{\nu}$.

It is important to point out that in this paper, we dispense ourselves completely of making a formal theory of normal form before conducting a geometric reduction to normal form, we come directly to (geometric) heart.

Then we study the initial weights $\nu=3,4,5$, even restricting our attention firstly to total degree $a+b+c+d \leqslant 5$. In Section 7 , we show that only two monomials (up to conjugation) remain after prenormalization in:

$$
G_{3}=2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{z^{3} \bar{\zeta} G_{3,0,0,1}+z^{3} \bar{\zeta}^{2} G_{3,0,0,2}\right\}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(6) .
$$

Using the freedom (1.12) and taking account of preservation of prenormalization, similarly as in [1], we show that we can annihilate $G_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime}:=0$. And then, we show that no other Taylor coefficient of $G_{3}$ can be normalized, if one requires preservation of $G_{3,0,0,1}=0=$ $G_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime}$

In particular, this implies that there is no invariant of (differential) order 4, and this confirms the results of [7], to be reviewed and compared in a while.

Next, we study $\nu=4$, still with $a+b+c+d \leqslant 5$, and there are again only two monomials:

$$
G_{4}=2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{z^{4} \bar{\zeta} G_{4,0,0,1}+z^{3} \bar{z} \bar{\zeta} G_{3,0,1,1}\right\}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(6)
$$

Using the freedom (1.12) and taking account of preservation of all preceding normalizations, we show that we can annihilate $\operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime}:=0$. And then, we show that no other Taylor coefficient of $G_{4}$ can be normalized.

Lastly, for every remaining $\nu \geqslant 5$, we verify that only the identity tranformation $z^{\prime}=z$, $\zeta^{\prime}=\zeta, w^{\prime}=w$, stabilizes prenormalization and:

$$
0=G_{3,0,0,1}=G_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime}, \quad 0=\operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1}=\operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime}
$$

namely we show that $0=f_{\nu-1}=g_{\nu-2}=h_{\nu}$, necessarily.
Moser's algorithm therefore terminates, and we may at last state our main
Theorem 1.13. Every hypersurface $M^{5} \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ is equivalent, through a local rigid biholomorphism, to a rigid $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ hypersurface $M^{\prime 5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{\prime 3}$ which, dropping primes for target coordinates, is a perturbation of the Gaussier-Merker model:

$$
u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}+\sum_{\substack{a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N} \\ a+c \geqslant 3}} G_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}
$$

with a simplified remainder $G$ which:
(1) is normalized to be an $\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$;
(2) satisfies the prenormalization conditions $G=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=\mathrm{O}_{z}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\zeta}(1)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{a, b, 0,0} & =0=G_{0,0, c, d}, \\
G_{a, b, 1,0} & =0=G_{1,0, c, d}, \\
G_{a, b, 2,0} & =0=G_{2,0, c, d} ;
\end{aligned}
$$

(3) satisfies in addition the sporadic normalization conditions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{3,0,0,1} & =0=G_{0,1,3,0} \\
\operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1} & =0=\operatorname{Im} G_{1,1,3,0}
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, two such rigid $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ and $M^{\prime 5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{\prime 3}$, both brought into such a normal form, are rigidly biholomorphically equivalent if and only if there exist two constants $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{*}, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}$, such that for all $a, b, c, d$ :

$$
G_{a, b, c, d}=G_{a, b, c, d}^{\prime} \rho^{\frac{a+c-2}{2}} e^{i \varphi(a+2 b-c-2 d)} .
$$

Now, before talking about any bridge, we must survey the results of the article [7], from Cartan's side of the river. These results were finalized after the stay in Orsay of Alexander Isaev, who raised the problem. The reader is referred to the introduction of [7] for more extensive information.

Consider as before a rigid $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ with $0 \in M$, which is 2-nondegenerate and has Levi form of constant rank 1 , i.e. belongs to the class $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$, and which is graphed as:

$$
u=F\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}\right)
$$

The letter $\zeta$ is protected, hence not used instead of $z_{2}$, since $\zeta$ will denote a 1 -form. The two natural generators of $T^{1,0} M$ and $T^{0,1} M$ are:

$$
\mathscr{L}_{1}:=\partial_{z_{1}}-i F_{z_{1}} \partial_{v} \quad \text { and } \quad \mathscr{L}_{2}:=\partial_{z_{2}}-i F_{z_{2}} \partial_{v}
$$

in the intrinsic coordinates $\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}, v\right)$ on $M$. The Levi kernel bundle $K^{1,0} M \subset$ $T^{1,0} M$ is generated by:

$$
\mathscr{K}:=k \mathscr{L}_{1}+\mathscr{L}_{2}, \quad \quad \text { where } \quad \quad k:=-\frac{F_{z_{2} \bar{z}_{1}}}{F_{z_{1} \bar{z}_{1}}}
$$

is the slant function. The hypothesis of 2-nondegeneracy is equivalent to the nonvanishing:

$$
0 \neq \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)
$$

Also, the conjugate $\overline{\mathscr{K}}$ generates the conjugate Levi kernel bundle $K^{0,1} \subset T^{0,1} M$.
There is a second fundamental function, and no more:

$$
P:=\frac{F_{z_{1} z_{1} \bar{z}_{1}}}{F_{z_{1} \bar{z}_{1}}}
$$

In the rigid case, it looks so simple! But in the nonrigid case, $P$ has a numerator involving 69 differential monomials!

Foo-Merker-Ta produced in [7] reduction to an $\{e\}$-structure for the equivalence problem, under rigid (local) biholomorphic transformations, of such rigid $M^{5} \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$. They constructed an invariant 7 -dimensional bundle $P^{7} \longrightarrow M^{5}$ equipped with coordinates:

$$
\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}, v, \mathrm{c}, \overline{\mathrm{c}}\right)
$$

with $\mathrm{c} \in \mathbb{C}$, together with a collection of seven complex-valued 1-form which make a frame for $T P^{7}$, denoted:

$$
\{\rho, \kappa, \zeta, \bar{\kappa}, \bar{\zeta}, \alpha, \bar{\alpha}\} \quad(\bar{\rho}=\rho),
$$

which satisfy 7 invariant structure equations of the form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& d \rho=(\alpha+\bar{\alpha}) \wedge \rho+i \kappa \wedge \bar{\kappa}, \\
& d \kappa=\alpha \wedge \kappa+\zeta \wedge \bar{\kappa}, \\
& d \zeta=(\alpha-\bar{\alpha}) \wedge \zeta+\frac{1}{\mathrm{c}} I_{0} \kappa \wedge \zeta+\frac{1}{\overline{\mathrm{cC}}} V_{0} \kappa \wedge \bar{\kappa}, \\
& d \alpha=\zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}-\frac{1}{\mathrm{c}} I_{0} \zeta \wedge \bar{\kappa}+\frac{1}{\mathrm{c} \overline{\mathrm{C}}} Q_{0} \kappa \wedge \bar{\kappa}+\frac{1}{\overline{\mathrm{c}}} \bar{I}_{0} \bar{\zeta} \wedge \kappa,
\end{aligned}
$$

conjugate structure equations for $d \bar{\kappa}, d \bar{\zeta}, d \bar{\alpha}$ being easily deduced.
Here, as in Pocchiola's Ph.D., there are exactly two primary Cartan-curvature invariants:

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{0}:= & -\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{2}}+\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{3}}+ \\
& +\frac{2}{3} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\right)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}+\frac{2}{3} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}, \\
V_{0}:= & -\frac{1}{3} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+\frac{5}{9}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right)^{2}- \\
& -\frac{1}{9} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \bar{P}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+\frac{1}{3} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\bar{P})-\frac{1}{9} \bar{P} \bar{P} .
\end{aligned}
$$

One can check that Pocchiola's $W_{0}$ which occurs under general biholomorphic transformations of $\mathbb{C}^{3}$ (not necessarily rigid!), when written for a rigid $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$, identifies with:

$$
I_{0}\left(F\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}\right)\right) \equiv W_{0}\left(F\left(z_{1}, z_{2}, \bar{z}_{1}, \bar{z}_{2}\right)\right)
$$

Furthermore, there is one secondary invariant whose unpolished expression is:

$$
Q_{0}:=\frac{1}{2} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(I_{0}\right)-\frac{1}{3}\left(P-\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\right)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}\right) \bar{I}_{0}-\frac{1}{6}\left(\bar{P}-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right) I_{0}-\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(V_{0}\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} .
$$

Visibly indeed, the vanishing of $I_{0}$ and $V_{0}$ implies the vanishing of $Q_{0}$. In fact, a consequence of Cartan's general theory is:
$0 \equiv I_{0} \equiv V_{0} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad M$ is rigidly equivalent to the Gaussier-Merker model.
In [7], by deducing new relations from the structure equations above, it was proved that $Q_{0}$ is real-valued, but a finalized expression was missing there. A clean finalized expression of $Q_{0}$, in terms of only the two fundamental functions $k, P$ (and their conjugates), from which one immediately sees real-valuedness, is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Q_{0}:=2 \operatorname{Re} & \left\{\frac{1}{9} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{4}}-\right. \\
& -\frac{1}{9} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{3}}-\frac{1}{9} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \bar{P}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{3}}- \\
& -\frac{1}{9} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{2}}+\frac{1}{9} \frac{\mathscr{K}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right) \bar{P}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)^{2}}- \\
& \left.-\frac{2}{9} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) \bar{P}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-\frac{1}{9} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right) P}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+\frac{1}{6} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(P)\right\} \\
& -\frac{1}{9}|\bar{P}|^{2}+\frac{1}{3}\left|\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Section $\sqrt[8]{ }$ is devoted to provide the details of the necessary, nontrivial computations. Having $Q_{0}$ in finalized form is required to compare with what Moser's method gives on the other side of the bridge.

Indeed, to finish this introduction, we can at last say that the key idea of the bridge is presented in Sections 9 and 10
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## 2. Rigid Equivalences of Rigid Hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ : A Toy Study

We first consider the equivalence problem of rigid hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ under the action of rigid biholomorphic transformations. We will solve this problem with both Cartan's method of equivalence and Moser's method of normal forms. The calculations here are simple, and they will serve as a toy model for our more substantial problem in $\mathbb{C}^{3}$ later.

Throughout this section, we use the complex coordinates $(z, w)$ on $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ with $w=u+i v$, where $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$.

We recall that a real analytic hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ is called rigid if it can be written $\{u=$ $F(z, \bar{z})\}$, where $F$ is a converging power series in $z, \bar{z}$. A local biholomorphic map of $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(z, w) \longmapsto(f(z), a w+g(z)), \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $a \in \mathbb{R}^{*}, c \in \mathbb{R}$, will be called called rigid. Most of the times, we will assume that the origin is fixed, whence $0=f(0)=g(0)$.

Since rigid transformations send rigid hypersurfaces to hypersurfaces which are again rigid, it then makes sense to consider rigid equivalences of rigid hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, as we do here. The homogeneous model here is (still) the Heisenberg sphere $\{u=z \bar{z}\}$, whose rigid automorphisms fixing the origin can be extracted from the set of general automorphisms of the sphere (exercise).

As a starter, consider a rigid biholomorphic map $(z, w) \longmapsto(f(z), a w+g(z))=$ : $\left(z^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$ between two hypersurfaces $\{u=F(z, \bar{z})\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ and $\left\{u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}\right)\right\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ too. From:

$$
F^{\prime}(f(z), \bar{f}(\bar{z}))=F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}\right)=u^{\prime}=a u+\operatorname{Re} g(z)=a F(z, \bar{z})+\frac{1}{2} g(z)+\frac{1}{2} \bar{g}(\bar{z})
$$

it comes the fundamental equation, identically satisfied:

$$
\begin{equation*}
F^{\prime}(f(z), \bar{f}(\bar{z})) \equiv a F(z, \bar{z})+\frac{1}{2} g(z)+\frac{1}{2} \bar{g}(\bar{z}) \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 2.3. Through a rigid biholomorphism between two rigid hypersurfaces $\{u=F\}$ and $\left\{u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}\right\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, it holds:

$$
F_{z \bar{z}}=\frac{1}{a}\left|f_{z}\right|^{2} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}
$$

Proof. Applying $\partial_{z} \partial_{\bar{z}}$ eliminates $g$ and $\bar{g}$ above and yields the result.
Thus, $F_{z \bar{z}}$ is a relative invariant: it is nonvanishing in one system of coordinates if and only if it is nonvanishing in any other system of coordinates. Of course, $M$ is Levi nondegenerate in the classical sense if and only if $F_{z \bar{z}} \neq 0$. We will constantly assume that this holds at every point.
2.4. Cartan's method of equivalence. Consider a real analytic graphed hypersurface $M^{3}=\{u=F(z, \bar{z})\}$ passing through the origin in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$. Its holomorphic tangent space $T^{1,0} M:=(\mathbb{C} \otimes T M) \cap T^{1,0} \mathbb{C}$ is a 1 -dimensional complex vector bundle on $M$. One can check directly that the vector field $\mathscr{L}:=\frac{\partial}{\partial z}-i F_{z} \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$ generates $T^{1,0} M$, in the intrinsic coordinates $(z, \bar{z}, v)$ on $M$. We abbreviate $A:=-i F_{z}$ so that $\mathscr{L}=\frac{\partial}{\partial z}+A \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$ and $\overline{\mathscr{L}}=\frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}+\bar{A} \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$.

Assume that $M$ is everywhere Levi nondegenerate, namely $F_{z \bar{z}} \neq 0$. Next, define the real vector field $\mathscr{T}$ on $M$ by $\mathscr{T}:=-i[\mathscr{L}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}]=\ell \frac{\partial}{\partial v}$, where $\ell:=-2 F_{z \bar{z}}$. As in [7], introduce also the auxiliary function on $M$ :

$$
P:=\frac{\ell_{z}}{\ell}=\frac{F_{z z \bar{z}}}{F_{z \bar{z}}} .
$$

Lemma 2.5. The vector fields $\mathscr{T}, \mathscr{L}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}$ constitute a frame on $\mathbb{C} \otimes T M$, with Lie brackets:

$$
[\mathscr{T}, \mathscr{L}]=-P \mathscr{T}, \quad[\mathscr{T}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}]=-\bar{P} \mathscr{T}, \quad[\mathscr{L}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}]=-i \mathscr{T} .
$$

Next, denote by $\rho_{0}, \zeta_{0}, \bar{\zeta}_{0}$ the (complex) 1-forms on $M$ which are dual to the (complex) vector fields $\mathscr{T}, \mathscr{L}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}$, respectively. More precisely, the expressions of $\rho_{0}, \zeta_{0}, \bar{\zeta}_{0}$ in terms of $d v, d z, d \bar{z}$ are:

$$
\rho_{0}:=\frac{1}{\ell}(d v-A d z-\bar{A} d \bar{z}), \quad \zeta_{0}:=d z, \quad \bar{\zeta}_{0}=d \bar{z}
$$

This gives us an initial coframe for $\mathbb{C} \otimes T M$ having structure equations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \rho_{0} & =P \rho_{0} \wedge \zeta_{0}+\bar{P} \rho_{0} \wedge \bar{\zeta}_{0}+i \zeta_{0} \wedge \overline{\zeta_{0}} \\
d \zeta_{0} & =d \bar{\zeta}_{0}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

We now look at the action of rigid transformations on $M$ in order to setup an initial $G$-structure. Observe that if a rigid biholomorphism $h:(z, w) \longmapsto(f(z), a w+g(z))=$ : $\left(z^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$ fixing the origin maps a rigid hypersurface $M \subset \mathbb{C}^{2}$ to another rigid hypersurface $M^{\prime} \subset \mathbb{C}^{\prime 2}$, then $h$ sends $T^{1,0} M$ to $T^{1,0} M^{\prime}$, i.e. $h_{*}\left(T^{1,0} M\right)=T^{1,0} M^{\prime}$. Without loss of generality, it can be assumed that the target $M^{\prime}=\left\{u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}\right)\right\}$ is also graphed, and is equipped with a similar frame $\left\{\mathscr{T}^{\prime}, \mathscr{L}^{\prime}, \mathscr{L}^{\prime}\right\}$. It follows that there exists a uniquely defined nowhere vanishing function $c^{\prime}: M^{\prime} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^{*}$ so that $h_{*}(\mathscr{L})=c^{\prime} \mathscr{L}^{\prime}$.

Similary, $h_{*}(\mathscr{T})=a^{\prime} \mathscr{T}+b^{\prime} \mathscr{L}+\bar{b}^{\prime} \overline{\mathscr{L}}^{\prime}$. From Definition 2.1, it is clear that $h_{*}\left(\partial_{v}\right)=$ $a \partial_{v^{\prime}}$. Since $\mathscr{T}=\ell \partial_{v}$ and $\mathscr{T}^{\prime}=\ell^{\prime} \partial_{v^{\prime}}$, it comes $h_{*}(\mathscr{T})=a \frac{\ell}{\ell^{\prime}} \mathscr{T}^{\prime}$. Hence $b^{\prime}=0$. Furthermore:

$$
h_{*}(\mathscr{T})=h_{*}(-i[\mathscr{L}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}])=-i\left[h_{*}(\mathscr{L}), h_{*}(\overline{\mathscr{L}})\right]=-i\left[c^{\prime} \mathscr{L}^{\prime}, \bar{c}^{\prime} \overline{\mathscr{L}}^{\prime}\right]=c^{\prime} \bar{c}^{\prime} \mathscr{T}^{\prime}
$$

with necessarily $0 \equiv \mathscr{L}^{\prime}\left(\bar{c}^{\prime}\right)$ while expanding the bracket thanks to $b^{\prime}=0$, and we conclude that the function $a^{\prime}=c^{\prime} \bar{c}^{\prime}$ is determined.

Consequently, under the action of $h$, the frame $\{\mathscr{T}, \mathscr{L}, \overline{\mathscr{L}}\}$ changes as:

$$
h_{*}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\mathscr{T} \\
\mathscr{L} \\
\frac{\mathscr{L}}{}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
c^{\prime} \bar{c}^{\prime} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & c^{\prime} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & c^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{l}
\mathscr{T}^{\prime} \\
\mathscr{L}^{\prime} \\
\mathscr{L}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right) \quad\left(c^{\prime} \neq 0\right)
$$

This gives us the transfer relation between the two dual coframes, in terms of a nowhere vanishing function $c: M \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^{*}$ :

$$
h^{*}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\rho_{0}^{\prime} \\
\zeta_{0}^{\prime} \\
\bar{\zeta}_{0}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
c \bar{c} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & c & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \bar{c}
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
\rho_{0} \\
\zeta_{0} \\
\bar{\zeta}_{0}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

The initial $G$-structure is now obtained as follows. Such a function $c$ is replaced by a free variable $\mathrm{c} \in \mathbb{C}^{*}$, an unknown of the problem. The structure group is the 2-dimensional Lie group of matrices of the form:

$$
g=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathrm{c} \overline{\mathrm{c}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \mathrm{c} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \overline{\mathrm{c}}
\end{array}\right)
$$


and we introduce the lifted coframe:

$$
\left(\begin{array}{l}
\rho \\
\zeta \\
\zeta
\end{array}\right):=g \cdot\left(\begin{array}{c}
\rho_{0} \\
\zeta_{0} \\
\bar{\zeta}_{0}
\end{array}\right) .
$$

We are now in the position to apply Cartan's method of equivalence to the $G$-structure just obtained. First, we compute the Maurer-Cartan matrix as:

$$
d g \cdot g^{-1}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
\frac{d c}{c}+\frac{d \bar{c}}{\bar{c}} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{d c}{c} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \frac{d \bar{c}}{\bar{c}}
\end{array}\right)
$$

and there is only one (complex-valued) Maurer-Cartan form $\alpha:=\frac{d c}{c}$. The structure equations are the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \rho & =(\alpha+\bar{\alpha}) \wedge \rho+\frac{1}{\mathrm{c}} P \rho \wedge \zeta+\frac{1}{\overline{\mathrm{c}}} \bar{P} \rho \wedge \bar{\zeta}+i \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta} \\
d \zeta & =\alpha \wedge \zeta \\
d \bar{\zeta} & =\bar{\alpha} \wedge \bar{\zeta}
\end{aligned}
$$

We proceed to absorption of torsion by introducing the modified Maurer-Cartan form:

$$
\pi:=\alpha-\frac{1}{c} P \zeta
$$

in terms of which the structure equations contract as:

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
d \rho=(\pi+\bar{\pi}) \wedge \rho+i \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta} & \\
d \zeta=\pi \wedge \zeta, & d \bar{\zeta}=\bar{\pi} \wedge \bar{\zeta}
\end{array}
$$

At this point, no more absorption can be performed, because if one modifies the 1-form $\pi$ as $\tilde{\pi}:=\pi-A \rho-B \zeta-C \bar{\zeta}$, which transforms the structure equations into:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \rho & =(\tilde{\pi}+\overline{\tilde{\pi}}) \wedge \rho-(B+\bar{C}) \rho \wedge \zeta-(\bar{B}+C) \rho \wedge \bar{\zeta}+i \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta} \\
d \zeta & =\tilde{\pi} \wedge \zeta+A \rho \wedge \zeta-C \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}
\end{aligned}
$$

all the functions $A, B, C$ must be zero to conserve the same shape. In other words, the prolongation reduces to identity, and $\pi$ is uniquely defined.

Therefore, Cartan's process stops, and to finish, it remains to finalize the expression of:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \pi & =\frac{d \alpha_{o}}{}+\frac{1}{c} \frac{d c}{c} P \wedge \zeta-\frac{1}{c} d P \wedge \zeta-\frac{1}{c} P d \zeta \\
& =0+\frac{1}{c}\left(\pi+\frac{1}{c} P \zeta\right) P \wedge \zeta-\frac{1}{c}\left(P_{z} d z+P_{\bar{z}} d \bar{z}\right) \wedge \zeta-\frac{1}{c} P \pi \wedge \zeta \\
& =-\frac{1}{c}\left(P_{z} \frac{1}{c} \zeta+P_{\bar{z}} \frac{1}{\bar{c}} \bar{\zeta}\right) \wedge \zeta
\end{aligned}
$$

where we need to know/abbreviate just:

$$
P_{\bar{z}}=\frac{F_{z z \bar{z} \bar{z}} F_{z \bar{z}}-F_{z z \bar{z}} F_{z z \bar{z}}}{\left(F_{z \bar{z}}\right)^{2}}=: R,
$$

whence:

$$
d \pi=\frac{1}{c \bar{c}} R \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}
$$

Visibly, $\bar{R}=R$ is real, because $\bar{F}=F$ is, whence $\overline{F_{z^{a} \bar{z}^{c}}}=F_{\bar{z}^{a} z^{c}}$.
Theorem 2.6. The equivalence problem under local rigid biholomorphisms of $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ rigid real hypersurfaces $\{u=F(z, \bar{z})\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ whose Levi form is everywhere nondegenerate reduces to classifying $\{e\}$-structures on the 5 -dimensional bundle $M^{3} \times \mathbb{C}$ equipped with coordinates $(z, \bar{z}, v, \mathrm{c}, \bar{c})$ together with a coframe of 5 differential 1-forms:

$$
\{\rho, \zeta, \bar{\zeta}, \pi, \bar{\pi}\} \quad(\bar{\rho}=\rho)
$$

which satisfy invariant structure equations of the shape:

$$
\begin{aligned}
d \rho & =(\pi+\bar{\pi}) \wedge \rho+i \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}, & & \\
d \zeta & =\pi \wedge \zeta, & & d \bar{\zeta}=\bar{\pi} \wedge \bar{\zeta} \\
d \pi & =\frac{1}{c \bar{c}} R \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}, & & d \bar{\pi}=-\frac{1}{c \bar{c}} \bar{R} \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}
\end{aligned}
$$

Another way to see that $\bar{R}=R$ is real from the structure equations is as follows, using Poincaré's relation:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0=d \circ d \rho & =(d \pi+d \bar{\pi}) \wedge \rho-(\pi+\bar{\pi}) \wedge d \rho+i d \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}-i \zeta \wedge d \bar{\zeta} \\
& =\frac{1}{\mathrm{c} \overline{\mathrm{c}}} R \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta} \wedge \rho+\frac{1}{\mathrm{c} \overline{\mathrm{c}}} \bar{R} \bar{\zeta} \wedge \zeta \wedge \rho-(\pi+\bar{\pi})[\underline{(\pi+\bar{\pi})} \circ \wedge \rho+i \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}]+i \pi \wedge \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}-i \zeta \wedge \bar{\pi} \wedge \bar{\zeta} \\
& =\frac{1}{\mathrm{c} \overline{\mathrm{c}}}(R-\bar{R}) \rho \wedge \zeta \wedge \bar{\zeta}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, the only invariant here is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
R:=\frac{F_{z z \overline{z z}} F_{z \bar{z}}-F_{z z \bar{z}} F_{z \overline{z z}}}{\left(F_{z \bar{z}}\right)^{2}} . \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $R \equiv 0$, the structure equations have constants coefficients, which shows, by Cartan's theory, that all rigid hypersurfaces with $R \equiv 0$ are rigidly equivalent to each other, and equivalent to the model $\{u=z \bar{z}\}$. There also are straightforward arguments to get this.

Proposition 2.8. A rigid $M=\{u=F(z, \bar{z})\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ is rigidly biholomorphically equivalent to the Heisenberg sphere $\left\{u^{\prime}=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}\right\}$ if and only if:

$$
0 \equiv R(F) \equiv F_{z z \overline{z \bar{z}}} F_{z \bar{z}}-F_{z z \bar{z}} F_{z \overline{z \bar{z}}}
$$

Proof. Recall that the condition $R(F) \equiv 0$ is invariant under rigid biholomorphisms.
Trivially, $F:=z \bar{z}$ implies $R(F) \equiv 0$.
For the converse, Lemma 2.3 guarantees that $M$ is of course Levi-nondegenerate too, and by invariancy of $R=0$, we can assume that $F=z \bar{z}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$.

Set $G:=F_{z \bar{z}}$, a function which is also real-valued, with $G(0)=1$. Thus:

$$
0 \equiv G_{z \bar{z}} G-G_{z} G_{\bar{z}} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad(\log G)_{z \bar{z}} \equiv 0
$$

Consequently $\log G(z, \bar{z})=\varphi(z)+\bar{\varphi}(\bar{z})$ for some holomorphic function with $\varphi(0)=0$, whence $G(z, \bar{z})=\psi(z) \cdot \bar{\psi}(\bar{z})$ with $\psi(0)=1$, and

$$
F(z, \bar{z})=\int_{0}^{z} \psi(\zeta) d \zeta \cdot \int_{0}^{\bar{z}} \bar{\psi}(\bar{\zeta}) d \bar{\zeta}=: f(z) \cdot \bar{f}(\bar{z})
$$

with $f(z)=z+\mathrm{O}_{z}(2)$. Thus $u=f(z) \bar{f}(\bar{z})$, and the rigid biholomorphism $z^{\prime}:=f(z)$ terminates.

We know from Lemma 2.3 that $F_{z \bar{z}}$ is a relative invariant. What about $R$ ? It suffices to examine how the numerator of $R$ behaves under transformations.

Lemma 2.9. Through a rigid biholomorphism $(z, w) \longmapsto(f(z)$, $a w+g(z))=:\left(z^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$ between two rigid hypersurfaces $\{u=F\}$ and $\left\{u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}\right\}$ in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, it holds:

$$
F_{z z \overline{z z}} F_{z \bar{z}}-F_{z z \bar{z}} F_{z \overline{z z}} \equiv \frac{1}{a^{2}}\left(f_{z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}}\right)^{3}\left[F_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}-F_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}\right] .
$$

Proof. Differentiate the fundamental identity (2.2) four appropriate times:

$$
\begin{aligned}
a F_{z \bar{z}} & \equiv f_{z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime} \\
a F_{z z \bar{z}} & \equiv f_{z z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}+f_{z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} f_{z} F_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \\
a F_{z \overline{z z}}^{\prime} & \equiv f_{z} \bar{f}_{\overline{z z}} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}+f_{z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}, \\
a F_{z z \overline{z z}} & \equiv f_{z z} \bar{f}_{\overline{z \bar{z}}} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}+f_{z z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}+f_{z} \bar{f}_{\overline{z z}} f_{z} F_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime}+f_{z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} f_{z} \bar{f}_{\bar{z}} F_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime},
\end{aligned}
$$

perform the necessary products, substract, and get the result.
2.10. Method of normal forms of Moser. In this subsection, following the method of Moser, we will approach the equivalence problem for rigid hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ under rigid biholomorphisms by constructing a normal form. Notice that although the problem is (much) simpler than that considered by Moser for general hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, our problem here is not a special case of what is already known.

The goal is to simplify the defining function $u=F(z, \bar{z})$ of a given hypersurface $M^{3} \subset$ $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ as much as possible by applying rigid holomorphic changes of variables $(z, w) \mapsto$ $(f(z), \rho w+g(z))=:\left(z^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$, with $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{*}$. We will find step by step changes, so that the transformed graphing functions $F^{\prime}$ for successive $M^{\prime}=\left\{u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}\right)\right\}$ will contain more and more zero coefficients.

Take a real analytic hypersurface $M=\{u=F(z, \bar{z})\}$ passing through the origin in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, and expand:

$$
u=\frac{1}{2}(w+\bar{w})=\sum_{j+k \geqslant 1} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k},
$$

with $F_{j, k}=\bar{F}_{k, j}$. At first, set $z^{\prime}:=z$ and:

$$
w^{\prime}:=w-2 \sum_{j \geqslant 1} F_{j, 0} z^{j},
$$

in order to subtract all harmonic monomials $F_{j, 0} z^{j}$ and $F_{0, k} \bar{z}^{k}$ to obtain:

$$
u^{\prime}=\sum_{\substack{j \geqslant 1 \\ k \geqslant 1}} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k}=F_{1,1} z \bar{z}+\sum_{\substack{j+k \geqslant 3 \\ j \geqslant 1 \text { and } k \geqslant 1}} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} .
$$

The invariant property $F_{1,1} \neq 0$ characterizes Levi nondegeneracy of $M$ at the origin (hence in a neighborhood). Switching $u \longmapsto-u$ if necessary, we may assume $F_{1,1}>0$.

Next, make the rigid biholomorphism $z^{\prime}:=\sqrt{F_{1,1}} z$ with $w^{\prime}:=w$, drop the prime, single out monomials of degree 1 in either $z$ or $\bar{z}$, factorize, and point out remainders:

$$
\begin{aligned}
u= & z \bar{z}+\sum_{\substack{j+k \geqslant 3 \\
j \geqslant 1 \text { and } k \geqslant 1}} \frac{F_{j, k}}{\sqrt{F_{1,1}} j+k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} \\
= & z \bar{z}+\bar{z}\left(\frac{F_{2,1}}{F_{1,1}^{3 / 2}} z^{2}+\sum_{j \geqslant 3} \frac{F_{j, 1}}{F_{1,1}^{(j+1) / 2}} z^{j}\right)+z\left(\frac{F_{1,2}}{F_{1,1}^{3 / 2}} \bar{z}^{2}+\sum_{k \geqslant 3} \frac{F_{1, k}}{F_{1,1}^{(1+k) / 2}} \bar{z}^{k}\right)+\frac{F_{2,2}}{F_{1,1}^{2}} z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}+\sum_{\substack{j+k \geqslant 5 \\
j \geqslant 2 \geqslant 2 \mathrm{mak} k 2}} \frac{F_{j, k}}{F_{1,1}^{(j, k) / 2}} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} \\
= & \left(z+\frac{F_{2,1}}{F_{1,1}^{3 / 2}} z^{2}+\sum_{j \geqslant 3} \frac{F_{j, 1}}{F_{1,1}^{(j+1) / 2}} z^{j}\right)\left(\bar{z}+\frac{F_{1,2}}{F_{1,1}^{3 / 2}} \bar{z}^{2}+\sum_{k \geqslant 3} \frac{F_{1, k}}{F_{1,1}^{(1+k) / 2}} \bar{z}^{k}\right)-\frac{F_{2,1} F_{1,2}}{F_{1,1}^{3}} z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}-z^{2} \bar{z}^{3}(\cdots)-z^{3} \bar{z}^{2}(\cdots)+ \\
& +\frac{F_{2,2}}{F_{1,1}^{2}} z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}+z^{2} \bar{z}^{3}(\cdots)+z^{3} \bar{z}^{2}(\cdots) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Such a factorization suggests to perform the rigid biholomorphism:

$$
z^{\prime}:=z+\frac{F_{2,1}}{F_{1,1}^{3 / 2}} z^{2}+\sum_{j \geqslant 3} \frac{F_{j, 1}}{F_{1,1}^{(j+1) / 2}} z^{j}
$$

again with untouched $w^{\prime}:=w$. Its inverse is of the form $z=z^{\prime}\left(1+z^{\prime 2}(\cdots)\right)$, so $\mathrm{O}\left(z^{l} \bar{z}^{m}\right)=\mathrm{O}\left(z^{\prime l} \bar{z}^{\prime m}\right)$, and finally, dropping primes, we have proved the
Proposition 2.11. Any rigid $M=\left\{u=\sum F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k}\right\}$ can be brought, by a rigid biholomorphic transformation fixing the origin, to:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\left[\frac{F_{2,2} F_{1,1}-F_{2,1} F_{1,2}}{F_{1,1}^{3}}\right] z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}+z^{2} \bar{z}^{3}(\cdots)+z^{3} \bar{z}^{2}(\cdots)
$$

In other words:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
0=F_{j, 0}=F_{0, k} & (j \geqslant 1, k \geqslant 1), \\
1=F_{1,1}, & (j \geqslant 2, k \geqslant 2) . \\
0=F_{j, 1}=F_{1, k} &
\end{array}
$$

Can one normalize the graphing function $F$ further? For instance, can one annihilate some other $F_{j, k}$ ? Not much freedom is left, as states the next
Lemma 2.12. If two rigid hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ having the form:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} \quad \text { and } \quad u^{\prime}=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k}^{\prime} z^{\prime j} \bar{z}^{\prime k}
$$

are equivalent through a rigid biholomorphism fixing the origin, then there exist $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{*}$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$
z^{\prime}=\rho^{1 / 2} e^{i \varphi} z, \quad \quad w^{\prime}=\rho w
$$

In particular, this shows that the group of rigid transformations fixing the origin of the Heisenberg sphere $\{u=z \bar{z}\}$ is 2-dimensional, generated by these obvious rotation/dilation commuting transformations (solution of the exercise).

Proof. Write as above $\left(z^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)=(f(z), \rho w+g(z))$, with $f(0)=0=g(0)$. The fundamental equation (5.10) reads:

$$
\rho F(z, \bar{z})+\frac{1}{2} g(z)+\frac{1}{2} \bar{g}(\bar{z}) \equiv F^{\prime}(f(z), \bar{f}(\bar{z}))
$$

Put $\bar{z}:=0$, get $\bar{g}(\bar{z}) \equiv 0$. Thus:

$$
\rho\left(z \bar{z}+z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}(\cdots)\right) \equiv f(z) \bar{f}(\bar{z})+f(z)^{2} \bar{f}(\bar{z})^{2}(\cdots),
$$

and using $f(z)=\mathrm{O}(z)$ :

$$
\rho z \bar{z} \equiv f(z) \bar{f}(\bar{z})+z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}(\cdots)
$$

Invertibility of the Jacobian yields $f_{z}(0) \neq 0$. Apply $\left.\partial_{\bar{z}}\right|_{0}$ and get:

$$
\rho z \equiv f(z) \bar{f}^{\prime}(0)
$$

so $f(z)=\lambda z$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{*}$. Lastly, $\rho=\lambda \bar{\lambda}$, which concludes.

Corollary 2.13. Two rigid hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$ :

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k} z^{j} \bar{z}^{k} \quad \text { and } \quad u^{\prime}=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\sum_{j, k \geqslant 2} F_{j, k}^{\prime} z^{\prime j} \bar{z}^{\prime k}
$$

are rigidly biholomorphically equivalent if and only if there exist $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{*}$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$
F_{j, k}=\rho^{\frac{j+k-2}{2}} e^{i \varphi(j-k)} F_{j, k}^{\prime} \quad(j \geqslant 2, k \geqslant 2) .
$$

At any point $\left(z_{0}, w_{0}\right) \in M$ close to the origin, all these results are also valid, and using the recentered holomorphic coordinates $z-z_{0}$ and $w-w_{0}$, one obtains:
$u-u_{0}=\left(z-z_{0}\right)\left(\bar{z}-\bar{z}_{0}\right)+\frac{4 F_{z z \bar{z}}\left(z_{0}\right) F_{z \bar{z}}\left(z_{0}\right)-2 F_{z z \bar{z}}\left(z_{0}\right) 2 F_{z \bar{z} \bar{z}}\left(z_{0}\right)}{F_{z \bar{z}}\left(z_{0}\right)^{3}}\left(z-z_{0}\right)^{2}\left(\bar{z}-\bar{z}_{0}\right)^{2}+\cdots$.
The $(2,2)$-coefficient at various points $z_{0}$ is, up to a power of $F_{z \bar{z}}$ in the denominator, exactly equal to the relative invariant function $R$ found in (2.7) by applying Cartan's method.

According to Lie's principle of thought ([20, Chap. 1]), a relative invariant is assumed to be either identically zero, or nowhere zero, after restriction to an appropriate open subset. Since Proposition 2.8 already understood the branch $R \equiv 0$, it remains only to treat the branch $R \neq 0$. This is left as an exercise.

## 3. Two Invariant Determinants for Hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$

Consider a rigid biholomorphism:

$$
H: \quad(z, \zeta, w) \longmapsto(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \rho w+h(z, \zeta))=:\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right) \quad\left(\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{*}\right)
$$

hence with Jacobian $f_{z} g_{\zeta}-f_{\zeta} g_{z} \neq 0$, between two rigid $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ hypersurfaces:
$w=-\bar{w}+2 F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=: Q \quad$ and $\quad w^{\prime}=-\bar{w}^{\prime}+2 F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right)=: Q^{\prime}$.
Plugging the three components of $H$ in the target equation:

$$
\rho w+h(z, \zeta)+\rho \bar{w}+\bar{h}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=2 F^{\prime}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \bar{f}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}), \bar{g}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}))
$$

and replacing $w+\bar{w}=2 F$, one receives the fundamental equation expressing $H(M) \subset$ $M^{\prime}$ :

$$
2 \rho F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})+h(z, \zeta)+\bar{h}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \equiv 2 F^{\prime}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \bar{f}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}), \bar{g}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}))
$$

By differentiating it (exercise! use a computer!), one expresses as follows the invariancy of the Levi determinant defined for general biholomorphisms [29] as:

$$
\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
Q_{\bar{z}} & Q_{\bar{\zeta}} & Q_{\bar{w}} \\
Q_{z \bar{z}} & Q_{z \bar{\zeta}} & Q_{z \bar{w}} \\
Q_{\zeta \bar{z}} & Q_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} & Q_{\zeta \bar{w}}
\end{array}\right|=2^{2}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
F_{\bar{z}} & F_{\bar{\zeta}} & -1 \\
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{\zeta}} & 0 \\
F_{\zeta \bar{z}} & F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} & 0
\end{array}\right| .
$$

Proposition 3.1. Through any rigid biholomorphism:

$$
\left|\begin{array}{cc}
F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime} & F_{z^{\prime} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}^{\prime} \\
F_{\zeta^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}} & F_{\zeta^{\prime} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right|=\frac{\rho^{2}}{\left|\begin{array}{cc}
f_{z} & f_{\zeta} \\
g_{z} & g_{\zeta}
\end{array}\right|\left|\begin{array}{cc}
\bar{f}_{\overline{\bar{z}}} & \bar{f}_{\bar{\zeta}} \\
\bar{g}_{\bar{z}} & \bar{g}_{\bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right|}\left|\begin{array}{cc}
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{\zeta}} \\
F_{\zeta \bar{z}} & F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right| .
$$

Consequently, the property that the Levi form is of constant rank 1 is biholomorphically invariant. The 2-nondegeneracy property [29] then expresses as the nonvanishing of:

$$
\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
Q_{\bar{z}} & Q_{\bar{\zeta}} & Q_{\bar{w}} \\
Q_{z \bar{z}} & Q_{z \bar{\zeta}} & Q_{z \bar{w}} \\
Q_{z z \bar{z}} & Q_{z z \bar{\zeta}} & Q_{z z \bar{w}}
\end{array}\right|=2^{2}\left|\begin{array}{ccc}
F_{\bar{z}} & F_{\bar{\zeta}} & -1 \\
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{\zeta}} & 0 \\
F_{z z \bar{z}} & F_{z z \bar{\zeta}} & 0
\end{array}\right| .
$$

Proposition 3.2. When the Levi form is of constant rank 1, through any rigid biholomorphism:

$$
\left|\begin{array}{cc}
F_{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime} & F_{z^{\prime} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}^{\prime} \\
F_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}}^{\prime} & F_{z^{\prime} z^{\prime} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}^{\prime}
\end{array}\right|=\frac{\rho^{2}\left(g_{\zeta} F_{z \bar{z}}-g_{z} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}\right)^{3}}{\left.\left|\begin{array}{cc}
f_{z} & f_{\zeta} \\
g_{z} & g_{\zeta}
\end{array}\right|^{3}\left|\begin{array}{cc}
\bar{f}_{\bar{z}} & \bar{f}_{\bar{\zeta}} \\
\bar{g}_{\bar{z}} & \bar{g}_{\bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right| \begin{array}{cc}
F_{z \bar{\zeta}} \\
F_{z z \bar{z}} & F_{z z \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array} \right\rvert\, . . . . . . . ~}
$$

Recall that we denote the class of (local) hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ passing by the origin $0 \in M$ that are 2-nondegenerate and whose Levi form has constant rank 1 as:

$$
\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}
$$

## 4. Rigid Infinitesimal CR Automorphisms of the Gaussier-Merker Model

The appropriate model $M_{\mathrm{LC}}$ is rigid and was set up by Gaussier-Merker in [8] and FelsKaup in [4]:

$$
M_{\mathrm{LC}}: \quad u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}=: m(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

It is a locally graphed representation of the tube in $\mathbb{C}^{3}$ over the future light cone in $\mathbb{R}^{3}$. The 10-dimensional simple Lie algebra of its infinitesimal CR automorphisms:

$$
\mathfrak{g}:=\mathfrak{a u t}_{C R}\left(M_{\mathrm{LC}}\right) \cong \mathfrak{s o}_{2,3}(\mathbb{R})
$$

has 10 natural generators $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{10}$, which are $(1,0)$ vector fields having holomorphic coefficients with $X_{\sigma}+\bar{X}_{\sigma}$ tangent to $M_{\mathrm{LC}}$. Assigning weights to variables, to vector fields, and the same weights to their conjugates:

$$
\begin{equation*}
[z]:=1 \quad[\zeta]:=0, \quad[w]:=2 \quad\left[\partial_{z}\right]:=-1 \quad\left[\partial_{\zeta}\right]:=0 \quad\left[\partial_{w}\right]:=-2 \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

this Lie algebra of vector fields isomorphic to $\mathfrak{s o}_{2,3}(\mathbb{R})$ can be graded as:

$$
\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{g}_{-2} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{0} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{2}
$$

where, as shown in [8, 7]:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_{-2} & :=\operatorname{Span}\left\{i \partial_{w}\right\}, \\
\mathfrak{g}_{-1} & :=\operatorname{Span}\left\{(\zeta-1) \partial_{z}-2 z \partial_{w}, \quad(i+i \zeta) \partial_{z}-2 i z \partial_{w}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\mathfrak{g}_{0}=\mathfrak{g}_{0}^{\text {trans }} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{0}^{\text {iso }}:$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{g}_{0}^{\text {trans }} & :=\operatorname{Span}\left\{z \zeta \partial_{z}+\left(\zeta^{2}-1\right) \partial_{\zeta}-z^{2} \partial_{w}, \quad i z \zeta \partial_{z}+\left(i+i \zeta^{2}\right) \partial_{\zeta}-i z^{2} \partial_{w}\right\}, \\
\mathfrak{g}_{0}^{\text {iso }} & :=\operatorname{Span}\left\{z \partial_{z}+2 w \partial_{w}, \quad i z \partial_{z}+2 i \zeta \partial_{\zeta}\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

while:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathfrak{g}_{1}:=\operatorname{Span}\left\{\left(z^{2}-\zeta w-w\right) \partial_{z}+(2 z \zeta+2 z) \partial_{\zeta}+2 z w \partial_{w},\right. \\
&\left.\quad\left(-i z^{2}+i \zeta w-i w\right) \partial_{z}+(-2 i z \zeta+2 i z) \partial_{\zeta}-2 i z w \partial_{w}\right\}, \\
& \mathfrak{g}_{2}::=\operatorname{Span}\left\{i z w \partial_{z}-i z^{2} \partial_{\zeta}+i w^{2} \partial_{w}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Calling these $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{10}$ in order of appearance, the five $X_{\sigma}+\bar{X}_{\sigma}$ for $\sigma=1,2,3,4,5$ span $T M^{5}$ while those for $\sigma=6,7,8,9,10$ generate the isotropy subgroup of the origin.

## 5. Prenormalization

In coordinates $(z, \zeta, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{3}$ with $w=u+i v$, consider a local $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ rigid hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ graphed as $u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ passing through the origin. Expand $\sum_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 1} F_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$, and define by conjugating only coefficients:

$$
\bar{F}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}):=\sum_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 1} \bar{F}_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}
$$

The reality $\bar{u}=u$ forces $\overline{F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})}=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ which becomes:

$$
\bar{F}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, z, \zeta) \equiv F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

The 4 independent derivations $\partial_{z}, \partial_{\zeta}, \partial_{\bar{z}}, \partial_{\bar{\zeta}}$ commute. Applying $\frac{1}{a!} \partial_{z}^{a} \frac{1}{b!} \partial_{\zeta}^{b} \frac{1}{c!} \frac{\partial}{\bar{z}} \frac{1}{d!} \partial_{\bar{\zeta}}^{d}$ at the origin ( $0,0,0,0$ ), it comes:

$$
\bar{F}_{c, d, a, b}=F_{a, b, c, d} .
$$

With $\chi(z, \zeta):=F(z, \zeta, 0,0)$ which is holomorphic, setting $w^{\prime}:=w-2 \chi(z, \zeta)$, we get:

$$
\frac{w^{\prime}+\bar{w}^{\prime}}{2}=u^{\prime}=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})-\chi(z, \zeta)-\bar{\chi}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=: F^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}),
$$

with now $0 \equiv F^{\prime}(z, \zeta, 0,0) \equiv F^{\prime}(0,0, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$.
By $\mathrm{O}_{x}(3)$, we mean a (remainder) function equal to $x^{3}(\cdots)$, where $(\cdots)$ is any function of one or several variables. By $\mathrm{O}_{x, y}(2)$, we mean $x^{2}(\cdots)+x y(\cdots)+y^{2}(\cdots)$, and so on.
Proposition 5.1. After a rigid biholomorphism, an $M \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ satisfies:

$$
F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, 0)=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta \bar{z}^{2}+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)
$$

Employing the letter $\mathscr{R}$ for unspecified functions, this amounts to:

$$
\begin{equation*}
F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta \bar{z}^{2}+\bar{z}^{3} \mathscr{R}(z, \zeta, \bar{z})+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will use without mention:

$$
\mathscr{R}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\mathscr{R}(z, \zeta, \bar{z})+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

Proof. We will perform rigid biholomorphisms of the form $z^{\prime}=z^{\prime}(z, \zeta), \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta^{\prime}(z, \zeta)$, $w^{\prime}=w$ fixing 0 . They transform $u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ into $u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right)$ with:

$$
F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right):=F\left(z\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right), \zeta\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right), \bar{z}\left(\bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right), \bar{\zeta}\left(\bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right)\right)
$$

hence they conserves $F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, 0,0\right) \equiv 0$.
The Levi form being of rank 1 at 0 , we may assume:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\mathrm{O}_{3}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

Assertion 5.3. After a rigid biholomorphism fixing 0:

$$
F=z \bar{z}+\bar{z}^{2} \mathscr{R}+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R}
$$

Proof. We can decompose:

$$
F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, 0)+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R}=\bar{z}(z+\chi(z, \zeta))+\bar{z}^{2} \mathscr{R}+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R}
$$

with $\chi=\mathrm{O}(2)$. Then:

$$
F=(z+\chi)(\bar{z}+\bar{\chi})-z \bar{\chi}-\chi \bar{\chi}+\bar{z}^{2} \mathscr{R}+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R} .
$$

But $\bar{\chi}=\bar{z}^{2} \mathscr{R}(\bar{z})+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ is absorbable, hence:

$$
F=(z+\chi)(\bar{z}+\bar{\chi})+\bar{z}^{2} \mathscr{R}+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R} .
$$

Thus, we perform the rigid biholomorphism $z^{\prime}:=z+\chi(z, \zeta), \zeta^{\prime}:=\zeta$, with inverse:

$$
z=z^{\prime}+\mathrm{O}_{z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}}(2)=z^{\prime}+z^{\prime 2} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}+\zeta^{\prime} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}
$$

Hence $\bar{z}^{2}=\bar{z}^{\prime 2} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}+\bar{\zeta}^{\prime} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}$, and lastly:

$$
F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right)=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\bar{z}^{\prime 2} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}+\bar{\zeta}^{\prime} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}
$$

Next, dropping primes, specifying $3^{\text {rd }}$ order (real) terms $P=P_{3}$ in $F=z \bar{z}+P_{3}+$ $\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(4)$, let us inspect the Levi determinant:

$$
0 \equiv\left|\begin{array}{cc}
1+P_{z \bar{z}}+\mathrm{O}_{2} & P_{\zeta \bar{z}}+\mathrm{O}_{2} \\
P_{z \bar{\zeta}}+\mathrm{O}_{2} & P_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}+\mathrm{O}_{2}
\end{array}\right|, \quad \text { whence } \quad 0 \equiv P_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}
$$

i.e. $P$ is harmonic with respect to $\zeta$ when $z, \bar{z}$ are seen as constants. Thus taking account of $0 \equiv P(z, \zeta, 0,0)$ :

$$
P=a z^{2} \bar{z}+\bar{a} z \bar{z}^{2}+\zeta\left(b z \bar{z}+c \bar{z}^{2}\right)+\bar{\zeta}\left(\bar{b} z \bar{z}+\bar{c} z^{2}\right)+\zeta^{2}(d \bar{z})+\bar{\zeta}^{2}(\bar{d} z)
$$

But Assertion 5.3 forces $a=0, b=0, d=0$, whence:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+c \zeta \bar{z}^{2}+\bar{c} \bar{\zeta} z^{2}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(4)
$$

From Proposition 3.2, we know that $c \neq 0$, hence $c \zeta=: \frac{1}{2} \zeta^{\prime}$ conducts to:

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(4)=z \bar{z}+\bar{z}^{2} \mathscr{R}+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R} . \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next, let us look at $4^{\text {th }}$ order terms which depend only on $(z, \bar{z})$, especially at the monomial $e z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}$ with $e:=F_{2,0,2,0} \in \mathbb{R}$. We can make $e=0$ thanks to $\zeta^{\prime}:=\zeta+e z^{2}$ :

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\zeta+e z^{2}\right) \bar{z}^{2}+\frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{\zeta}+e \bar{z}^{2}\right) z^{2}+\bar{z}^{2} \mathscr{R}+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R} .
$$

So we can assume $F_{2,0,2,0}=0$. We then write:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} S(z, \zeta, \bar{z})+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

with $S=\zeta+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}}(2)$ and with no $z^{2}$ monomial in the remainder. Hence with some function $\tau(z)$ which is an $\mathrm{O}_{z}(3)$, and with some function $\omega(z, \zeta)=\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta}(1)$, we devise which biholomorphism to perform:

$$
\begin{aligned}
u & =z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2}(\zeta+\tau(z)+\zeta \omega(z, \zeta)+\bar{z} \theta(z, \zeta, \bar{z}))+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R} \\
& =z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2}(\underbrace{\zeta+\tau(z)+\zeta \omega(z, \zeta)}_{=: \zeta^{\prime}, \text { while } z=: z^{\prime}})+\bar{z}^{3} \mathscr{R}+\bar{\zeta} \mathscr{R} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Assertion 5.5. The inverse $\zeta=\zeta^{\prime}+O(2)=\tau^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}\right)+\zeta^{\prime}\left[1+\omega^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right)\right]$ also satisfies $\tau^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}\right)=\mathrm{O}_{z^{\prime}}(3)$.

Proof. Indeed, by definition:

$$
\zeta \equiv \tau^{\prime}(z)+[\tau(z)+\zeta(1+\omega(z, \zeta))]\left[1+\omega^{\prime}(z, \tau(z)+\zeta(1+\omega(z, \zeta)))\right]
$$

and it suffices to put $\zeta:=0$ to get a concluding relation which even shows that $\operatorname{ord}_{0} \tau=$ $\operatorname{ord}_{0} \tau^{\prime}$ :

$$
0 \equiv \tau^{\prime}(z)+\tau(z)\left[1+\omega^{\prime}(z, \tau(z))\right]
$$

All this enables to reach the goal (5.2) since $\bar{\tau}^{\prime}\left(\bar{z}^{\prime}\right)$ is absorbable in $\bar{z}^{\prime} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}$ :

$$
u=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime}+\bar{z}^{\prime 3} \mathscr{R}^{\prime}+\left(\bar{\zeta}^{\prime}+\bar{\tau}^{\prime}\left(\bar{z}^{\prime}\right)+\bar{\zeta}^{\prime} \bar{\omega}^{\prime}\left(\bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right)\right) \mathscr{R}^{\prime} .
$$

Coordinates like in Proposition 5.1 will be called prenormalized. Equivalently (exercise):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0=F_{a, b, 0,0}=F_{0,0, c, d}, \\
& 0=F_{a, b, 1,0}=F_{1,0, c, d}, \\
& 0=F_{a, b, 2,0}=F_{2,0, c, d},
\end{aligned}
$$

with only three exceptions $F_{1,0,1,0}=1$ and $F_{2,0,0,1}=\frac{1}{2}=F_{0,1,2,0}$. During the proof, in (5.4), we obtained simultaneously:

$$
\begin{equation*}
u=F=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z} \bar{\zeta}}(4) \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, recall that the Gaussier-Merker model is homogeneous of degree 2 in $z, \bar{z}$, when $\zeta, \bar{\zeta}$ are treated as constants:

$$
u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}=: m(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

A general $M \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ is just a perturbation of it:

$$
u=F=m+G, \quad \text { with } \quad G:=F-m=\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(4)
$$

Proposition 5.7. In prenormalized coordinates, one has $G=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$.
Proof. Expand:

$$
\begin{aligned}
m & =z \bar{z} \sum_{i \geqslant 0} \zeta^{i} \bar{\zeta}^{i}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \sum_{i \geqslant 0} \zeta^{i} \bar{\zeta}^{i+1}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \sum_{i \geqslant 0} \zeta^{i+1} \bar{\zeta}^{i}=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(4), \\
G & =\sum_{k \geqslant 4} \sum_{a+b+c+d=k} G_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}=: \sum_{k \geqslant 4} G^{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Of course, $F^{k}=m^{k}+G^{k}$, with $G^{2}=G^{3}=0$.
Assertion 5.8. For every $k \geqslant 2$, one has $G^{k}=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$.
Proof. For some $k \geqslant 4$, assume by induction that $G^{2}, G^{3}, \ldots, G^{k-1}$ are $\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$, whence:

$$
G_{z \bar{z}}^{\ell}=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(1), \quad G_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{\ell}=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(2)=G_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{\ell}, \quad G_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{\ell}=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3) \quad(1 \leqslant \ell \leqslant k-1)
$$

Next, insert $F=\sum_{i \geqslant 2} F^{i}$ in the Levi determinant:

$$
0 \equiv\left|\begin{array}{cc}
\sum_{i} F_{z \bar{z}}^{i} & \sum_{j} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{j} \\
\sum_{i} F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{i} & \sum_{j}^{j} F_{\bar{\zeta} \bar{\zeta}}^{j}
\end{array}\right|=\sum_{\ell \geqslant 4}\left(\sum_{\substack{i+j=\ell \\
i, j \geqslant 2}}\left(F_{z \bar{z}}^{i} F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{j}-F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{i} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{j}\right)\right) .
$$

Behind $\sum_{\ell}$, all terms are of constant homogeneous order $i-2+j-2=\ell-4$, hence $0 \equiv \sum_{i+j=\ell}$ for each $\ell \geqslant 4$. Take $\ell:=k+2$ and expand:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 \equiv & F_{z \bar{z}}^{2} \widehat{F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k}}+\sum_{3 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} F_{z \bar{z}}^{i} F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k+2-i}+F_{z \bar{z}}^{k} \underline{F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{\circ}} \\
& -\underline{F}_{z \overline{\bar{\zeta}}}^{\circ}
\end{aligned} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{k}-\sum_{3 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{i} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{k+2-i}-F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{k} \underline{F}_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{2} .
$$

Observe from $\left(5.6\right.$ that $1 \equiv F_{z \bar{z}}^{2}$ while $0 \equiv F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{2} \equiv F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{2} \equiv F_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{2}$. Of course, Levi determinant vanishing holds for $F:=m$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0 \equiv m_{z \bar{z}}^{2} m_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k}+\sum_{3 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} m_{z \bar{z}}^{i} m_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k+2-i}+m_{z \bar{z}}^{k} \underline{m_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{\circ}}{ }_{\circ}^{2}- \\
& -\underline{m}_{z \bar{\zeta}_{0}}^{2} m_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{k}-\sum_{3 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1} m_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{i} m_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{k+2-i}-m_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{k} \underline{m}_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Substituting the boxed term $F_{\bar{\zeta}}^{k}$ with $m_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k}+G_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k}$, solving for $G_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k}$, substituting as well the other $F_{. .}^{\ell}=m_{. .}^{\ell}+G_{. .}^{\ell}$, and subtracting, we obtain:

$$
\begin{aligned}
-G_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k} \equiv & \sum_{3 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1}\left(m_{z \bar{z}}^{i} G_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k+2-i}+G_{z \bar{z}}^{i} m_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k+2-i}+G_{z \bar{z}}^{i} G_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k+2-i}\right)- \\
& -\sum_{3 \leqslant i \leqslant k-1}\left(m_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{i} G_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{k+2-i}+G_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{i} m_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{k+2-i}+G_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{i} G_{\zeta \bar{z}}^{k+2-i}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since we also have $3 \leqslant k+2-i \leqslant k-1$, induction applies to all six products to get $G_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}^{k}=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$.

By integration, $G^{k}=\lambda^{k}(z, \zeta, \bar{z})+\bar{\lambda}^{k}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, z)+\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$. After absorption in $\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$, we can assume that $\lambda^{k}$ is of degree $\leqslant 2$ in $(z, \bar{z})$, hence contains only monomials $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c}$ with $a+c \leqslant 2$ and $a+b+c=k$. So $b \geqslant k-2$.

Further, $G^{k}(z, \zeta, 0,0) \equiv 0$ imposes $\lambda^{k}(z, \zeta, 0) \equiv 0$. So $1 \leqslant c \leqslant 2$. Consequently, $\lambda^{k}$ can contain only three monomials:

$$
\lambda^{k}(z, \zeta, \bar{z})=a \bar{z} \zeta^{k-1}+b z \bar{z} \zeta^{k-2}+c \bar{z}^{2} \zeta^{k-2}
$$

Since $k \geqslant 4$, we see that the conjugate $\bar{\lambda}^{k}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}, z)$ is multiple of $\bar{\zeta}^{k-2 \geqslant 2}$, hence:

$$
G^{k}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, 0)=\lambda^{k}(z, \zeta, \bar{z})+\underline{\bar{\lambda}^{k}(\bar{z}, 0, z)}{ }_{\circ}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)
$$

Finally, because the prenormalized coordinates of Proposition 5.1 require $G^{k}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, 0)=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)$, we reach $\lambda^{k}(z, \zeta, \bar{z})=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$, which forces $a=b=c=0=\lambda^{k}$, so as asserted $G^{k}=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$.

In conclusion, $G=\sum G^{k}=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$.

According to [7], the Lie group $G$ of rigid CR automorphisms of the Gaussier-Merker model $\{u=m\}$ has Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{-2} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{0}$ of dimension 7, generated by $X_{1}, \ldots, X_{7}$. The 2 -dimensional isotropy subgroup $G_{0} \subset G$ of the origin $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{3}$ has Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{0}^{\text {iso }}$ generated by:

$$
X_{6}:=z \partial_{z}+2 w \partial_{w}, \quad X_{7}:=i z \partial_{z}+2 i \zeta \partial_{\zeta}
$$

By computing the flows $\exp \left(t X_{\sigma}\right)(z, \zeta, w)$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma=6,7$, one verifies that $G_{0}$ consists of scalings coupled with 'rotations':

$$
z^{\prime}=\rho^{1 / 2} e^{i \varphi} z, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=e^{2 i \varphi} \zeta, \quad w^{\prime}=\rho w \quad\left(\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{*}, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}\right)
$$

Next, any holomorphic function $e=e(z, w)$ decomposes in weighted homogeneous terms as:

$$
e(z, w)=\sum_{a, b} e_{a, b} z^{a} \zeta^{b}=\sum_{k \geqslant 0}\left(\sum_{b} e_{k, b} \zeta^{b}\right) z^{k}=: \sum_{k \geqslant 0} e_{k} .
$$

Mind notation: for weights, indices $e_{k}$ are lower case, while for orders, as e.g. in $G^{k}$ before, they were upper case. Similarly:

$$
E(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\sum_{k \geqslant 0}\left(\sum_{a+c=k}\left(\sum_{b, d} E_{a, b, c, d} \zeta^{b} \bar{\zeta}^{d}\right) z^{a} \bar{z}^{c}\right)=: \sum_{k \geqslant 0} E_{k} .
$$

According to what precedes, we can assume that both the source $M$ and the target $M^{\prime}$ rigid hypersurfaces are prenormalized. Assume therefore that a rigid biholomorphism:

$$
H: \quad(z, \zeta, w) \longmapsto(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \rho w+h(z, \zeta))=:\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)
$$

fixing the origin is given between:

$$
\begin{aligned}
u & =F=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)=m+G=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3), \\
u^{\prime} & =F^{\prime}=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{\prime 2} \zeta^{\prime}+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}^{\prime}}(3)=m^{\prime}+G^{\prime}=\frac{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime}}{1-\zeta^{\prime} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}+\mathrm{O}_{z^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}}(3) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Observation 5.9. Scalings and rotations $\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right) \longmapsto\left(\rho^{1 / 2} e^{i \varphi} z^{\prime}, e^{2 i \varphi} \zeta^{\prime}, \rho w^{\prime}\right)$ preserve prenormalizations.

Since $T_{0}^{c} M=\{w=0\}$ and $T_{0}^{c} M^{\prime}=\left\{w^{\prime}=0\right\}$, and since $H_{*} T_{0}^{c} M=T_{0}^{c} M^{\prime}$, we necessarily have $h=\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta}(2)$. After the scaling $w^{\prime} \longmapsto \frac{1}{\rho} w^{\prime}$, we may therefore assume that the last component of $H$ is $w+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta}(2)$.

Let us decompose the components of $H$ in weighted homogeneous parts:

$$
f=f_{0}+f_{1}+f_{2}+f_{3}+\cdots, \quad g=g_{0}+g_{1}+g_{2}+\cdots, \quad h=h_{0}+h_{1}+h_{2}+h_{3}+h_{4}+\cdots
$$

Plug in the components of $H$ in the target rigid equation $\frac{w^{\prime}+\bar{w}^{\prime}}{2}=F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right)$ :

$$
w+h(z, \zeta)+\bar{w}+\bar{h}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=2 F^{\prime}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \bar{f}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}), \bar{g}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}))
$$

and then, substitute $w+\bar{w}=2 F$ to get a fundamental equation, holding identically:

$$
\begin{equation*}
2 F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})+h(z, \zeta)+\bar{h}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \equiv 2 F^{\prime}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \bar{f}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}), \bar{g}(\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})) \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proposition 5.11. Possibly after a rotation $\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right) \longmapsto\left(e^{i \varphi} z^{\prime}, e^{2 i \varphi} \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)$, one has:

$$
f=z+f_{2}+f_{3}+\cdots, \quad g=\zeta+g_{1}+g_{2}+\cdots, \quad h=w+h_{3}+h_{4}+\cdots
$$

or equivalently: $f_{0}=0, f_{1}=z ; g_{0}=\zeta ; h_{0}=0, h_{1}=0, h_{2}=w$.
Proof. Recall that $F=m+G$, that $m=m_{2}$ and that $G=G_{3}+G_{4}+\cdots$, with the same about $F^{\prime}=m^{\prime}+G^{\prime}$. So $F$ and $F^{\prime}$ have no terms of weights 0 or 1 . Of course $f_{0}=f_{0}(\zeta)$, $g_{0}=g_{0}(\zeta), h_{0}=h_{0}(\zeta)$ depend on $\zeta$ only.

In (5.10), pick terms of weight zero:

$$
0+h_{0}(\zeta)+\bar{h}_{0}(\bar{\zeta}) \equiv 2 F^{\prime}\left(f_{0}(\zeta), g_{0}(\zeta), \bar{f}_{0}(\bar{\zeta}), \bar{g}_{0}(\bar{\zeta})\right)
$$

put $\bar{\zeta}:=0$, use $F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, 0,0\right) \equiv 0$, and get $h_{0}=0$.
Once again, pick in 5.10) terms of weight zero using $F^{\prime}=m^{\prime}+\mathrm{O}_{z^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}}(3)$ :

$$
0 \equiv \frac{f_{0}(\zeta) \bar{f}_{0}(\bar{\zeta})+\frac{1}{2} f_{0}(\zeta)^{2} \bar{g}_{0}(\bar{\zeta})+\frac{1}{2} \bar{f}_{0}(\bar{\zeta}) g_{0}(\zeta)}{1-g_{0}(\zeta) \bar{g}_{0}(\bar{\zeta})}+\mathrm{O}_{f_{0}(\zeta), \bar{f}_{0}(\bar{\zeta})}(3)
$$

We claim that $f_{0}(\zeta) \equiv 0$. Otherwise, $f_{0}=c \zeta^{\nu}+\mathrm{O}_{\zeta}(\nu+1)$ with $c \neq 0$, but on the right, the monomial $c \bar{c} \zeta^{\nu} \bar{\zeta}^{\nu}$ cannot be killed - contradiction. This finishes examination of weight zero, for it remains only $0 \equiv 0$.

Hence, pass to weight 1 . We claim that $h_{1}=0$. Of course, $f_{1}=z f_{1}(\zeta)$ and $h_{1}=$ $z h_{1}(\zeta)$. Since $m^{\prime}$ is weighted homogeneous of degree 2 , we have $F^{\prime}=\mathrm{O}_{z^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}}(2)$, and we get from (5.10) what forces $h_{1}=0$ :

$$
\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(2)+z h_{1}(\zeta)+\bar{z} \bar{h}_{1}(\bar{\zeta}) \equiv \mathrm{O}_{z f_{1}(\zeta), \bar{z} \bar{z}_{1}(\zeta)}(2) \equiv \mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(2)
$$

Before passing to weight 2, since $f=z f_{1}(\zeta)+\mathrm{O}_{z}(2)$ and $g=g_{0}(\zeta)+z g_{1}(\zeta)+\mathrm{O}_{z}(2)$, the nonzero Jacobian $\left|\begin{array}{c}f_{z} f_{\zeta} \\ g_{z} \\ g_{\zeta}\end{array}\right|$ has value at the origin $\left|\begin{array}{cc}f_{1}(0) \\ g_{1}(0) & g_{0}^{\prime}(0)\end{array}\right|$, hence $f_{1}(0) \neq 0 \neq g_{0}^{\prime}(0)$.

Lastly, picking weighted degree 2 terms in (5.10), we get:

$$
2 m(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})+z^{2} h_{2}(\zeta)+\bar{z}^{2} \bar{h}_{2}(\bar{\zeta}) \equiv 2 m\left(z f_{1}(\zeta), g_{0}(\zeta), \bar{z}_{1}(\bar{\zeta}), \bar{g}_{0}(\bar{\zeta})\right)
$$

This identity means that the map $(z, \zeta, w) \longmapsto\left(z f_{1}(\zeta), g_{0}(\zeta), w+z^{2} h_{2}(\zeta)\right)$ is an automorphism of the Gaussier-Merker model fixing the origin, hence is a rotation, so that $f_{1}(\zeta)=e^{i \varphi}, g_{0}(\zeta)=e^{2 i \varphi} \zeta, h_{2}(z, \zeta) \equiv 0$. Post-composing with the inverse rotation, we attain the conclusion.

Question 5.12. Suppose given two rigid hypersurfaces prenormalized as before:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u=F=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=m+G=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{z} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3) \\
& u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}=z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{\prime 2} \zeta^{\prime}+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}^{\prime}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}(1)=m^{\prime}+G^{\prime}=\frac{z^{\prime} \bar{z}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime}}{1-\zeta^{\prime} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}+\mathrm{O}_{z^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}}(3) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Is it true that the group of rigid biholomorphisms at the origin between them:

$$
(z, \zeta, w) \longmapsto(z+f(z, \zeta), \zeta+g(z, \zeta), w+h(z, \zeta))=:\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)
$$

where $f=f_{2}+f_{3}+\cdots, g=g_{1}+g_{2}+\cdots, h=h_{3}+h_{4}+\cdots$, is finite-dimensional $\boldsymbol{?}$
Here, the two appearing remainders $\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$ and $\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)$ are different. By expanding $1 /(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})$ we see that:

$$
m=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)
$$

hence by subtraction, we get that $G$ is more than just an $\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$.
Observation 5.13. The remainder function satisfies $G=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)$.
The synthesis between these two conditions will be made in Section 7.

## 6. Weighted Homogeneous Normalizing Biholomorphisms

Now, inspired by Jacobowitz's presentation [18] of Moser's normal form in $\mathbb{C}^{2}$, Propositions 5.7 and 5.11 justify to introduce the spaces:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{G} & :=\left\{G=G(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}): G=G_{3}+G_{4}+\cdots\right\}, \\
\mathscr{D} & :=\left\{(z+f(z, \zeta), \zeta+g(z, \zeta), w+h(z, \zeta)): f=f_{2}+f_{3}+\cdots, g=g_{1}+g_{2}+\cdots, h=h_{3}+h_{4}+\cdots\right\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where lower indices denote homogeneous components with respect to the weighting (4.1) defined by:

$$
\left[z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}\right]=a+c
$$

The goal is to use the 'freedom' space $\mathscr{D}$ of rigid biholomorphisms in order to 'normalize' as much as possible the remainder $G$ in the graphed equation $\{u=m+G\}$ of any given hypersurface. Here, $m=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}$ is homogeneous of weight 2 .

Both $\mathscr{G}$ and $\mathscr{D}$ decompose as direct sums graded by increasing weights:

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathscr{G}=\bigcup_{\nu \geqslant 3} \mathscr{G}_{\nu}, & \mathscr{G}_{\nu}:=\left\{G_{\nu}\right\}, \\
\mathscr{D}=\bigcup_{\nu \geqslant 3} \mathscr{D}_{\nu}, & \mathscr{D}_{\nu}:=\left\{\left(f_{\nu-1}, g_{\nu-2}, h_{\nu}\right)\right\},
\end{array}
$$

and the (upcoming) justification for the shifts in $\mathscr{D}_{\nu}$ will be due to two multipliers:

$$
m_{z}=\frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \quad \text { of weight } 1 \quad \text { and } \quad m_{\zeta}=\frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2}}{2(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} \quad \text { of weight } 2 .
$$

One can figure out that $G_{2}:=m$ and $G_{2}^{\prime}:=m^{\prime}$ are already finalized/normalized. With increasing weights $\nu=3,4,5, \ldots$, we shall perform successive holomorphic rigid transformations of the shape:

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime}:=z+f_{\nu-1}, \quad \quad \zeta^{\prime}:=\zeta+g_{\nu-2}, \quad w^{\prime}:=w+h_{\nu} \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $\nu \gg 1$ is high, it is intuitively clear that such transformations close to the identity will preserve previously achieved low order normalizations; to make this claim precise, let us follow and adapt [18, Chap. 3].

For $\mu \geqslant 0$, denote by $\mathrm{O}(\mu)$ power series whose monomials $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$ are all of weight $a+c \geqslant \mu$, and introduce the projection operators:

$$
\pi_{\mu}\left(\sum_{a, b, c, d \geqslant 0} T_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}\right):=\sum_{a+c \leqslant \mu} \sum_{b, d \geqslant 0} T_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d} .
$$

Proposition 6.2. Through any biholomorphism (6.1) which transforms:
$u=m+G_{3}+\cdots+G_{\nu-1}+G_{\nu}+\mathrm{O}(\nu+1) \quad$ into $\quad u^{\prime}=m+G_{3}^{\prime}+\cdots+G_{\nu-1}^{\prime}+G_{\nu}^{\prime}+\mathrm{O}^{\prime}(\nu+1)$, homogeneous terms are kept untouched up to order $\leqslant \nu-1$ :

$$
G_{\mu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=G_{\mu}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \quad(3 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu-1)
$$

while:
$G_{\nu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=G_{\nu}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})-2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} f_{\nu-1}(z, \zeta)+\frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2}}{2(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} g_{\nu-2}(z, \zeta)-\frac{1}{2} h_{\nu}(z, \zeta)\right\}$.

Thus, by appropriately choosing $\left(f_{\nu-1}, g_{\nu-2}, h_{\nu}\right)$, we will be able to 'kill' many monomials in $G_{\nu}$, hence make $G_{\nu}^{\prime}$ simpler, or normalized. Exercise: verify that in fact $h_{\nu} \equiv 0$ necessarily, when $F$ and $F^{\prime}$ are assumed to be prenormalized.

Proof. As already seen, the fundamental equation, holding identically, is:

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(w+h_{\nu}\right)=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})+\operatorname{Re} h_{\nu} \equiv F^{\prime}\left(z+f_{\nu-1}(z, \zeta), \zeta+g_{\nu-2}(z, \zeta), w+h_{\nu}(z, \zeta)\right)
$$

Decomposing $F=m+G, F^{\prime}=m^{\prime}+G^{\prime}$ and reorganizing, it becomes:

$$
\frac{\left(z+f_{\nu-1}\right)\left(\bar{z}+\bar{f}_{\nu-1}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(z+f_{\nu-1}\right)^{2}\left(\bar{\zeta}+\bar{g}_{\nu-2}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(\bar{z}+\bar{f}_{\nu-1}\right)^{2}\left(\zeta+g_{\nu-2}\right)}{1-\left(\zeta+g_{\nu-2}\right)\left(\bar{\zeta}+\bar{g}_{\nu-2}\right)}-\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-\operatorname{Re} h_{\nu}=G-G^{\prime}
$$

A reduction of the left hand side to the same denominator shows after algebraic simplifications:

$$
\frac{(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})\left[z \bar{f}_{\nu-1}+\bar{z} f_{\nu-1}+\frac{1}{2}\left(2 z f_{\nu-1} \bar{\zeta}+z^{2} \bar{g}_{\nu-2}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(2 \bar{z} \bar{f}_{\nu-1} \zeta+\bar{z}^{2} g_{\nu-2}\right)\right]+\left(\zeta \bar{\zeta}_{\nu-2}+\bar{\zeta} g_{\nu-2}\right)\left(z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta\right)}{(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})\left(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}-\zeta \bar{g}_{\nu-2}-\bar{\zeta} g_{\nu-2}-g_{\nu-2} \bar{g}_{\nu-2}\right)}-\operatorname{Re} h_{\nu}
$$

that this left-hand side is $\mathrm{O}(\nu)$, hence has zero $\pi_{\nu-1}(\cdot)=0$. Moreover, its homogeneous degree $\nu$ part is obtained by taking only weighted degree zero terms in the denominator, namely $\frac{\text { numerator }}{(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}}-\operatorname{Re} h_{\nu}$, and one recognizes/reconstitutes $m_{z}, m_{\zeta}$ as homogeneous multipliers of weights 1,2 :

$$
\pi_{\nu}\left(m^{\prime}-m-\operatorname{Re} h_{\nu}\right)=2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} f_{\nu-1}(z, \zeta)+\frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2}}{2(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} g_{\nu-2}(z, \zeta)-\frac{1}{2} h_{\nu}(z, \zeta)\right\}
$$

It remains to treat $\pi_{\nu}(\cdot)$ of the right-hand side:

$$
\sum_{3 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu} G_{\mu}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})-\pi_{\nu}\left(\sum_{3 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu} G_{\mu}^{\prime}\left(z+f_{\nu-1}, \zeta+g_{\nu-2}, \bar{z}+\bar{f}_{\nu-1}, \bar{\zeta}+\bar{g}_{\nu-2}\right)\right)
$$

Assertion 6.3. For each $3 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu$ :

$$
\pi_{\nu}\left(G_{\mu}^{\prime}\left(z+f_{\nu-1}, \zeta+g_{\nu-2}, \bar{z}+\bar{f}_{\nu-1}, \bar{\zeta}+\bar{g}_{\nu-2}\right)\right)=G_{\mu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

Proof. All possible monomials in $G_{\mu}^{\prime}$ with $a+c=\mu \geqslant 3$ after binomial expansion:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(z+f_{\nu-1}\right)^{a}\left(\zeta+g_{\nu-2}\right)^{b}\left(\bar{z}+\bar{f}_{\nu-1}\right)^{c}\left(\bar{\zeta}+\bar{g}_{\nu-2}\right)^{d} & =\left(z^{a}+\mathrm{O}(a-1+\nu-1)\right)\left(\zeta^{b}+\mathrm{O}(\nu-2)\right)\left(\bar{z}^{c}+\mathrm{O}(c-1+\nu-1)\right)\left(\bar{\zeta}^{d}+\mathrm{O}(\nu-2)\right) \\
& =z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}+\mathrm{O}(a+c-2+\nu),
\end{aligned}
$$

have the simple projection $\pi_{\nu}(\cdot)=z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$ since $a+c-2+\nu \geqslant 1+\nu$.
We therefore obtain an identity in which all arguments are $(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ :

$$
2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} f_{\nu-1}+\frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2}}{2(1-\breve{\zeta})^{2}} g_{\nu-2}-\frac{1}{2} h_{\nu}\right\} \equiv \sum_{3 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu-1}\left(\underline{G_{\mu}-G_{\mu}^{\prime}}\right)+G_{\nu}-G_{\nu}^{\prime} .
$$

Applying $\pi_{\nu-1}$ annihilates both the left-hand side and $G_{\nu}-G_{\nu}^{\prime}$, whence $G_{\mu}=G_{\mu}^{\prime}$ for $3 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu-1$, which concludes.

## 7. Normal Form

The assumption that the Levi form is of constant rank 1:

$$
F_{z \bar{z}} \neq 0 \equiv F_{z \bar{z}} F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-F_{\zeta \bar{z}} F_{z \bar{\zeta}},
$$

enables to solve identically as functions of $(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ :

$$
F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \equiv \frac{F_{\zeta \bar{z}} F_{z \bar{\zeta}}}{F_{z \bar{z}}} .
$$

By successively differentiating this identity and performing replacements, we get formulas.
Lemma 7.1. For every jet multiindex $(a, b, c, d) \in \mathbb{N}^{4}$ with $b \geqslant 1$ and $d \geqslant 1$, abbreviating $n:=a+b+c+d$, there exists a polynomomial $P_{a, b, c, d}$ in its arguments and an integer $\mathrm{N}_{a, b, c, d} \geqslant 1$ such that:

$$
F_{z^{a} \zeta^{b} z^{c^{d}} \bar{\zeta}^{d}} \equiv \frac{1}{\left(F_{z \bar{z}}\right)^{N a, b, c, d}} P_{a, b, c, d}\left(\left\{F_{z^{a^{\prime}} \bar{z}^{c^{\prime}}}\right\}_{a^{\prime}+c^{\prime} \leqslant n},\left\{F_{z^{a^{\prime}} \zeta^{b^{\prime}} \bar{z}^{c^{\prime}}}\right\}_{a^{\prime}+b^{\prime}+c^{\prime} \leqslant n}^{b^{\prime} \geqslant 1},\left\{F_{z^{a^{\prime}} \bar{z}^{c^{\prime}} \zeta^{d^{\prime}}}\right\}_{a^{\prime}+c^{\prime}+d^{\prime} \leqslant n}^{d^{\prime} \geqslant 1}\right) .
$$

In other words, the Levi rank 1 assumption implies that all Taylor coefficients at the origin of $\sum_{a, b, c, d} F_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$ for which $b \geqslant 1$ and $d \geqslant 1$ are determined by the free Taylor coefficients:

$$
\left\{F_{a, 0, c, 0}\right\}_{a \geqslant 0, c \geqslant 0} \bigcup\left\{F_{a, b, c, 0}\right\}_{a \geqslant 0, b \geqslant 1, c \geqslant 0} \bigcup\left\{F_{a, 0, c, d}\right\}_{a \geqslant 0, c \geqslant 0, d \geqslant 1} .
$$

In subsequent computations, we will therefore normalize only these free (independent) Taylor coefficients at the origin, while those (dependent) attached to monomials that are multiple of $\zeta \bar{\zeta}$ will then be automatically determined by the formulas of Lemma 7.1

As promised, we can now explore Observation 5.13 further. What precedes shows that it is best appropriate to expand $G$ with respect to $(\zeta, \bar{\zeta})$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
G=\sum_{a, c \geqslant 0} G_{a, 0, c, 0} z^{a} \bar{z}^{c}+\sum_{b \geqslant 1} \zeta^{b}\left(\sum_{a, c \geqslant 0} G_{a, b, c, 0} z^{a} \bar{z}^{c}\right) & +\sum_{d \geqslant 1} \bar{\zeta}^{d}\left(\sum_{a, c \geqslant 0} G_{a, 0, c, d} z^{a} \bar{z}^{c}\right) \\
& +\sum_{b, d \geqslant 1} \sum_{a, c \geqslant 0} G_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d} .
\end{aligned}
$$

The last quadruple sum gathers all dependent jets. We will abbreviate this remainder as $\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)$. With different notations, we can therefore write:

$$
G=a(z, \bar{z})+\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \zeta^{k+1} \Pi_{k}(z, \bar{z})+\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \bar{\zeta}^{k+1} \bar{\Pi}_{k}(\bar{z}, z)+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)
$$

with $a(z, \bar{z}) \equiv \bar{a}(\bar{z}, z)$ real, but no reality constraint on the $\Pi_{k}(z, \bar{z})$.
Recall that $G=\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$. In view of Proposition 6.2, we must, for every weight $\nu \geqslant 3$, extract $G_{\nu}$, while writing $\zeta^{k+1}=\zeta \zeta^{k}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{\nu}= & a_{\nu, 0} z^{\nu}+a_{\nu-1,1} z^{\nu-1} \bar{z}+\cdots+a_{1, \nu-1} z \bar{z}^{\nu-1}+a_{0, \nu} \bar{z}^{\nu}+ \\
& +\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \zeta \zeta^{k}\left(z^{\nu} \Pi_{k, \nu, 0}+z^{\nu-1} \bar{z} \Pi_{k, \nu-1,1}+\cdots+z \bar{z}^{\nu-1} \Pi_{k, 1, \nu-1}+\bar{z}^{\nu} \Pi_{k, 0, \nu}\right)+ \\
& +\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \bar{\zeta} \bar{\zeta}^{k}\left(\bar{z}^{\nu} \bar{\Pi}_{k, \nu, 0}+\bar{z}^{\nu-1} z \bar{\Pi}_{k, \nu-1,1}+\cdots+\bar{z} z^{\nu-1} \bar{\Pi}_{k, 1, \nu-1}+z^{\nu} \bar{\Pi}_{k, 0, \nu}\right)+ \\
& +\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots) .
\end{aligned}
$$

To reorganize all this in powers of $(z, \bar{z})$, let us introduce the two collections for all $0 \leqslant \mu \leqslant \nu$ of (anti)holomorphic functions (mind the inversion $\nu-\mu \longleftrightarrow \mu$ at the end):

$$
B_{\nu-\mu, \mu}(\zeta):=\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \zeta^{k} \Pi_{k, \nu-\mu, \mu} \quad \text { and } \quad \bar{C}_{\nu-\mu, \mu}(\bar{\zeta}):=\sum_{k \geqslant 0} \bar{\zeta}^{k} \bar{\Pi}_{k, \mu, \nu-\mu}
$$

The definition of these $B_{\bullet, \bullet}$ and $\bar{C}_{\bullet, \bullet}$ enables us to emphasize that the obtained functions $\zeta B_{\mathbf{\bullet}, \bullet}(\zeta)$ and $\bar{\zeta} \bar{C},(\bar{\zeta})$ vanish when either $\zeta:=0$ or $\bar{\zeta}:=0$, and we therefore obtain, taking also account of the fact that $G_{\nu}$ is real:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{\nu}= & z^{\nu}\left(a_{\nu, 0}+\zeta B_{\nu, 0}(\zeta)+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{\nu, 0}(\bar{\zeta})\right)+z^{\nu-1} \bar{z}\left(a_{\nu-1,1}+\zeta B_{\nu-1,1}(\zeta)+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{\nu-1,1}(\bar{\zeta})\right)+ \\
& +\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \bar{z}^{\nu}\left(\bar{a}_{\nu, 0}+\bar{\zeta} \bar{B}_{\nu, 0}(\bar{\zeta})+\zeta C_{\nu, 0}(\zeta)\right)+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots) \\
& +z \bar{z}^{\nu-1}\left(\bar{a}_{\nu-1,1}+\bar{\zeta} \bar{B}_{\nu-1,1}(\bar{\zeta})+\zeta C_{\nu-1,1}(\zeta)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Of course, all these weighted homogeneous functions $G_{\nu}$ automatically satisfy $G_{\nu}=$ $\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$, since $\nu \geqslant 3$ thanks to Proposition 5.7. Now, Observation 5.13 also requires that they satisfy, since they are real:

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{\nu}=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=\mathrm{O}_{z}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\zeta}(1) \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 7.3. For each weight $\nu \geqslant 5$, the function $G_{\nu}$ satisfies (7.2) if and only if it is of the form:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{\nu}=\quad z^{\nu}\left(0+0+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{\nu, 0}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +z^{\nu-1} \bar{z}\left(0+0+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{\nu-1,1}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +z^{\nu-2} \bar{z}^{2}\left(0+0+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{\nu-2,2}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +z^{\nu-3} \bar{z}^{3}\left(a_{\nu-3,3}+\zeta B_{\nu-3,3}(\zeta)+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{\nu-3,3}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +\cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots+ \\
& +z^{3} \bar{z}^{\nu-3}\left(\bar{a}_{\nu-3,3}+\zeta C_{\nu-3,3}(\zeta)+\bar{\zeta} \bar{B}_{\nu-3,3}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +z^{2} \bar{z}^{\nu-2}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & +\zeta C_{\nu-2,2}(\zeta)+0
\end{array}\right) \\
& +z^{1} \bar{z}^{\nu-1}\left(\begin{array}{cc}
0 & +\zeta C_{\nu-1,1}(\zeta)+0
\end{array}\right) \\
& +\bar{z}^{\nu}\left(0+\zeta C_{\nu, 0}(\zeta)+0\right)+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Just after, we will treat the two weights $\nu=3,4$ separately.
Proof. Putting $\bar{\zeta}:=0$ above, it must hold that:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+0=\left.G_{\nu}\right|_{\bar{\zeta}=0}= & z^{\nu}\left(a_{\nu, 0}+\zeta B_{\nu, 0}(\zeta)+0\right) \\
& +z^{\nu-1} \bar{z}\left(a_{\nu-1,1}+\zeta B_{\nu-1,1}(\zeta)+0\right)+ \\
& +z^{\nu-2} \bar{z}^{2}\left(a_{\nu-2,2}+\zeta B_{\nu-2,2}(\zeta)+0\right) \\
& +\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+0
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, all the appearing $a_{\bullet, \bullet}$ and $B_{\bullet, \bullet}$ should vanish, as stated, and the converse is clear.

Proceeding similarly, the reader will find for $\nu=3$ that $G_{3}$ satisfies (7.2) if and only if:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{3}= & z^{3}\left(0+0+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{3,0}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +z^{2} \bar{z}(0+0+0) \\
& +z \bar{z}^{2}(0+0+0) \\
& +\bar{z}^{3}\left(0+\zeta C_{3,0}(\zeta)+0\right)+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)
\end{aligned}
$$

as well as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{4}= & z^{4}\left(0+0+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{4,0}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +z^{3} \bar{z}\left(0+0+\bar{\zeta} \bar{C}_{3,1}(\bar{\zeta})\right) \\
& +z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}(0+0+0) \\
& +z \bar{z}^{3}\left(0+\zeta C_{1,3}(\zeta)+0\right) \\
& +\bar{z}^{4}\left(0+\zeta C_{4,0}(\zeta)+0\right)+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)
\end{aligned}
$$

Now, consider a rigid biholomorphism $z^{\prime}=f(z, \zeta), \zeta^{\prime}=g(z, \zeta), w^{\prime}=\rho w+h(z, \zeta)$ between two rigid hypersurfaces $M$ and $M^{\prime}$. Of course, as in Question 5.12, we may assume that both $M$ and $M^{\prime}$ have already been prenormalized, and thanks to Proposition 5.11 also that $f=f_{2}+f_{3}+\cdots, g=g_{1}+g_{2}+\cdots, \rho=1, h=h_{3}+h_{4}+\cdots$.

The goal is to normalize $M^{\prime}$ even further, by means of appropriate choices of $f, g, h$.
We saw that it is natural to decompose $G=G_{3}+G_{4}+G_{5}+\cdots$ and $G^{\prime}=G_{3}^{\prime}+G_{4}^{\prime}+G_{5}^{\prime}+$ $\ldots$ in weighted homogeneous parts, and we just finished to express what prenormalization means about these $G_{\nu}$ and $G_{\nu}^{\prime}$. Proceeding with increasing weights $\nu=3,4,5, \ldots$, we therefore consider biholomorphisms of the shape $z^{\prime}=z+f_{\nu-1}, \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta+g_{\nu-2}, w^{\prime}=w+h_{\nu}$, and we recall that Proposition 6.2 showed that:
$G_{\nu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=G_{\nu}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})-2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} f_{\nu-1}(z, \zeta)+\frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2}}{2(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} g_{\nu-2}(z, \zeta)-\frac{1}{2} h_{\nu}(z, \zeta)\right\}$.
The freedom to 'normalize' $G_{\nu}^{\prime}$ even more that $G_{\nu}$, namely the term $-2 \operatorname{Re}\{\cdots\}$, is parametrized by the complely free choice for the triple of holomorphic functions $\left(f_{\nu-1}, g_{\nu-2}, h_{\nu}\right)$. However, prenormalizations should be left untouched.

Lemma 7.4. At every weight level $\nu \geqslant 5$, only the identity biholomorphic transformation $z^{\prime}=z, \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta, w^{\prime}=w$ stabilizes prenormalization in source and target spaces:

$$
G_{\nu}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=G_{\nu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

or equivalently, the 'freedom function' respects prenormalization:
$\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} f_{\nu-1}(z, \zeta)+\frac{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2}}{2(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta})^{2}} g_{\nu-2}(z, \zeta)-\frac{1}{2} h_{\nu}(z, \zeta)\right\}=: \Phi(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$, if and only if $0=f_{\nu-1}=g_{\nu-2}=h_{\nu}$.
Proof. It is easy to verify that the vanishings $G_{\nu}(z, \zeta, 0,0) \equiv 0 \equiv G_{\nu}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, 0,0)$, which hold from the very beginning (of Proposition 5.1) already suffice to force $h_{\nu}(z, \zeta) \equiv 0$.

Next, write:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{\nu-1}(z, \zeta)=z^{\nu-1} f(\zeta)=z^{\nu-1}\left(f_{0}+f_{1} \zeta+f_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right) \\
& g_{\nu-2}(z, \zeta)=z^{\nu-2} g(\zeta)=z^{\nu-2}\left(g_{0}+g_{1} \zeta+g_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The goal is to show that $f(\zeta) \equiv 0$ and $g(\zeta) \equiv 0$.
Prenormalization being expressed modulo $\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)$, when we expand the two denominators of $\Phi$, we have by luck $\frac{1}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \equiv 1$ and $\frac{1}{2\left(1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right)} \equiv \frac{1}{2}$, and hence it suffices to require that:

$$
\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1) \stackrel{?}{=} 2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}) z^{\nu-1} \sum_{k \geqslant 0} f_{k} \zeta^{k}+\frac{1}{2}(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta})^{2} z^{\nu-2} \sum_{k \geqslant 0} g_{k} \zeta^{k}\right\} .
$$

Using $\nu \geqslant 5$ to guarantee that there is no interference when extracting the first three powers $z^{\nu}, z^{\nu-1} \bar{z}, z^{\nu-2} \bar{z}^{2}$, let us compute the three relevant terms of the freedom function:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})= & (\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}) z^{\nu-1}\left(f_{0}+f_{1} \zeta+f_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right)+\left(\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2}+z \bar{z} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right) z^{\nu-2}\left(g_{0}+g_{1} \zeta+g_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right)+ \\
& +(z+\overline{z \zeta}) \bar{z}^{\nu-1}\left(\bar{f}_{0}+\bar{f}_{1} \bar{\zeta}+\bar{f}_{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2}+\cdots\right)+\left(\frac{1}{2} z^{2}+\bar{z} z \zeta+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta^{2}\right) \bar{z}^{\nu-2}\left(\bar{g}_{0}+\bar{g}_{1} \bar{\zeta}+\bar{g}_{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2}+\cdots\right) \\
= & z^{\nu}\left(f_{0} \bar{\zeta}+\underline{f_{1} \zeta \bar{\zeta}+f_{2} \zeta^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\cdots}{ }^{2}+\frac{1}{2} g_{0} \bar{\zeta}^{2}+\underline{\frac{1}{2} g_{1} \zeta \bar{\zeta}^{2}+\frac{1}{2} g_{2} \zeta^{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2}+\cdots}\right) \\
& +z^{\nu-1} \bar{z}\left(f_{0}+f_{1} \zeta+f_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots+g_{0} \bar{\zeta}+\underline{g_{1} \zeta \bar{\zeta}+g_{2} \zeta^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\cdots}\right) \\
& +z^{\nu-2} \bar{z}^{2}\left(\frac{1}{2} g_{0}+\frac{1}{2} g_{1} \zeta+\frac{1}{2} g_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right) \\
& +\bar{z}^{3}(\cdots)+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the underlined terms can be absorbed into the remainder $\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)$, it remains only:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})= & \frac{1}{2} z^{\nu}\left(2 f_{0} \bar{\zeta}+g_{0} \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right) \\
& +z^{\nu-1} \bar{z}\left(f_{0}+f_{1} \zeta+f_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots+g_{0} \bar{\zeta}\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{2} z^{\nu-2} \bar{z}^{2}\left(g_{0}+g_{1} \zeta+g_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right) \\
& +\bar{z}^{3}(\cdots)+\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)
\end{aligned}
$$

Putting $\bar{\zeta}:=0$, the result should be an $\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)$, hence the first three lines should vanish, and lines 2 and 3 conclude that $f(\zeta) \equiv 0 \equiv g(\zeta)$, as aimed at.

Next, inspect the two remaining weights $\nu=3,4$. For $\nu=3$, again modulo $\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)$, the freedom function is:

$$
\Phi_{3} \equiv 2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}) z^{2}\left(f_{0}+f_{1} \zeta+f_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right)+\left(\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2}+z \bar{z} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right) z^{1}\left(g_{0}+g_{1} \zeta+g_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right)\right\}
$$

Assertion 7.5. Prenormalization $\Phi_{3}=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)$ is preserved if and only if:

$$
0=f_{0}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{g}_{0}, \quad 0=f_{1}, \quad 0=f_{2}, \quad 0=\bar{g}_{0}+\frac{1}{2} g_{1}, \quad 0=g_{2}
$$

Consequently, only 1 complex constant is free, $f_{0}$, in terms of which:

$$
g_{0}=-2 \bar{f}_{0}, \quad \quad g_{1}=-4 f_{0}
$$

With this, how can one normalize $G_{3}^{\prime}=G_{3}-\Phi_{3}$ further? Still modulo $\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)$ :

$$
\Phi_{3} \equiv z^{3}\left(f_{0} \bar{\zeta}-\bar{f}_{0} \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right)+z^{2} \bar{z}(0)+z \bar{z}^{2}(0)+\bar{z}^{3}\left(\bar{f}_{0} \zeta-f_{0} \zeta^{2}\right)
$$

hence:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime} & =G_{3,0,0,1}-f_{0} \\
G_{3,0,0,2}^{\prime} & =G_{3,0,0,2}+\bar{f}_{0}
\end{aligned}
$$

It is natural to normalize the lowest jet order $4=3+0+0+1$ coefficient here.
Assertion 7.6. One can normalize $G_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime}:=0$ by choosing $f_{0}:=G_{3,0,0,1}$.

Once this is done, it is easy to see that preserving/maintaining the normalization:

$$
G_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime}=G_{3,0,0,1}=0
$$

forces $f_{0}=0$ above.
Assertion 7.7. In prenormalized coordinates which satisfy in addition $G_{3,0,0,1}=0$, the coefficient:

$$
G_{3,0,0,2}^{\prime}=G_{3,0,0,2}
$$

is an invariant (at the origin).
In the next Section 10 , we will show how to deduce the expression of corresponding invariants at every point (not only the origin) of a rigid hypersurface.

After such a normalization, we get:

$$
u=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+z \bar{z} \zeta \bar{\zeta}+a z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}+\mathrm{O}_{z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}}(5)
$$

with, possible, a nonzero real constant $a$, and possibly, a remainder that is not prenormalized.

Fortunately, we can apply the process of Proposition 5.1 to prenormalize again the coordinates, making in particular $a=0$, without perturbing the normalizations obtained up to order 4 included.

Lastly, treat weight $\nu=4$. The freedom function modulo $\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)$, is:
$\Phi_{4} \equiv 2 \operatorname{Re}\left\{(\bar{z}+z \bar{\zeta}) z^{3}\left(f_{0}+f_{1} \zeta+f_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right)+\left(\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2}+z \overline{\bar{z}} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right) z^{2}\left(g_{0}+g_{1} \zeta+g_{2} \zeta^{2}+\cdots\right)\right\}$.
Assertion 7.8. Prenormalization $\Phi_{4}=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)$ is preserved if and only if:

$$
0=f_{0}=f_{1}=f_{2}=\cdots, \quad 0=g_{0}+\bar{g}_{0}=g_{1}=g_{2}=\cdots
$$

Thus now, only 1 real degree of freedom is left:

$$
g_{0}=i \tau \quad(\tau \in \mathbb{R})
$$

With this, how can one normalize $G_{4}^{\prime}=G_{4}-\Phi_{4}$ further? Still modulo $\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\cdots)$ :

$$
\Phi_{4} \equiv z^{4}\left(\frac{i}{2} \tau \bar{\zeta}^{2}\right)+z^{3} \bar{z}(i \tau \bar{\zeta})+z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}(0)+z \bar{z}^{3}(-i \tau \zeta)+z^{4}\left(-\frac{i}{2} \tau \zeta^{2}\right)
$$

hence:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{4,0,0,2}^{\prime} & =G_{4,0,0,2}-\frac{i}{2} \tau \\
G_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime} & =G_{3,0,1,1}-i \tau \\
G_{2,0,2,0}^{\prime} & =G_{2,0,0,2}
\end{aligned}
$$

The third line shows an invariant. Notice also that $G_{4,0,0,1}^{\prime}=G_{4,0,0,1}$ is an invariant. We choose to normalize the lowest jet order $3+0+1+1=5$ coefficient here.

Assertion 7.9. One can normalize $\operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime}:=0$ by choosing $\tau:=\operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1}$.
Once this is done, $G_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime}=G_{3,0,1,1} \in \mathbb{R}$ is an invariant.
Again, we can re-apply the process of Proposition 5.1 to prenormalize the coordinates without touching the lower order normalizations.

We already saw in Lemma 7.4 that for any weight $\nu \geqslant 5$, no degree of freedom exists. Since only $2+1=3$ real degrees of freedom have been encountered, namely $f_{0} \in \mathbb{C}$ in weight $\nu=3$ and $\operatorname{Im} g_{0} \in \mathbb{R}$ in weight $\nu=4$, we conclude that the answer to Question5.12 is positive.

All this enables us to conclude the present section by stating results which come from our analysis.

Theorem 7.10. Every local rigid $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ graphed hypersurface $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3} \ni(z, \zeta, w=u+i v)$ passing through the origin of equation:

$$
u=\sum_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 1} F_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d},
$$

whose Levi form is of constant rank 1 and which is 2-nondegenerate:

$$
F_{z \bar{z}} \neq 0 \equiv\left|\begin{array}{cc}
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{\zeta}} \\
F_{\zeta \bar{z}} & F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right| \quad \text { and } \quad 0 \neq\left|\begin{array}{cc}
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{\zeta}} \\
F_{z z \bar{z}} & F_{z z \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right|
$$

is equivalent, through a local rigid biholomorphism:

$$
(z, \zeta, w) \longmapsto(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \rho w+h(z, \zeta))=:\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right) \quad\left(\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{*}\right)
$$

to a rigid $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ hypersurface $M^{\prime 5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{\prime 3}$ which, dropping primes for target coordinates, is a perturbation of the Gaussier-Merker model - homogeneous of order 2 in $(z, \bar{z})$-:

$$
u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}+\sum_{\substack{a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N} \\ a+c \geqslant 3}} G_{a, b, c, d} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}
$$

with a simplified remainder $G$ which:
(1) is normalized to be an $\mathrm{O}_{z, \bar{z}}(3)$;
(2) satisfies the prenormalization conditions $G=\mathrm{O}_{\bar{z}}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\bar{\zeta}}(1)=\mathrm{O}_{z}(3)+\mathrm{O}_{\zeta}(1)$, or equivalently:

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{a, b, 0,0} & =0=G_{0,0, c, d}, \\
G_{a, b, 1,0} & =0=G_{1,0, c, d}, \\
G_{a, b, 2,0} & =0=G_{2,0, c, d} ;
\end{aligned}
$$

(3) satisfies in addition the sporadic normalization conditions:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{3,0,0,1}=0 \\
& \operatorname{Im} G_{3,0,1,1}=0=G_{0,1,3,0} \\
&=\operatorname{Im} G_{1,1,3,0}
\end{aligned}
$$

There is of course no uniqueness of a rigid biholomorphic map which transfers $M$ to an $M^{\prime}$ satisfying all these normalization conditions (1), (2), (3), just because any postcomposition with a dilation-rotation map:

$$
\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right) \longmapsto\left(\rho^{1 / 2} e^{i \varphi} z^{\prime}, e^{2 i \varphi} \zeta^{\prime}, \rho w^{\prime}\right)=\left(z^{\prime \prime}, \zeta^{\prime \prime}, w^{\prime \prime}\right) \quad\left(\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{*}, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}\right)
$$

will transfer $M^{\prime}$ into an $M^{\prime \prime}=\left\{u^{\prime \prime}=m^{\prime \prime}+G^{\prime \prime}\right\}$ which enjoys again the normalization conditions (1), (2), (3), since one obviously has:

$$
G_{a, b, c, d}^{\prime \prime} \rho^{\frac{a+c-2}{2}} e^{i \varphi(a+2 b-c-2 d)}=G_{a, b, c, d}^{\prime} .
$$

Remind that such dilation-rotation maps parametrize the 2-dimensional isotropy group of the origin for the Gaussier-Merker model $\left\{u^{\prime}=m\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \bar{z}^{\prime}, \bar{\zeta}^{\prime}\right)\right\}$. Fortunately, an examination of our analysis above can show that these two parameters $\rho, \varphi$ are the only ambiguity, since once one assumes that $f=z+f_{2}+f_{3}+\cdots$, with no $\rho^{1 / 2} e^{i \varphi}$ in front of $z$, that $g=\zeta+g_{1}+g_{2}+\cdots$, and that $h=w+h_{3}+h_{4}+\cdots$, with no $\rho^{1 / 2} e^{i \varphi}$, our reasonings showed uniqueness (exercise) of the map to normal form.

To finish, let us abbreviate the space of power series $G=G(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ satisfying the normalization conditions (1), (2), (3) as:

$$
\mathfrak{N}_{2,1} .
$$

Corollary 7.11. Two rigid $\mathscr{C}^{\omega}$ hypersurfaces $M^{5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{3}$ and $M^{\prime 5} \subset \mathbb{C}^{\prime 3}$ belonging to $\mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$, both brought into normal form:

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
u & =m+G, & G \in \mathfrak{N}_{2,1}, \\
u^{\prime} & =m^{\prime}+G^{\prime}, & & G^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{N}_{2,1}^{\prime},
\end{array}
$$

are rigidly biholomorphically equivalent if and only if there exist two constants $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{+}^{*}$, $\varphi \in \mathbb{R}$, such that for all $a, b, c, d$ :

$$
G_{a, b, c, d}=G_{a, b, c, d}^{\prime} \rho^{\frac{a+c-2}{2}} e^{i \varphi(a+2 b-c-2 d)} .
$$

Granted that hypersurfaces can be put into such a normal form, this criterion is quite effective to determine whether two $M, M^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{C}_{2,1}$ are rigidly equivalent.

## 8. Finalized Expression of $Q_{0}$

In this section, we revisit the secondary invariant $Q_{0}$. Our goal is to transform $Q_{0}$ into a new expression which makes transparent two interesting features of $Q_{0}$ : that it is real-valued and of order 5 (not 6 as it was first obtained by Cartan's method in [7]). The calculations in the following are laborious, and for readers who are only interested in the finalized expression of $Q_{0}$, we suggest to use a mathematical software for symbolic computations to have a quick and easy check to confirm that the finalized expression (8.2) of $Q_{0}$ indeed agrees with the expression of $Q_{0}$ obtained previously in [7], which will be recalled later in this section as the formula (8.5) .

Proposition 8.1. The secondary invariant $\boldsymbol{Q}_{0}$ can be brought into the following form

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{0}=B I_{0}+\bar{B} \overline{I_{0}}-B \bar{B}+\frac{2}{3} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left[\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right]\right\}+\frac{1}{3} \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right) . \tag{8.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The rest of this section is devoted to the proof of Proposition 8.1. Let us first recall the formulas of $I_{0}, V_{0}, Q_{0}$ from [7].

$$
\begin{align*}
& I_{0}=-\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}+\frac{1}{3} \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}+\frac{2}{3} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}+\frac{2}{3} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)},  \tag{8.3}\\
& V_{0}=-\frac{1}{3} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+\frac{5}{9} \frac{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-\frac{1}{9} \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \bar{P}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+\frac{1}{3} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\bar{P})-\frac{1}{9} \bar{P} \bar{P}, \tag{8.4}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q_{0}=\frac{1}{2}\left\{B I_{0}+\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}\left(I_{0}\right)-\frac{\bar{B} \bar{K}\left(I_{0}\right)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}-\frac{\mathscr{K}\left(V_{0}\right)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}\right\}, \tag{8.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
B=\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-\bar{P}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \bar{B}=\frac{1}{3}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}-P\right) .
$$

For convenience, we will do calculations with $3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}, 9 V_{0}, 18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}$ and $3 \boldsymbol{B}, 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}}$.

$$
\begin{align*}
& 3 I_{0}= \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}-\frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}+2 \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}+2 \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}  \tag{8.6}\\
& 9 V_{0}=5 \frac{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-\frac{3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)+\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \bar{P}}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{P})}-\bar{P} \bar{P}  \tag{8.7}\\
& 18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}= {\left[3 B 3 I_{0}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(3 I_{0}\right)\right] \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) }  \tag{8.8}\\
&-3 \bar{B} \overline{\mathscr{K}_{0}}\left(3 I_{0}\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-\mathscr{K}\left(9 V_{0}\right) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
\end{align*}
$$

with

$$
3 B=\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-\bar{P} \quad \text { and } \quad 3 \bar{B}=\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}-P .
$$

In order to transform the expression 8.8 of $18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} Q_{0}$, we will make use of the following identities.
Lemma 8.9. We have the following identities:
(1) $\mathscr{K}(\bar{P})=-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)$,
(2) $\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\bar{P})=-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \cdot 2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)$,
(3) $\overline{\mathscr{K}}\left(I_{0}\right)=(-2) \overline{I_{0}} \cdot \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})$.

Proof. The identities (1) and (3) are obtained in Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 10.6 of [7], respectively.

For the identity (2), we use the relation $\left[\mathscr{K}, \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}\right]=\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}-\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{K}=-\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}$ from (2.9) of [7] to deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\bar{P}) & =\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{K}(\bar{P})-\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{P}) \\
& =\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left[-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right]-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{P}) \quad(\text { using }(1)) \\
& =-\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}(\bar{P}) \\
& =-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\left[\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(P)+\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{P})\right]-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \\
& =-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \cdot 2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(P)\right)-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof of Proposition 8.1. We first substitute the identity (3) of Lemma 8.9p into the term $-3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} \overline{\mathscr{K}}\left(3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{k})$ of $18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{k})\right|^{2} \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}$ to obtain

$$
-3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} \overline{\mathscr{K}}\left(3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\boldsymbol{k})=-3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}}\left(-6 \overline{\boldsymbol{I}_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\overline{\boldsymbol{k}})\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\boldsymbol{k})=2 \cdot 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} \cdot 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{I}_{0}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\boldsymbol{k}) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\overline{\boldsymbol{k}}),
$$

with which the sum on the right hand side of (8.8) can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{align*}
18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}= & {\left[3 B \cdot 3 I_{0}+3 \bar{B} \cdot 3 \overline{I_{0}}\right] \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}\left(3 I_{0}\right) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) }  \tag{8.10}\\
& +3 \bar{B} \cdot 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)-\mathscr{K}\left(9 V_{0}\right) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) .
\end{align*}
$$

Observe that on the right hand side of (8.10), the first term is already real-valued, which hints that we should keep it untouched until the very end of the proof. We proceed by transforming the other terms so that the real-valuedness of the sum in 8.10 will be transparent.

Our strategy is to look for terms that involve in $P$ and $\bar{P}$ first. From the expression 8.6 of $3 I_{0}$, one sees that the second term of the right hand side of 8.10 doesnot contain $P$ and $\bar{P}$. Thus, we only need to extract parts involved in $P$ and $\bar{P}$ from the last two terms of the right hand side of (8.10).

Note that in the expression $3 \bar{B} \cdot 3 \overline{I_{0}}=\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}-P\right) \cdot 3 \overline{I_{0}}=\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})} 3 \overline{I_{0}}-P \cdot 3 \overline{I_{0}}$, the only part involved in $P$ and $\bar{P}$ is $-P \cdot 3 \overline{I_{0}}$. We will see that by extracting terms involved in $P$ and $\bar{P}$ in $-\mathscr{K}\left(9 V_{0}\right) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})$, which is

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathscr{K}\left\{-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \bar{P}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\bar{P})-\bar{P} \bar{P}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}), \tag{8.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

we will obtain a conjugate of $-P \cdot 3 \overline{I_{0}} \cdot \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)$. Indeed, let us expand

At this point, we extract $-\bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \cdot 3 I_{0}$ to obtain
$-\mathscr{K}\left\{-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \bar{P}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\overline{\boldsymbol{P}})-\bar{P} \bar{P}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})$

$$
=-\bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\left\{\frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}-\frac{\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}+2 \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+2 \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}\right\}
$$

$$
+2 \bar{P} \mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})+2 \bar{P} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)-P \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
$$

$$
+\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+6 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \cdot \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(P)\right)+3 P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
$$

$$
+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})-2 \bar{P} P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})-2 \bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& -\mathscr{K}\left\{-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \bar{P}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\bar{P})-\bar{P} \bar{P}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& =\left\{\mathscr{K}\left[\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \bar{P}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right]-3 \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\overline{\boldsymbol{P}})+2 \overline{\boldsymbol{P}} \mathscr{K}(\overline{\boldsymbol{P}})\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\overline{\boldsymbol{k}}) \\
& =\left\{\mathscr{K}\left[\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}\right] \bar{P}+\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} \mathscr{K}(\overline{\boldsymbol{P}})-3 \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\bar{P})+2 \bar{P} \mathscr{K}(\overline{\boldsymbol{P}})\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& =\left\{\left[\frac{\mathscr{K}_{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}\right] \bar{P}+\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\left[-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right]\right. \\
& -3\left[-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \cdot 2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right] \\
& \left.+2 \bar{P}\left[-P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right]\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \quad \text { (using (1) and (2) of Lemma 8.9) } \\
& =\left\{\bar{P}\left[-\frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}+\frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right]-P \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right. \\
& -\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+6 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \cdot \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)+3 P \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \\
& \left.+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)-2 \bar{P} P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)-2 \bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
= & -\bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \cdot 3 I_{0}-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& +2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} P\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})+6 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)-2 \bar{P} P \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
= & -\bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \cdot 3 I_{0}-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& +2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)} P\right)\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2}+6\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)-2|P|^{2}\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

whose last 3 terms are real-valued.
Now, we substitute the just obtained expansion

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (-1) \mathscr{K}\left\{(-1) \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \cdot \bar{P}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\bar{P})-\bar{P} \bar{P}\right\} \cdot \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& =(-1) \bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \cdot 3 I_{0}+(-1) \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& \quad+2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)} P\right) \cdot\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2}+6\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \cdot \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)+(-2)|P|^{2} \cdot\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

back into the expression 8.10 of $18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} Q_{0}$ to obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{k})\right|^{2} \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}=\left[3 \boldsymbol{B} 3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}+3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{I}}_{0}\right] \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}\right) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \\
& -P 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)+\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})} 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \\
& -\mathscr{K}\left\{5 \frac{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-3 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& -\mathscr{K}\left\{-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) . \bar{P}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\bar{P})-\bar{P} \bar{P}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& =\left[3 B 3 I_{0}+3 \bar{B} 3 \bar{I}_{0}\right] \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}\left(3 I_{0}\right) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \\
& -P 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)+\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})} 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \\
& -\mathscr{K}\left\{5 \frac{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-3 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& -\bar{P} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) 3 I_{0}-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} \\
& +3 \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})-2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} P\right)\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \\
& +6\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)-2|P|^{2}\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2},
\end{aligned}
$$

which after rearranging gives

$$
\begin{align*}
& 18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} Q_{0}= {\left[3 B 3 I_{0}+3 \bar{B} 3 \overline{I_{0}}\right] \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) } \\
&-\left[3 \overline{I_{0}} P+3 I_{0} \bar{P}\right] \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \\
&+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}\left(3 I_{0}\right) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)+\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})} 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \\
&-\mathscr{K}\left\{5 \frac{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-3 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})  \tag{8.12}\\
&-\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& \mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k) \\
&-3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
&-2 \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right. \\
&-2|P|^{2}\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} .
\end{align*}
$$

Next, we want to extract a conjugate of $\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})} 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)$ and a copy of $-3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}\left(3 I_{0}\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})$ from $-\mathscr{K}\left\{5 \frac{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-3 \frac{\mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1} \mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1} \mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})$.

We first expand

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})} 3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)=3 \bar{I}_{0} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)  \tag{8.13}\\
=\frac{\overline{\mathscr{K}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\left(\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\right)^{2} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\right)^{3}}-\frac{\overline{\mathscr{K}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\right)^{2}} \\
+2 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}+2 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}),
\end{gather*}
$$

and

$$
\left.\begin{align*}
& =9 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}\left(3 I_{0}\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{3}}-9 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}  \tag{8.14}\\
& -3 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}+3 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)} \\
& \quad-3 \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+3 \mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
&
\end{align*}+12 \right\rvert\, \overline{\left.\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}\right)-12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right) .}
$$

We now use the expansions 8.13 and 8.14) to expand $-\mathscr{K}\left\{5 \frac{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-\right.$ $\left.3 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{I}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})$ as follows.

$$
\begin{equation*}
-\mathscr{K}\left\{5 \frac{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}-3 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \tag{8.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
=\left\{\left[-10 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}+10 \frac{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2} \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}\right]\right.
$$

$$
\left.+\left[3 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-3 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}\right]\right\} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
$$

$$
=10 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}-10 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}
$$

$$
-3 \frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2}}+3 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}
$$

$$
=\overline{3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}+9 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}-9 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2}}
$$

$$
-3 \frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2}}+\frac{3 \mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})-2 \mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}
$$

$$
-2 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
$$

$$
=\overline{3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}-3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}\left(3 I_{0}\right) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})+\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}
$$

$$
-3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})-12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}\right)
$$

$$
+12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right)-2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2}
$$

Substituting the expansion (8.15) into the right hand side of 8.12) leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} Q_{0}= & {\left[3 B 3 I_{0}+3 \bar{B} 3 \overline{I_{0}}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) } \\
& -\left[3 \overline{I_{0}} P+3 I_{0} \bar{P}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \\
& +3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)+\overline{3 \overline{I_{0}}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \\
& -12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left.\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2}}\right) \\
& +12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right) \\
& +2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(-\frac{P \frac{\mathscr{L}_{1}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+3 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right) \\
& -2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2}|P|^{2}-2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

At this point, we can see from the right hand side of (8.16) that $Q_{0}$ is real valued and of order 5 , but observe that we can contract more terms into $\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{k})\right|^{2} 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \boldsymbol{B}$.

Let us expand

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \boldsymbol{B}=\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2}|P|^{2}-2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{P \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right)+\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \tag{8.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

By using the identity 8 8.17), we now substitute $-2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} 3 \bar{B} 3 B$ into the expansion 8.16 of $18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \bar{Q}_{0}$ in order to obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}= \tag{8.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
=\left[3 B 3 I_{0}+3 \bar{B} 3 \overline{I_{0}}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})-\left[3 \overline{I_{0}} P+3 I_{0} \bar{P}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
$$

$$
+3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{k})+\overline{3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}-2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} 3 \bar{B} 3 B
$$

$$
-12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}\right)+12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right)
$$

$$
+6\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(-\frac{P \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}+\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{P})\right)
$$

$$
=\left[3 B 3 I_{0}+3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3{\overline{I_{0}}}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})+\left[3 \overline{I_{0}} P+3 I_{0} \overline{\boldsymbol{P}}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})
$$

$$
+3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\boldsymbol{k})+\overline{3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}-2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\boldsymbol{k})\right|^{2} 3 \bar{B} 3 B
$$

$$
+12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left[\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right]\right\}+6\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right) .
$$

At this point, a quick look at the first 4 terms on the right hand side of the expansion (8.18) suggests that we should contract them as follows.

Substituting the contraction (8.19) into the right hand side of the expression (8.18) gives

$$
\begin{align*}
18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2} \boldsymbol{Q}_{0}= & 2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2}\left(3 \boldsymbol{B} 3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}+3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \overline{I_{0}}-3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \boldsymbol{B}\right) \\
& +12\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left[\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right]\right\}  \tag{8.20}\\
& +6\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{k})\right|^{2} \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\boldsymbol{P})\right) .
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& {\left[3 B 3 I_{0}+3 \bar{B} 3 \overline{I_{0}}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})+\left[3 \overline{I_{0}} P+3 I_{0} \bar{P}\right] \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}  \tag{8.19}\\
& +3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(\boldsymbol{k})+\overline{3 \overline{I_{0}} \mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k}) \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(\boldsymbol{k})}-2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2} 3 \bar{B} 3 B \\
& =\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\left\{\left[3 B 3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}+3 \bar{B} 3 \overline{I_{0}}\right]+\left[3 \overline{I_{0}} P+3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0} \bar{P}\right]\right. \\
& \left.+\frac{\mathscr{L}_{1} \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})} 3 \overline{I_{0}}+\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k)} 3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}-2 \cdot 3 \bar{B} 3 \boldsymbol{B}\right\} \\
& =\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) \mathscr{L}_{1}(\bar{k})\left\{\left[3 \boldsymbol{B} 3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}+3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{I}_{0}}\right]+\left[3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{I}_{0}}+3 \boldsymbol{B} 3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}\right]-2 \cdot 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \boldsymbol{B}\right\} \\
& =2\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right|^{2}\left\{\left[3 \boldsymbol{B} 3 \boldsymbol{I}_{0}+3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \overline{\boldsymbol{I}_{0}}\right]-3 \overline{\boldsymbol{B}} 3 \boldsymbol{B}\right\} .
\end{align*}
$$

Finally, simplifying the factor $18\left|\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right|^{2}$ on both side of 8.20 gives us the desired expression (8.2) of $\boldsymbol{Q}_{0}$.

When we fully expand $Q_{0}$ from the expression (8.2) using the formulas of $I_{0}$ and $B$, we arrive at the following long expression of $Q_{0}$, which only involves in the fundamental functions k and $P$, and their derivatives:

$$
\begin{align*}
Q_{0}= & \frac{2}{9} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{2}}{\left.\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)\right)^{4}}\right\}  \tag{8.21}\\
& -\frac{2}{9} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)+\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \bar{P}}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{3}}\right\} \\
& +\frac{2}{9} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{2 \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \mathscr{L}_{1}(k)+\mathscr{K} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k) \bar{P}}{\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)\right)^{2}}\right\} \\
& -\frac{2}{9} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\frac{2 \mathscr{L}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}(k) \bar{P}+\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k) P}}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right\} \\
& -\frac{1}{9}|P|^{2}+\frac{1}{3}\left|\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}{\mathscr{\mathscr { L }}_{1}(k)}\right|^{2} \\
& +\frac{2}{3} \operatorname{Re}\left\{\mathscr{L}_{1}\left[\frac{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1} \overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(k)}{\overline{\mathscr{L}}_{1}(k)}\right]\right\}+\frac{1}{3} \operatorname{Re}\left(\overline{\mathscr{L}_{1}}(P)\right)
\end{align*}
$$

## 9. Caves Beneath a Waterfall

This section displays the technique of calculating differential invariants under infinite dimensional lie group action. First, introduce some notations.

### 9.1. Finite dimensional approximations.

Definition 9.2. The rigid transformation group of $\mathbb{C}^{2+1}$ fixing the origin is denoted by:

$$
R T:=\left\{(z, \zeta, w) \mapsto\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)=(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \rho w)\right\}
$$

where $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{*}$ and $f, g$ are holomorphic functions near $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{2}$ with $f(0,0)=g(0,0)=0$ and with invertible Jacobian

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
f_{z} & f_{\zeta} \\
g_{z} & g_{\zeta}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Multiplications and inversions are induced by compositions and inversions of transformations.

Proposition 9.3. $(f, g)$ defines a biholomorphism between neighborhoods of $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{2}$ if and only if the jacobian matrix is invertible at 0 .
Proof. Let us explain only the existence of a formal inverse. Expand the holomorphic functions $f, g$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{f_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \\
& g(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{g_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let us construct progressively the formal inverse, which will be expanded as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{f}(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\tilde{f}_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \\
& \tilde{g}(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\tilde{g}_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta), \tilde{g}(z, \zeta)) & \equiv z \\
g(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta), \tilde{g}(z, \zeta)) & \equiv \zeta
\end{aligned}
$$

At each degree we get a linear system. For example at degree 1 we have

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
f_{1,0} & f_{0,1} \\
g_{1,0} & g_{0,1}
\end{array}\right) \cdot\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\tilde{f}_{1,0} & \tilde{f}_{0,1} \\
\tilde{g}_{1,0} & \tilde{g}_{0,1}
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & 0 \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right) .
$$

Here $\tilde{f}_{1,0}, \tilde{f}_{0,1}, \tilde{g}_{1,0}, \tilde{g}_{0,1}$ can be uniquely solved thanks to the invertibility of the Jacobian of $(f, g)$.

Suppose by induction, for some $\delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 1}$ that all the coefficients $\tilde{f}_{j, k}$ and $\tilde{g}_{j, k}$ with $j+k \leqslant \delta$ have been already solved as rational functions of $f_{l, n-l}$ and $g_{l, n-l}$ with $n \leqslant \delta$. Then for $j+k=\delta+1$, we expand $f(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})$ and $g(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})$ to degree $\delta+1$ and compare the coefficients of $z^{j} \zeta^{\delta+1-j}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 & =\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j}} \zeta^{\delta+1-j}\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{\delta+1} \sum_{l=0}^{n} \frac{f_{l, n-k}}{!!(n-l)!}(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta))^{j}(\tilde{g}(z, \zeta))^{n-l}\right\} \\
& =f_{1,0} \tilde{f}_{j, \delta+1-j}+f_{0,1} \tilde{g}_{j, \delta+1-j}+\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j}} \zeta^{\delta+1-j}\left\{\sum_{n=2}^{\delta+1} \sum_{l=0}^{n} \frac{f_{l, n-k}}{l!(n-l)!}(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta))^{j}(\tilde{g}(z, \zeta))^{n-l}\right\}, \\
0 & =\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j}} \zeta^{\delta+1-j}\left\{\sum_{n=1}^{\delta+1} \sum_{l=0}^{n} \frac{g_{l, n-l}}{l!(n-l)!}(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta))^{j}(\tilde{g}(z, \zeta))^{n-l}\right\} \\
& =g_{1,0} \tilde{f}_{j, \delta+1-j}+g_{0,1} \tilde{g}_{j, \delta+1-j}+\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j}} \zeta^{\delta+1-j}\left\{\sum_{n=2}^{\delta+1} \sum_{l=0}^{n} \frac{g_{l, n-l}^{l} l(n-l)!}{}(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta))^{j}(\tilde{g}(z, \zeta))^{n-l}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

i.e.

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
f_{1,0} & f_{0,1} \\
g_{1,0} & g_{0,1}
\end{array}\right) \cdot\binom{\tilde{f}_{j, \delta+1-j}}{\tilde{g}_{j, \delta+1-j}}+\binom{\mathscr{R}_{1}}{\mathscr{R}_{2}}=\binom{0}{0},
$$

where $\mathscr{R}_{1}$ and $\mathscr{R}_{2}$ are polynomials of $f_{l, n-l}, g_{l, n-l}$ with $n \leqslant \delta+1$ and $\tilde{f}_{p, q}, \tilde{g}_{p, q}$ with $p+q \leqslant$ $\delta$. By inductive assumption $\tilde{f}_{p, q}, \tilde{g}_{p, q}$ are rational functions of $f_{l, n-l}, g_{l, n-l}$ with $n \leqslant \delta$. So $\mathscr{R}_{1}$ and $\mathscr{R}_{2}$ are rational functions of $f_{l, n-l}, g_{l, n-l}$ with $n \leqslant \delta+1$. We can solve $\tilde{f}_{j, \delta+1-j}$ and $\tilde{g}_{j, \delta+1-j}$ as rational functions of $f_{l, n-l}, g_{l, n-l}$ with $n \leqslant \delta+1$.
Definition 9.4. The space of all Levi-rank 1 and 2 non-degenerate CR graphed hypersurfaces passing by the origin in $\mathbb{C}^{3}$ is denoted by

$$
\mathscr{H}:=\{u:=\operatorname{Re}(w)=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})\}
$$

where

- (real-valued analytic) $F$ is an analytic and real-valued function in a neigborhood of $(0,0) \in \mathbb{C}^{2}$;
- (passing by the origin) $F(0,0,0,0)=0$;
- (no harmonic monomials) $\partial_{z}^{a} \partial_{\zeta}^{b} F(0,0,0,0)=0$, for any $a, b \geqslant 0$.
- (Levi-rank 1) the matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{\zeta}} \\
F_{\zeta \bar{z}} & F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right)
$$

has rank 1 everywhere;

- (2-non degenerate) the matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{cc}
F_{z \bar{z}} & F_{z \bar{\zeta}} \\
F_{z z \bar{z}} & F_{z z \bar{\zeta}}
\end{array}\right)
$$

is invertible at the origin.
There is a natural action of the group $R T$ on the space $\mathscr{H}$ : a graphed hypersurface $u=\operatorname{Re}(w)=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ is transformed into another hypersurface $u^{\prime}=\operatorname{Re}\left(w^{\prime}\right)=$ $F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)$. The expression of $F^{\prime}$ is obtained by solving the fundamental equation

$$
F^{\prime}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \overline{f(z, \zeta)}, \overline{g(z, \zeta)})=\rho F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
$$

Indeed $F^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\rho F(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta), \tilde{g}(z, \zeta), \bar{f}(z, \zeta), \bar{g}(z, \zeta))$ where $(\tilde{f}, \tilde{g})$ is the inverse of $(f, g)$. The inverse transformation brings convenience to obtain the explicit action.

Both the group $R T$ and the space $\mathscr{H}$ are infinite-dimensional in the sense that they admet infinitely many linearly independent parameters.

For $R T$, any transformation is defined by $\rho \in \mathbb{R}^{*}$ and two holomorphic functions $f, g$ with expansions

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{f_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \\
& g(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{g_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

where $f_{j, k}, g_{j, k} \in \mathbb{C}, f_{1,0} g_{0,1}-f_{0,1} g_{1,0} \neq 0$. The group $R T$ is hence parametrized by $f_{j, k}, g_{j, k}$ and $\rho$.

For $\mathscr{H}$, any graphed hypersurface admets an expansion

$$
u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b!c!d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}
$$

where $F_{a, b, c, d} \in \mathbb{C}, F_{c, d, a, b}=\overline{F_{a, b, c, d}}, F_{a, b, 0,0}=0$ and conditions of constant Levi-rank 1 and of 2-non degeneracy are satisfied. The space is hence parametrized by $F_{a, b, c, d}$.

But these infinite-dimensional objects have finite dimensional approximations. They can be truncated by degrees in expansions. Then they can be viewed as inverse or projective limits of those finite-dimensional truncations.

Definition 9.5. The $\delta^{t h}$ residue group $R e s_{\delta}$ is the subgroup of $R T$ with

$$
f(z, \zeta)=z+O(\delta), \quad g(z, \zeta)=\zeta+O(\delta), \quad \rho=1
$$

Proposition 9.6. The group $R e s_{\delta}$ is a normal subgroup of $R T$.

Definition 9.7. The $\delta^{t h}$ approximation group $R T_{\delta}$ is the quotient group $R T / \operatorname{Res}_{\delta+1}$. Each element has a representative

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{f_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \\
& g(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\delta} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{g_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j}
\end{aligned}
$$

The group $R T_{\delta}$ is a finite dimensional Lie group parameterized by $\rho$ and $f_{j, n-j}, g_{j, n-j}$ with $n \leqslant \delta$.

| $\delta$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | $\delta$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{\delta}$ | 9 | 21 | 37 | 57 | 81 | 109 | 141 | $2 \delta^{2}+6 \delta+1$ |

Its multiplication and inversion are obtained by dropping terms of degree $\geqslant \delta+1$ in the multiplication and inversion of $R T$.
Proposition 9.8. For any $\delta, \delta^{\prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$with $\delta>\delta^{\prime}$ there is a projection $R T_{\delta} \longrightarrow R T_{\delta^{\prime}}$ induced by the injection Res $_{\delta} \longrightarrow$ Res $_{\delta^{\prime}}$. For any $\delta, \delta^{\prime}, \delta^{\prime \prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$with $\delta>\delta^{\prime}>\delta^{\prime \prime}$ The following diagram commutes.


These projections define a projective system $\left\{R T_{\delta}\right\}_{\delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}$. Projections $\pi_{\delta}: R T \longrightarrow R T_{\delta}$ are compatible with this system. By the universal property of the projective limit, there is a morphism

$$
R T \longrightarrow \underset{\delta}{\lim _{\delta}} R T_{\delta}
$$

which is indeed an inclusion whose image consists of all convergent power series.
Definition 9.9. For any $\delta \geqslant 2$, the $\delta^{\text {th }}$ approximation of $\mathscr{H}$ is a manifold

$$
\mathscr{H}_{\delta}:=\left\{u:=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\sum_{n=2}^{\delta} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b!c!d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}\right\},
$$

where

- (real-valued) $F_{a, b, c, d}=\overline{F_{c, d, a, b}}$ for any $a, b, c, d \geqslant 0$;
- (passing by the origin) $F_{0,0,0,0}=0$;
- (no harmonic monomials) $F_{a, b, 0,0}=F_{0,0, c, d}=0$ for any $a, b, c, d \geqslant 0$.
- (2-non-degenerate) the matrix

$$
\left(\begin{array}{ll}
F_{1,0,1,0} & F_{1,0,0,1} \\
F_{2,0,1,0} & F_{2,0,0,1}
\end{array}\right)
$$

is invertible.

- (Levi-rank 1 until degree $\delta$ ) $F_{1,0,1,0}, F_{1,0,0,1}=\overline{F_{0,1,1,0}}$ and $F_{0,1,0,1}$ are not simultaneously 0 . The complex Hessian of $F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ vanishes up to order $\delta-2$, i.e. $F_{z \bar{z}} F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-F_{z \bar{\zeta}} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}=O(\delta-1)$.
The last condition may look strange, but it is reasonable, as shows the

Proposition 9.10. A polynomial $F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\sum_{n=2}^{\delta} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b!c!d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$ is a degree $\delta$ truncation of a formal power series $\tilde{F}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ with $\tilde{F}_{z \bar{z}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-\tilde{F}_{z \bar{\zeta}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{z}}=0$ if and only if $F_{z \bar{z}} F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-F_{z \bar{\zeta}} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}=O(\delta-1)$.
Proof. (only if) When calculating the complex Hessian of a power series

$$
\tilde{F}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{\tilde{F}_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b!c \mid d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}
$$

the $\delta-2$ degree terms of $\tilde{F}_{z \bar{z}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-\tilde{F}_{z \bar{\zeta}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{z}}$ involve only coefficients $\tilde{F}_{a, b, c, d}$ with $a+b+$ $c+d \leqslant \delta$.

Let $F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ be its degree $\delta$ truncation

$$
F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}):=\sum_{n=2}^{\delta} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{\tilde{F}_{a, b, c, c}}{a!b!c!d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d} .
$$

Then $F_{z \bar{z}} F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-F_{z \bar{\zeta}} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}=\tilde{F}_{z \bar{z}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-\tilde{F}_{z \bar{\zeta}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{z}}+O(\delta-1)=O(\delta-1)$.
To prove the (if) part, let us introduce dependent and independent coordinates. The manifolds $\mathscr{H}$ and $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ are covered by 3 open subsets: $\left\{F_{1,0,1,0} \neq 0\right\},\left\{F_{1,0,0,1}=\overline{F_{0,1,1,0}} \neq\right.$ $0\}$ and $\left\{F_{0,1,0,1} \neq 0\right\}$. We only treat $F_{1,0,1,0} \neq 0$ case because the other two cases can be transformed into this one by changes of coordinates $\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right)=(z+\zeta, z-\zeta)$ or $\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right)=$ $(z, \zeta)$ preserving the Levi-rank.

When $F_{1,0,1,0} \neq 0$ we have $F_{z, \bar{z}} \neq 0$ in a neighborhood of the origin. The Levi-rank 1 condition is now equivalent to

$$
F_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}} \equiv \frac{F_{z \bar{\zeta}} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}}{F_{z \bar{z}}}
$$

By differentiating both sides, all terms $F_{z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}}$ with $b \geqslant 1$ and $d \geqslant 1$ can be uniquely expressed as rational functions of $F_{z^{a^{\prime}} \zeta^{b^{\prime}} \bar{z}^{c^{\prime}}}$ with $a^{\prime}+b^{\prime}+c^{\prime} \leqslant a+b+c+d$ and $F_{z^{a^{\prime \prime}}} \bar{z}^{c^{\prime \prime}} \overline{\zeta^{d^{\prime \prime}}}$ with $a^{\prime \prime}+b^{\prime \prime}+c^{\prime \prime} \leqslant a+b+c+d$. Moreover, only powers of $F_{z \bar{z}}$ appears in the denominators. For example:

$$
F_{z \zeta, \bar{\zeta}} \equiv \frac{F_{z \zeta \bar{z}} F_{z \bar{\zeta}}}{F_{z \overline{\bar{\zeta}}}}+\frac{F_{z^{2} \bar{\zeta}} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}}{F_{z \bar{z}}}-\frac{F_{z^{2} \bar{z}} F_{z \bar{\zeta}} F_{\zeta \bar{z}}}{F_{z \bar{\zeta}}^{2}} .
$$

Taking their values at the origin, the coefficients $F_{a, b, c, d}$ with $b \geqslant 1$ and $d \geqslant 1$ can be uniquely expressed as rational functions of $F_{a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}, c^{\prime}, 0}$ with $a^{\prime}+b^{\prime}+c^{\prime} \leqslant a+b+c+d$ and $F_{a^{\prime \prime}, 0, c^{\prime \prime}, d^{\prime \prime}}$ with $a^{\prime \prime}+b^{\prime \prime}+c^{\prime \prime} \leqslant a+b+c+d$. Moreover, only powers of $F_{1,0,1,0}$ appear in the denominators. For example:

$$
F_{1,1,0,1}=\frac{F_{1,1,1,0} F_{1,0,0,1}}{F_{1,0,1,0}}+\frac{F_{2,0,0,1} F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}}-\frac{F_{2,0,1,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{2}} .
$$

Definition 9.11. The coefficient $F_{a, b, c, d}$ will be called dependent if $b \geqslant 1$ and $d \geqslant 1$. Otherwise, it will be called independent.

Elements in the open subset $\left\{F_{1,0,1,0} \neq 0\right\}$ of $\mathscr{H}$ and $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ are uniquely determined by the independent coefficients $F_{a, b, c, d}$ with $b d=0$. Since $F$ is real-valued, i.e. $F_{c, d, a, b}=\overline{F_{a, b, c, d}}$, one has

$$
\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{\delta}=\#\{(a, b, c, d) \mid a+b \geqslant 1, c+d \geqslant 1, a+b+c+d \leqslant \delta, b d=0\} .
$$

| $\delta$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ | 3 | 11 | 26 | 50 | 85 | 133 | 196 | $\frac{1}{6}\left(2 \delta^{3}+3 \delta^{2}-5 \delta\right)$ |

To prove the (if) part of Proposition 9.10, one shall construct a power series $\tilde{F}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})+\sum_{n=\delta+1}^{\infty} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{\tilde{F}_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b!c l d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$ with $\tilde{F}_{z \bar{z}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{\zeta}}-\tilde{F}_{z \bar{\zeta}} \tilde{F}_{\zeta \bar{z}}=0$. This can be achieved by taking all the independent coefficients $\tilde{F}_{a, b, c, d}=0$ with $a+b+c+d \geqslant n+1$ and $b d=0$ and calculate all the dependent coefficients $\tilde{F}_{a, b, c, d}$ with $b \geqslant 1$ and $d \geqslant 1$ by their rational expressions of the independent ones.

Proposition 9.12. For any $\delta, \delta^{\prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$with $\delta>\delta^{\prime}$ there is a projection $\mathscr{H}_{\delta} \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_{\delta^{\prime}}$ by dropping terms of degree $\geqslant \delta^{\prime}+1$. For any $\delta, \delta^{\prime}, \delta^{\prime \prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}$with $\delta>\delta^{\prime}>\delta^{\prime \prime}$ The following diagram commutes.


These projections define a projective system $\left\{\mathscr{H}_{\delta}\right\}_{\delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}}$. Projections $\pi_{\delta}: \mathscr{H} \longrightarrow \mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ are compatible with this system. By the universal property of the projective limit, there is a morphism

$$
\mathscr{H} \longrightarrow \underset{\delta}{\lim _{\delta}} \mathscr{H}_{\delta}
$$

which is indeed an inclusion.
The manifold $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ is a finite-dimensional manifold parameterized by the independent coefficients $F_{a, b, c, d}$ with $a+b+c+d \leqslant \delta$ and $b d=0$. The action of the group $R T$ on $\mathscr{H}$ induces an action on each manifold $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}, \forall \delta \geqslant 0$ :


More precisely, a polynomial $F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \in \mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ is a degree $\delta$ truncation of a (not unique) convergent power series $\tilde{F}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \in \mathscr{H}$, which is transformed to another convergent power series $\tilde{F}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ by the fundamental equation

$$
\begin{aligned}
\tilde{F}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) & =\rho \tilde{F}(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta), \tilde{g}(z, \zeta), \overline{\tilde{f}(z, \zeta)}, \overline{\tilde{g}(z, \zeta)}) \\
& =\rho \sum_{n=2}^{\delta} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{F_{a, b, c, c, d}}{a b b c c d!}(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta))^{a}(\tilde{g}(z, \zeta))^{b}(\overline{\tilde{f}(z, \zeta)})^{c}(\overline{\tilde{g}(z, \zeta)})^{d}+O(\delta+1)
\end{aligned}
$$

The degree $\delta$ truncation of $\tilde{F}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$, denoted by $F^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$, is the image of $F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ after the group action. It depends on the coefficients $F_{a, b, c, d}$ with $a+b+c+d \leqslant$ $\delta$ only, hence is independent of the choice of $\tilde{F}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$. The group action is well-defined.

More precisely

Proposition 9.13. There is a group action of $R T_{\delta-1}$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$. The group action of $R T$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ factors through the projection $\pi_{\delta-1}: R T \longrightarrow R T_{\delta-1}$, i.e. the following diagram commutes:


Proof. When calculating the Taylor coefficients $F_{a, b, c, d}^{\prime}$ in

$$
\tilde{F}^{\prime}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=\sum_{n=2}^{\delta} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}^{\prime}}{a!b!c d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}+O(\delta+1)
$$

we are calculating coefficients of $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$ with $a+b+c+d \leqslant \delta$ from

$$
\rho \sum_{n=2}^{\delta} \sum_{a+b+c+d=n} \frac{F_{a, b, c, c, d}}{a!b!c l d!}(\tilde{f}(z, \zeta))^{a}(\tilde{g}(z, \zeta))^{b}(\overline{\tilde{f}(z, \zeta)})^{c}(\overline{\tilde{g}(z, \zeta)})^{d}
$$

Each monomial is a product of at least 2 terms among $\{\tilde{f}(z, \zeta), \tilde{g}(z, \zeta), \bar{f}(z, \zeta), \overline{\tilde{g}(z, \zeta)}\}$. Each term

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{f}(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{f}_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j}, \\
& \tilde{g}(z, \zeta)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tilde{g}_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j},
\end{aligned}
$$

as a power series of $z, \zeta$ or $\bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}$, starts from degree 1 . So only $\tilde{f}_{j, n-j}, \tilde{g}_{j, n-j}$ and their conjugations with $n \leqslant \delta-1$ contribute to $F_{a, b, c, d}^{\prime}$ with $a+b+c+d \leqslant \delta$. The group action of $R T_{\delta-1}$ on $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ can be well-defined and the commutative diagram is satisfied.

Compare the two tables of dimensions:

| $\delta$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{\delta-1}$ | 9 | 21 | 37 | 57 | 81 | 109 | 141 |
| $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ | 3 | 11 | 26 | 50 | 85 | 133 | 196 |

The theory of differential invariants of finite-dimensional Lie group actions applies: the orbit dimension of $R T_{\delta-1}$ on $\mathscr{H}_{d}$ is at most equal to $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{\delta-1}$ and the equality is achieved only when the action is locally free. We see immediately that the dimension of transversal, which equals to the number of linearly independent differential invariants up to order $\delta$, is positive when $\delta \geqslant 6$.

The infinite-dimensional Lie group $R T$ can be interpreted as an infinitely long flow of water. The space $\mathscr{H}$ can be interpreted as an infinitely high valley. At the beginning, water fills the space up. But later on as the waterfall grows wider, water cannot fill the space. Some caves, corresponding to the transversal dimension, or differential invariants, show
up.


## 10. Invariants $I_{0}, V_{0}, Q_{0}$ at Every Point

Since the $R T$ action on $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ factors through $\pi_{\delta-1}: R T \longrightarrow R T_{\delta-1}$, we have the
Proposition 10.1. A rational function on $\mathscr{H}_{\delta}$ is invariant under the $R T$ action if and only if it is invariant under the $R T_{\delta}$ action.

Thus, to calculate differential invariants of order $\delta$ under $R T$ is equivalent to calculate those under the finite-dimensional Lie group $R T_{\delta-1}$. The algorithm goes as follows:
(1) Write down how $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{\delta-1}$ acts on some independent parameters $F_{a, b, c, d}$.
(2) Choose certain $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{\delta-1}$ to normalize as many independent parameters $F_{a, b, c, d}$ to 0 or 1 as possible, i.e. $(f, g, \rho)$ send $F_{a, b, c, d}$ to $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}$ and some $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}=0$ or 1 .
(3) Calculate how the other independent parameters $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}$ are changed under this special $(f, g, \rho)$ action, i.e. express them as rational functions of $F_{a, b, c, d}, f_{j, n-j}, g_{j, n-j}$ and $\rho$.
(4) Calculate the "stabilizer", the subgroup $R T_{\delta-1}^{(1)}$ of $R T_{\delta-1}$ which preserves current normalizations.
(5) Repeat (2) (3) (4) by studying $R T_{\delta-1}^{(1)}$ actions on $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}, R T_{\delta-1}^{(2)}$ actions on $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(2)}$ and so on, until no more terms can be normalized, i.e. $R T_{\delta-1}^{(k)}$ fixes all $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(k)}$.
(6) Express those non-constant $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(k)}$ in terms of $F_{a, b, c, d}$. They are rational functions fixed by $R T_{\delta-1}$, i.e. they are differential invariants of order $\leqslant \delta$.
We fix $\delta=5$ in this section. The goal is to show the existence of order 5 invariants and to compute their explicit expressions.
10.2. First normalization: degree 2 terms $=z \bar{z}$. We may assume that $F_{1,0,1,0} \neq 0$. In this case

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=F_{1,0,1,0} z \bar{z}+F_{1,0,0,1} z \bar{\zeta}+F_{0,1,1,0} \zeta \bar{z}+\frac{F_{1,0,0,1} F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \zeta \bar{\zeta}+O(3) \\
&=F_{1,0,1,0}\left(z+\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,0,0}} \zeta\right) \\
&=\underbrace{\left(F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2} z+\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \zeta\right)} \underbrace{\left(F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2} \overline{F_{1,0,1}} \bar{\zeta}\right)+O(3)} \overline{F_{1,0,1}} \overline{F_{1,0,0,1}} \bar{\zeta}) \\
& F_{1,0,1,0}^{1}
\end{aligned} O(3) .
$$

After the rigid transformation:

$$
z^{\prime}=F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2} z+\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}} \zeta, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta, \quad w^{\prime}=w
$$

the polynomial $F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ becomes $F^{(1)}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)=z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+O(3)$. The other independent parameters $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}$ with $a+b \geqslant 1, c+d \geqslant 1, b d=0$ can also be uniquely expressed as rational functions of $F_{a, b, c, d}$, by the fundamental equation.

Since all the independent parameters $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}$ have $b d=0$ and $F_{c, d, a, b}^{(1)}=\overline{F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}}$, it suffices to calculate $F_{a, b, c, 0}^{(1)}$ in terms of $F_{a, b, c, d}$. The inverse transformation is

$$
z=\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}} z^{\prime}-\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \zeta^{\prime}, \quad \zeta=\zeta^{\prime}, \quad w=w^{\prime}
$$

In the fundamental equality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{a, b, c, d} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}}{a!b c l d!} z^{\prime a} \zeta^{\prime b} \bar{z}^{c}{\overline{\zeta^{\prime}}}^{d} & =\sum_{a, b, c, d} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b c l d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d} \\
& =\sum_{a, b, c, d} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b l c c d!}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}} z^{\prime}-\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \zeta^{\prime}\right)^{a} \zeta^{\prime b}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}} \overline{z^{\prime}}-\frac{F_{1,0,0,1}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)^{c} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}
\end{aligned}
$$

we calculate the coefficient of $z^{\prime a} \zeta^{\prime b}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{c}$. On the left hand side, it is $F_{a, b, c, 0}^{(1)}$. On the right hand side only $F_{j, a+b-j, c, 0}$ with $a \leqslant j \leqslant a+b$ contribute. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{F_{j, a+b-j, c, 0}}{j!(a+b-j)!c!}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,0,0}^{1 / 2}} z^{\prime}-\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \zeta^{\prime}\right)^{a} \zeta^{\prime a+b-j}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}} \overline{z^{\prime}}-\frac{F_{1,0,0,1}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)^{c} \\
&=\frac{F_{j, a+b-j, c, 0}}{j!(a+b-j)!c!} \frac{j!}{a!(j-a)!}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}} z^{\prime}\right)^{a}\left(-\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}} \zeta^{\prime}\right)^{j-a} \zeta^{\prime a+b-j}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}} \overline{z^{\prime}}\right)^{c}+\text { irrelevant monomials }
\end{aligned}
$$

We get

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{a, b, c, 0}^{(1)} & =\sum_{j=a}^{a+b} \frac{F_{j, a+b-j, c, 0}}{a!(j-a)!(a+b-j)!c!}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}}\right)^{a}\left(-\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}}\right)^{j-a}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}}\right)^{c} \\
& =\sum_{j=0}^{b} \frac{F_{a+j, b-j, c, 0}}{a!j!(b-j)!c!}\left(\frac{1}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{1 / 2}}\right)^{a+c}\left(-\frac{F_{0,1,1,0}}{F_{1,0,1,0}}\right)^{j} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We define $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(1)}:=\left\{u:=F^{(1)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=z \bar{z}+O(3)\right\}$, a codimension 3 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}_{5}$ since we have normalized $F_{1,0,1,0}^{(1)}=1$ and $F_{1,0,0,1}^{(1)}=F_{0,1,1,0}^{(1)}=0$. So $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(1)}=$ $50-3=47$.

Its stabilizer group $R T_{4}^{(1)}$ consists of $(f, g, \rho)$ such that

$$
f(z, \zeta)=r e^{i \theta} z+O(2), \quad g(z, \zeta)=O(1), \quad \rho=r^{2}
$$

where $r \in \mathbb{R}_{+}, \theta \in[0,2 \pi)$. It is a codimension 3 subgroup of $R T_{4}$, hence $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{4}^{(1)}=$ $57-3=54$.
10.3. Second normalization: $F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(2)}=0$ for $(a, b) \neq(1,0)$.. Now, we study the group action of $R T_{4}^{(1)}$ on $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(1)}$. Any element in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(1)}$ has expansion:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(1)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) & =z \bar{z}+\bar{z}\left(\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(1)}}{a!b!} z^{a} \zeta^{b}\right)+z\left(\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{\overline{F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(1)}}}{a!b!} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}\right)+R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \\
& =\underbrace{\left(z+\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{F_{a, b, b, 0}^{(1)}}{a!b!} z^{a} \zeta^{b}\right)}_{=: z^{\prime}} \underbrace{\left(\bar{z}+\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{\overline{F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(1)}}}{a!b!} \bar{z}^{a} \bar{\zeta}^{b}\right)}_{=: \overline{z^{\prime}}}+R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})
\end{aligned}
$$

whose the remainder $R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ contains only terms $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{d}$ with either $(a, b)$ or $(c, d)$ $\notin\{(0,0),(1,0)\}$. After the rigid transformation in $R T_{4}^{(1)}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
z^{\prime}=z+\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(1)}}{a!b!} z^{a} \zeta^{b}, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta, \quad w^{\prime}=w \tag{*}
\end{equation*}
$$

the polynomial $F^{(1)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ becomes $F^{(2)}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)=z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+R^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)$. It remains to show that the remainder $R^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)$ contains only terms $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{z}^{d}$ with either $(a, b)$ or $(c, d) \notin\{(0,0),(1,0)\}$.

Lemma 10.4. The inverse of $(*)$ in $R T_{4}^{(1)}$ is of the form

$$
z=z^{\prime}+\sum_{n=2}^{4} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{\tilde{f}_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!} z^{j} \zeta^{n-j}, \quad \zeta=\zeta^{\prime}, \quad w=w^{\prime} .
$$

Proof. It suffices to show that $z:=\tilde{f}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right)=z^{\prime}+O_{z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}}(2)$. From $(*)$

$$
z=z^{\prime}-\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(1)}}{a!b!} z^{a} \zeta^{b}=z^{\prime}-\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(1)}}{a!b!} \tilde{f}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}\right)^{a} \zeta^{\prime b}=z^{\prime}+O_{z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}}(2)
$$

In the remainder $R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$, each term $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{z}^{d}$ is transformed to $\left(z^{\prime}+O_{z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}}(2)\right)^{a} \zeta^{\prime b}\left(\overline{z^{\prime}}+O_{\overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}}(2)\right){\overline{\zeta^{\prime}}}^{d}$, whose expansion still contains only terms $z^{\prime a}{\zeta^{\prime b}}_{{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{c}}^{\bar{\zeta}^{\prime}}$ with either $(a, b)$ or $(c, d) \notin\{(0,0),(1,0)\}$.

The terms $F_{a, b, c, 0}^{(2)}$ such that $2 \leqslant a+b+c \leqslant 5,(a, b),(c, 0) \notin\{(0,0),(1,0)\}$ can be solved in terms of $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{0,1,2,0}^{(2)}= F_{0,1,2,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{0,1,3,0}^{(2)}=-3 F_{0,1,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}+F_{0,1,3,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{0,1,4,0}^{(2)}= 15 F_{0,1,2,0}^{(1)}\left(F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}\right)^{2}-4 F_{0,1,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,3,0}^{(1)}-6 F_{0,1,3,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}+F_{0,1,4,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{0,2,2,0}^{(2)}=-F_{0,2,1,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}+F_{0,2,2,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{0,2,3,0}^{(2)}= 3 F_{0,2,1,0}^{(1)}\left(F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}\right)^{2}-F_{0,2,1,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,3,0}^{(1)}-3 F_{0,2,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}+F_{0,2,3,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{0,3,2,0}^{(2)}= 3 F_{0,2,1,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)}-3 F_{0,2,1,0}^{(1)} F_{1,1,2,0}^{(1)}-F_{0,3,1,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}+F_{0,3,2,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{1,1,2,0}^{(2)}=-F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)}+F_{1,1,2,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{1,1,3,0}^{(2)}=3\left(F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}\right)^{2} F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)}-3 F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,1,2,0}^{(1)}-F_{1,0,3,0}^{(1)} F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)}+F_{1,1,3,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{1,2,2,0}^{(2)}= F_{0,2,1,0}^{(1)} F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)}+2 F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}\left(F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)}-F_{0,2,1,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(1)}\right. \\
&-F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,2,1,0}^{(1)}-2 F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)} F_{1,1,2,0}^{(1)}+F_{1,2,2,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{2,0,2,0}^{(2)}=-F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)}+F_{2,0,2,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{2,0,3,0}^{(2)}= 3\left(F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}\right)^{2} F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)}-3 F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(1)}-F_{1,0,3,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)}+F_{2,0,3,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{2,1,2,0}^{(2)}= 3 F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)}-F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{2,1,1,0}^{(1)}-2 F_{1,1,1,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(1)}-F_{1,1,2,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)}+F_{2,1,2,0}^{(1)}, \\
& F_{3,0,2,0}^{(2)}= 3 F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)}\left(F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)}\right)^{2}-F_{1,0,2,0}^{(1)} F_{3,0,1,0}^{(1)}-3 F_{2,0,1,0}^{(1)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(1)}+F_{3,0,2,0}^{(1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

We define $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}:=\left\{u:=F^{(2)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=z \bar{z}+O(3) \mid F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(2)}=0, \forall(a, b) \neq(1,0)\right\}$, a codimension 24 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(1)}$. So $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}=47-24=23$.

It will be a bit strange to talk about stabilizer group from this step. We in fact need to introduce a new definition of stabilizer. But after the final step, we will recover the stabilizer in the standard sense.

Definition 10.5. For any fixed element $F^{(2)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}$, the subset of $R T_{0,4}^{(1)}$ consisting of elements $f, g, \rho$ which send $F^{(2)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ to another element in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}$, is defined as $R T_{0,4}^{(2)}\left(F^{(2)}\right)$. It depends on the choice of the original element $F^{(2)}$.

The stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(2)}\left(F^{(2)}\right)$ is a codimension 24 subgroup of $R T_{4}^{(1)}$ hence $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{4}^{(2)}\left(F^{(2)}\right)=54-24=30$. It contains elements $(f, g, \rho)=\left(r e^{i \theta} z+O(2), g, r^{2}\right) \in$ $R T_{4}^{(1)}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f_{2,0}=-r e^{i \theta} F_{2,0,0,1}^{(2)} \overline{g_{1,0}} \bar{g}_{0,1}-1 \\
& f_{3,0}=-r e^{i \theta} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(2)} \overline{g_{1,0}} \bar{g}_{0,1}-1 \\
& f_{4,0}=-r e^{i \theta} F_{4,0,0,1}^{(2)} \overline{g_{1,0}} \bar{g}_{0,1}
\end{aligned}
$$

which are in total 12 conditions on complex coefficients.
10.6. Third normalization: $F_{2,0,0,1}^{(3)}=\overline{F_{0,1,2,0}^{(3)}}=1$. Any element in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}$ has expansion:

$$
F^{(2)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=z \bar{z}+\frac{F_{2,0,0,1}^{(2)}}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{\overline{F_{2,0,0,1}}}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+O(4)
$$

By 2-non-degeneracy $F_{2,0,0,1}^{(2)} \neq 0$. So after the rigid transformation:

$$
z^{\prime}=z, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\overline{F_{2,0,0,1}^{(2)}} \zeta=F_{0,1,2,0}^{(2)} \zeta, \quad w^{\prime}=w
$$

it becomes a graph $u=F^{(3)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+O(4)$.
The relations are $F_{a, b, c, 0}^{(3)}=F_{a, b, c, 0}^{(2)}\left(F_{0,1,2,0}^{(2)}\right)^{-b}$.
We define $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(3)}:=\left\{u: \left.=F^{(3)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+O(4) \right\rvert\, F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(3)}=\right.$ $0, \forall(a, b) \neq(1,0)\}$, a codimension 2 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}$. So $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(3)}=23-2=21$.

For any fixed element $F^{(3)} \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(3)}$, there exists some $F^{(2)} \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}$ whose third normalization is equal to $F^{(3)}$. For example, we can take $F^{(2)}=F^{(3)}$. The stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(3)}\left(F^{(3)}\right)$ is a codimension 2 subgroup of $R T_{4}^{(2)}\left(F^{(3)}\right)$. Hence $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{4}^{(3)}\left(F^{(3)}\right)=30-2=28$. It contains elements $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{4}^{(2)}\left(F^{(3)}\right)$ satisfying $g_{0,1}=e^{2 i \theta}$, i.e.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f(z, \zeta)=r e^{i \theta} z-\frac{1}{2} r e^{3 i \theta} \overline{g_{1,0}} z^{2}-\frac{1}{6} r e^{3 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(3)} \overline{g_{1,0}} z^{3}-\frac{1}{24} r e^{3 i \theta} F_{4,0,0,1}^{(3)} \overline{g_{1,0}} z^{4} \\
& g(z, \zeta)=g_{1,0} z+e^{2 i \theta} \zeta+O(2), \quad \rho=r^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

10.7. Fourth normalization: $F_{2,0,2,0}^{(4)}=0$. Any element in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(3)}$ has expansion:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(3)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) & =z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \zeta+\frac{1}{4} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)} z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}+R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) \\
& =z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \underbrace{\left(\bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{4} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)} \bar{z}^{2}\right)}_{=: \zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \underbrace{\left(\zeta+\frac{1}{4} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)} z^{2}\right)}_{=: \zeta^{\prime}}+R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}),
\end{aligned}
$$

whose remainder $R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=O(4)$ contains no $z^{2} \bar{z}^{2}$ term. After the rigid transformation in $R T_{4}^{(3)}$ :

$$
z^{\prime}=z, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta+\frac{1}{4} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)} z^{2}, \quad w^{\prime}=w, \quad(* *)
$$

the polynomial $F^{(3)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ becomes $F^{(4)}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)=z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{2} \zeta^{\prime}+$ $R^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)$. The inverse of $(* *)$ is

$$
z=z^{\prime}, \quad \zeta=\zeta^{\prime}-\frac{1}{4} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)} z^{\prime 2}, \quad w=w^{\prime}
$$

So $R^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)=R\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}-\frac{1}{4} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)} z^{\prime 2}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}-\frac{1}{4} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{2}\right)=O(4)$ without $z^{\prime 2}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{2}$ term.

The relations are

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{0,1,3,0}^{(4)}=F_{0,1,3,0}^{(3)}, \quad F_{0,2,2,0}^{(4)}=F_{0,2,2,0}^{(3)}, \quad F_{1,1,2,0}^{(4)}=F_{1,1,2,0}^{(3)}, \quad F_{0,1,4,0}^{(4)}=F_{0,1,4,0}^{(3)}, \\
& F_{0,2,3,0}^{(4)}=F_{0,2,3,0}^{(3)}, \quad F_{0,3,2,0}^{(4)}=F_{0,3,2,0}^{(3)}, \quad F_{1,2,2,0}^{(4)}=F_{1,2,2,0}^{(3)}, \\
& F_{2,1,2,0}^{(4)}=-\frac{1}{2} F_{0,2,2,0}^{(3)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)}+F_{2,1,2,0}^{(3)}, \\
& F_{3,0,2,0}^{(4)}=-\frac{3}{2} F_{1,1,2,0}^{(3)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)}-\frac{1}{2} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(3)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)}+F_{3,0,2,0}^{(3)}, \\
& F_{1,1,3,0}^{(4)}=-\frac{3}{2} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)}+F_{1,1,3,0}^{(3)} \\
& F_{2,0,3,0}^{(4)}=-\frac{1}{2} F_{0,1,3,0}^{(3)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)}-\frac{3}{2} F_{2,0,1,1}^{(3)} F_{2,0,2,0}^{(3)}+F_{2,0,3,0}^{(3)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We define $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(4)}$, a codimension 1 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(3)}$ by requiring $F_{2,0,2,0}^{(4)}=0$. So $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(2)}=21-1=20$.

For any fixed element $F^{(4)} \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(4)}$, the stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(4)}\left(F^{(4)}\right)$ is a codimension 1 subgroup of some $R T_{4}^{(3)}\left(F^{(4)}\right)$. Hence $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{4}^{(4)}\left(F^{(3)}\right)=28-1=27$. It contains elements $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{4}^{(3)}\left(F^{(4)}\right)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{aligned}
g_{2,0}= & e^{-2 i \theta} F_{0,2,2,0}^{(4)} g_{1,0}^{2}+e^{6 i \theta} F_{2,0,0,2}^{(4)}{\overline{g_{1,0}}}^{2}-e^{-4 i \theta} g_{0,2} g_{1,0}^{2}-e^{8 i \theta} \overline{g_{0,2}}{\overline{g_{1,0}}}^{2} \\
& -2 F_{1,1,2,0}^{(4)} g_{1,0}-2 e^{4 i \theta} F_{2,0,1,1}^{(4)} \overline{g_{1,0}}+2 e^{-2 i \theta} g_{1,0} g_{1,1}+2 e^{6 i \theta} \overline{g_{1,0}} \overline{g_{1,1}} \\
& +3 e^{2 i \theta} g_{1,0} \overline{g_{1,0}}-e^{4 i \theta} \overline{g_{2,0}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

In other words

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Re}\left(e^{-2 i \theta} g_{2,0}\right)=\operatorname{Re}\{ & -e^{-4 i \theta} F_{0,2,2,0}^{(4)} g_{1,0}^{2}-e^{-6 i \theta} g_{0,2} g_{1,0}^{2} \\
& \left.-2 e^{-2 i \theta} F_{1,1,2,0}^{(4)} g_{1,0}+2 e^{-4 i \theta} g_{1,0} g_{1,1}+\frac{3}{2} g_{1,0} \overline{g_{1,0}}\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

10.8. Fifth normalization: $F_{a, b, 2,0}^{(5)}=0$ for $2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 3$ and $(a, b) \neq(2,0)$. Any element in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(4)}$ has expansion:

$$
F^{(4)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \underbrace{\left(\bar{\zeta}+\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 3} \frac{F_{2,0, a, b}^{(4)}}{a!b!}\right.}_{=: \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}} \bar{z}^{a} \bar{\zeta}^{b})+\frac{1}{2} \bar{z}^{2} \underbrace{\left(\zeta+\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 3} \frac{F_{a,,, 2,0}^{(4)}}{a!b b} z^{a} \zeta^{b}\right)}_{=: \bar{\zeta}}+R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}),
$$

whose remainder $R(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=O(4)$ contains no $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{2}$ term for any $2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 3$. After the rigid transformation in $R T_{4}^{(4)}\left(F^{(4)}\right)$ :

$$
z^{\prime}=z, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta+\sum_{2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4} \frac{F_{a, b, 2,0}^{(4)}}{a!b!} z^{a} \zeta^{b}, \quad w^{\prime}=w, \quad(* * *)
$$

the polynomial $F^{(4)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ becomes $F^{(5)}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)=z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{2} \zeta^{\prime}+$ $R^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)$. The inverse of $(* * *)$ is

$$
z=z^{\prime}, \quad \zeta=\zeta^{\prime}+O_{z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}}(2), \quad w=w^{\prime}
$$

So $R^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)=R\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}+O_{z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}}(2), \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+O_{\overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}}(2)\right)=O(4)$ without $z^{\prime a}{\zeta^{\prime b}}^{\bar{z}^{\prime}}$ terms for any $2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 3$.

The relations are

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
F_{0,1,3,0}^{(5)}=F_{0,1,3,0}^{(4)}, & F_{0,1,4,0}^{(5)}=F_{0,1,4,0}^{(4)} \\
F_{0,2,3,0}^{(5)}=-2 F_{0,1,3,0}^{(4)} F_{0,2,2,0}^{(4)}+F_{0,2,3,0}^{(4)}, & F_{1,1,3,0}^{(5)}=-2 F_{0,1,3,0}^{(4)} F_{1,1,2,0}^{(4)}+F_{1,1,3,0}^{(4)}
\end{array}
$$

We define $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(5)}$ a codimension 12 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(4)}$ where $F_{a, b, 2,0}^{(5)}=0$ for

$$
(a, b) \in\{(1,1),(0,2),(3,0),(2,1),(1,2),(0,3)\}
$$

So $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(5)}=20-12=8$.
For any fixed element $F^{(5)} \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(5)}$, the stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(5)}\right)$ is a codimension 12 subgroup of some $R T_{4}^{(4)}\left(F^{(5)}\right)$. Hence $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(5)}\right)=27-12=15$. It contains element $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{4}^{(4)}\left(F^{(5)}\right)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g_{0,2}=0, \quad g_{1,1}=-2 e^{4 i \theta} \overline{g_{1,0}}, \quad g_{0,3}=0, \quad g_{1,2}=0, \\
& g_{2,1}=2 e^{6 i \theta}{\overline{g_{1,0}}}^{2}-2 e^{4 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} \overline{g_{1,0}}, \\
& g_{3,0}=-5 e^{2 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} \bar{g}_{1,0} g_{1,0}+e^{6 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,2}^{(5)}{\overline{g_{1,0}}}^{2}-2 e^{4 i \theta} F_{3,0,1,1}^{(5)} \overline{g_{1,0}}-e^{4 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} \overline{g_{2,0}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{4}^{(4)}\left(F^{(5)}\right)$ we have

$$
\operatorname{Re}\left(e^{-2 i \theta} g_{2,0}\right)=\operatorname{Re}\left(-\frac{5}{2} g_{1,0} \overline{g_{1,0}}\right)
$$

Thus $e^{-2 i \theta} g_{2,0}=-\frac{5}{2} g_{1,0} \overline{g_{1,0}}+i b_{2,0}$ for some $b_{2,0} \in \mathbb{R}$. So the last equation becomes

$$
g_{3,0}=-\frac{5}{2} e^{2 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} \overline{g_{1,0}} g_{1,0}+e^{6 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,2}^{(5)}{\overline{g_{1,0}}}^{2}-2 e^{4 i \theta} F_{3,0,1,1}^{(5)} \overline{g_{1,0}}-i e^{2 i \theta} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} b_{2,0} .
$$

The stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(5)}\right)$ is parametrized by 3 real variables $b_{2,0}, r, \theta$ and 6 complex variables $g_{1,0}, g_{j, 4-j}$ for $0 \leqslant j \leqslant 4$.
10.9. Final normalization: $F_{0,1,3,0}^{(6)}=0$ and $\operatorname{Im}\left(F_{1,1,3,0}^{(6)}\right)=0$. Any element in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(5)}$ has expansion:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(5)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta}) & =z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta \bar{z}^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{6} F_{0,1,3,0}^{(5)} \zeta \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} z^{3} \bar{\zeta} \\
& +\frac{1}{6} F_{1,1,3,0}^{(5)} \zeta \zeta \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} F_{3,0,1,1}^{(5)} z^{3} \bar{z} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{24} F_{0,1,4,0}^{(5)} \zeta \bar{z}^{4}+\frac{1}{24} F_{4,0,0,1}^{(5)} z^{4} \bar{\zeta} \\
& +\frac{1}{12} F_{0,2,3,0}^{(5)} \zeta^{2} \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{12} F_{3,0,0,2}^{(5)} z^{3} \bar{\zeta}^{2} \\
& +\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\ldots) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We study how $g_{1,0}$ and $b_{2,0}$ act on this object, i.e. we consider an arbitrary $(f, g, \rho) \in$ $R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(5)}\right)$ with $r=1$ and $\theta=g_{j, 4-j}=0$. They have the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
f(z, \zeta) & =z-\frac{1}{2} \overline{g_{1,0}} z^{2}+O(3) \\
g(z, \zeta) & =g_{1,0} z+\zeta+\frac{1}{2}\left(-\frac{5}{2} g_{1,0} \overline{g_{1,0}}+i b_{2,0}\right) z^{2}+O(3), \\
\rho & =1
\end{aligned}
$$

This transformation sends $F^{(5)}$ to $F^{\prime(5)} \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(5)}$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime(5)}=F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)}+3 \overline{g_{1,0}}, \\
& F_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime(5)}=F_{3,0,1,1}^{(5)}-3 F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} g_{1,0}-F_{3,0,0,2}^{(5)} \overline{g_{1,0}}+\frac{15}{2} g_{1,0} \overline{g_{1,0}}-3 i b_{2,0}
\end{aligned}
$$

So by a unique choice of $g_{1,0}$ and $b_{2,0}$, namely

$$
g_{1,0}=-\frac{1}{3} F_{0,1,3,0}^{(5)}, \quad b_{2,0}=\frac{i}{18}\left(F_{0,2,3,0}^{(5)} F_{0,1,3,0}^{(5)}-F_{3,0,0,2}^{(5)} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)}+3 F_{1,1,3,0}^{(5)}-3 F_{3,0,1,1}^{(5)}\right),
$$

we can normalize $F_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime(5)}$ to 0 and $F_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime(5)}$ to a real number. The polynomial $F^{(5)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(6)}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)= & z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta^{\prime}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{6} F_{1,1,3,0}^{(6)} z^{\prime}{\overline{\zeta^{\prime}}}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} F_{3,0,1,1}^{(6)} z^{\prime 3} \overline{z^{\prime}} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{24} F_{0,1,4,0}^{(6)} \zeta^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{24} F_{4,0,0,1}^{(6)} z^{\prime 4} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& +\frac{1}{12} F_{0,2,3,0}^{(6)} \bar{\zeta}^{\prime 2} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{12} F_{3,0,0,2}^{(6)} z^{\prime 3} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& +\zeta^{\prime} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}(\ldots) \\
= & z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta^{\prime}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{6} Q_{0}{z^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime}}_{{z^{\prime}}^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{6} Q_{0} z^{\prime 3} \overline{z^{\prime}} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{24} V_{0} \zeta^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{24} \overline{V_{0}} z^{4} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& +\frac{1}{12} I_{0} \zeta^{\prime 2} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{12} \overline{I_{0}} z^{\prime 3} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& +\zeta^{\prime} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}(\ldots),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $I_{0}:=F_{0,2,3,0}^{(6)} \in \mathbb{C}, V_{0}:=F_{0,1,4,0}^{(6)} \in \mathbb{C}, Q_{0}:=F_{1,1,3,0}^{(6)} \in \mathbb{R}$.
The relations are

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{0} & =F_{0,2,3,0}^{(5)}+2 F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} \\
V_{0} & =-\frac{5}{3}\left(F_{0,1,3,0}^{(5)}\right)^{2}+F_{0,1,4,0}^{(5)} \\
Q_{0} & =\frac{1}{6} F_{0,2,3,0}^{(5)} F_{0,1,3,0}^{(5)}+\frac{1}{2} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)} F_{0,1,3,0}^{(5)}+\frac{1}{6} F_{3,0,0,2}^{(5)} F_{3,0,0,1}^{(5)}+\frac{1}{2} F_{1,1,3,0}^{(5)}+\frac{1}{2} F_{3,0,1,1}^{(5)} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We define $\mathscr{N}=\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$ a codimension 3 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(5)}$ by requiring $F_{0,3,1,0}^{(6)}=0$ and $\operatorname{Im}\left(F_{1,1,3,0}^{(6)}\right)=0$.

For any fixed element $F^{(6)} \in \mathscr{N}$, the stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(6)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)$ is a codimension 3 subgroup of some $R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)$. Hence $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{4}^{(6)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)=15-3=12$. It contains elements $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)$ of the form

$$
f(z, \zeta)=r e^{i \theta} z, \quad g(z, \zeta)=e^{2 i \theta} s+O(4), \quad \rho=r^{2}
$$

This group sends $I_{0}, V_{0}, Q_{0}$ to $I_{0}^{\prime}, V_{0}^{\prime}, Q_{0}^{\prime}$ with relations

$$
I_{0}^{\prime}=r^{-1} e^{-i \theta} I_{0}, \quad V_{0}^{\prime}=r^{-2} e^{2 i \theta} V_{0}, \quad Q_{0}^{\prime}=r^{-2} Q_{0}
$$

So if we ignore dilations and rotations $\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, w^{\prime}\right)=\left(r e^{i \theta} z, e^{2 i \theta} \zeta, r^{2} w\right)$, then $I_{0}, V_{0}, Q_{0}$ are invariants.

Each $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(t)}$ is a rational function of $F_{a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}, c^{\prime}, d^{\prime}}^{(t-1)}$ for $t=5,4,3,2$ and each $F_{a, b, c, d}^{(1)}$ is a rational function of $F_{a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}, c^{\prime}, d^{\prime}}$. By composing these rational functions, one can express $I_{0}$,
$V_{0}, Q_{0}$ in terms of original coordinates $F_{a, b, c, d}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
I_{0} & =\frac{52 \text { terms in degree } 9}{F_{1,0,1,0}^{3 / 2}\left(F_{0,1,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0}-F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}\right)^{3}\left(F_{1,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}-F_{1,0,1,0} F_{2,0,0,1}\right)}, \\
V_{0} & =\frac{11 \text { terms in degree } 4}{3 F_{1,0,1,0}\left(F_{0,1,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0}-F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}\right)^{2}}, \\
Q_{0} & =\frac{824 \text { terms in degree } 18}{6 F_{1,0,1,0}^{3}\left(F_{0,1,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0}-F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}\right)^{4}\left(F_{1,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}-F_{1,0,1,0} F_{2,0,0,1}\right)^{4}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

## The numerator of $I_{0}$ is

$F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,1,0} F_{2,0,3,0}-F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,1,0} F_{2,0,2,0}$
$+2 F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0}^{3} F_{3,0,1,0}-6 F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,2,0}^{3} F_{2,0,1,0}^{2}$
$-F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,3,0}+F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,2,0}$
$-2 F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,2,0}^{3} F_{3,0,0,1}+6 F_{0,1,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0}^{3} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$-F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{2,0,1,0} F_{2,0,3,0}-6 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,2,0}^{2} F_{3,0,1,0}$
$+F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,1,0}^{2}+18 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0}^{2} F_{2,0,1,0}^{2}$
$+F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,3,0}+6 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,2,0}^{2} F_{3,0,0,1}$
$-F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}-18 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,2,0}^{2} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$+F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{2,0,1,0} F_{2,0,2,0}-F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,1,0}^{2}$
$-F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,2,0}+F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$-2 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{1,1,3,0} F_{2,0,1,0}+2 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{1,1,2,0} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$+2 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{1,1,3,0} F_{2,0,0,1}-2 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{1,1,2,0} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$+6 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0}^{2} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{3,0,1,0}-18 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0}^{2} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,1,0}^{2}$
$-6 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0}^{2} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{3,0,0,1}+18 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0}^{2} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$+2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,1,3,0} F_{2,0,1,0}-2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{1,1,1,0} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$-2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{1,1,3,0} F_{2,0,0,1}+2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{1,1,1,0} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$-2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,1,2,0} F_{2,0,1,0}+2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{1,1,1,0} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$+2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{1,1,2,0} F_{2,0,0,1}-2 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{1,1,1,0} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$-F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,2,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,1,0}+F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,2,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$+F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,2,3,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,1,0}-F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,2,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$-2 F_{0,1,2,0}^{3} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{3,0,1,0}+6 F_{0,1,2,0}^{3} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{3} F_{2,0,1,0}^{2}$
$+2 F_{0,1,2,0}^{3} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{3,0,0,1}-6 F_{0,1,2,0}^{3} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{2,0,0,1} F_{2,0,1,0}$
$+F_{0,1,2,0} F_{0,2,1,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,1,0}-F_{0,1,2,0} F_{0,2,1,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{1,0,3,0} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$-F_{0,1,2,0} F_{0,2,3,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{2,0,1,0}+F_{0,1,2,0} F_{0,2,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{6} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$-F_{0,1,3,0} F_{0,2,1,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{4} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,1,0}+F_{0,1,3,0} F_{0,2,1,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{2,0,0,1}$
$+F_{0,1,3,0} F_{0,2,2,0} F_{1,0,0,1} F_{1,0,1,0}^{5} F_{2,0,1,0}-F_{0,1,3,0} F_{0,2,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{6} F_{2,0,0,1}$.

The numerator of $V_{0}$ is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{1,0,4,0}-5 F_{0,1,1,0}^{2} F_{1,0,3,0}^{2}-3 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,4,0} \\
+ & 12 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,2,0} F_{1,0,2,0} F_{1,0,3,0}+10 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,3,0}-12 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,2,0}^{2} \\
- & 3 F_{0,1,1,0} F_{0,1,4,0} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0}-12 F_{0,1,2,0}^{2} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,3,0}+12 F_{0,1,2,0} F_{0,1,3,0} F_{1,0,1,0} F_{1,0,2,0} \\
+ & 3 F_{0,1,2,0} F_{0,1,4,0} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2}-5 F_{0,1,3,0}^{2} F_{1,0,1,0}^{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

We define $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$ a codimension 3 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(5)}$ by requiring $F_{0,3,1,0}^{(6)}=0$ and $\operatorname{Im}\left(F_{1,1,3,0}^{(6)}\right)=0$.

For any fixed element $F^{(6)} \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$, the stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(6)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)$ is a codimension 3 subgroup of some $R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)$. Hence $\operatorname{dim}_{\mathbb{R}} R T_{4}^{(6)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)=15-3=12$. It contains elements $(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{4}^{(5)}\left(F^{(6)}\right)$ of the form

$$
f(z, \zeta)=r e^{i \theta} z, \quad g(z, \zeta)=e^{2 i \theta} \zeta+O(4), \quad \rho=r^{2} .
$$

Note that this stabilizer group no longer depends on the choice of $F^{(6)} \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$. We simply write it as $R T_{4}^{(6)}$.
10.1. Passing to the infinite dimension. After these six normalizations, we killed $f_{0,1}$ and $g_{1,0}$. It is a miracle that now we can work directly on the infinite dimensional objects. We define $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ be the subspace of $\mathscr{H}$ consisting of all power series $u=F^{(7)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=$ $\frac{F_{a, b, c, d}^{(7)}}{a l b!c l d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d}$ such that

- $F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(7)}=0, \forall(a, b) \neq(1,0) ; F_{1,0,1,0}^{(7)}=1 ;$
- $F_{a, b, 2,0}^{(7)}=0, \forall(a, b) \neq(0,1) ; F_{0,1,2,0}^{(7)}=1$;
- $F_{3,0,0,1}^{(7)}=0, F_{3,0,1,1}^{(7)}=F_{1,1,3,0}^{(7)}$.

It is both infinitely-dimensional and infinitely-codimensional in $\mathscr{H}$. But it has a finitelydimensional stabilizer.

By definition, any element in $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ has its degree 5 truncation in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$.
Theorem 10.10. Any element $u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ in $\mathscr{H}$ can be sent to some element $u=$ $F^{(7)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ in $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ by some (but not unique) element in $R T$. The ambiguity can be controlled in the following sense: any element $(f, g, \rho) \in R T$ sending one element $F^{(7)} \in$ $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ to another $F^{\prime(7)} \in \mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ has the form $f(z, \zeta)=r e^{i \theta} z, g(z, \zeta)=e^{2 i \theta} \zeta$ and $\rho=r^{2}$.

Proof. One shall simply use the six normalizations above with a bit modification: in the second (killing $F_{a, b, 1,0}$ ) and the fifth (killing $F_{a, b, 2,0}$ ) normalization, we normalize for infinitely many $(a, b)$. More precisely, we start from $u=F(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ in $\mathscr{H}$. After the six normalizations above we get $u=F^{(6)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ whose degree 5 truncation $\pi_{5}\left(F^{(6)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})\right)$ is in $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$, i.e.

- $F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(6)}=0, \forall 2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4 ; F_{1,0,1,0}^{(6)}=1$;
- $F_{a, b, 2,0}^{(6)}=0, \forall 2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4 ; F_{0,1,2,0}^{(6)}=1$;
- $F_{3,0,0,1}^{(6)}=0, F_{3,0,1,1}^{(6)}=F_{1,1,3,0}^{(6)}$.

Then we do 2 more normalizations. First

$$
z^{\prime}=z+\sum_{a+b \geqslant 5} \frac{F_{a, b, 1,0}^{(6)}}{a!b!} z^{a} \zeta^{b}, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\zeta, \quad w^{\prime}=w
$$

gives us $u^{\prime}=F^{\prime}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)$ with

- $F_{a, b, 1,0}^{\prime}=0, \forall a+b \geqslant 2 ; F_{1,0,1,0}^{\prime}=1$;
- $F_{a, b, 2,0}^{\prime}=0, \forall 2 \leqslant a+b \leqslant 4 ; F_{0,1,2,0}^{\prime}=1$;
- $F_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime}=0, F_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime}=F_{1,1,3,0}^{\prime}$.

Then

$$
z^{\prime \prime}=z^{\prime}, \quad \zeta^{\prime \prime}=\zeta^{\prime}+\sum_{a+b \geqslant 5} \frac{F_{a,,,, 2,0}^{\prime}}{a!b!} z^{a} \zeta^{b}, \quad w^{\prime}=w
$$

gives us $u^{\prime \prime}=F^{\prime \prime}\left(z^{\prime \prime}, \zeta^{\prime \prime}, \overline{z^{\prime \prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime \prime}}\right)$ with

- $F_{a, b, 1,0}^{\prime \prime}=0, \forall a+b \geqslant 2 ; F_{1,0,1,0}^{\prime \prime}=1$;
- $F_{a, b, 2,0}^{\prime \prime}=0, \forall a+b \geqslant 2 ; F_{0,1,2,0}^{\prime \prime}=1$;
- $F_{3,0,0,1}^{\prime \prime}=0, F_{3,0,1,1}^{\prime \prime}=F_{1,1,3,0}^{\prime \prime}$.

So $u^{\prime \prime}=F^{\prime \prime}\left(z^{\prime \prime}, \zeta^{\prime \prime}, \overline{z^{\prime \prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime \prime}}\right)$ is in $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$. It is the form we want.
Now suppose that $(f, g, \rho) \in R T$ sends one element $F^{(7)} \in \mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ to another $F^{\prime(7)} \in$ $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$. In the truncated setting, $\pi_{4}(f, g, \rho) \in R T_{4}$ sends $\pi_{5}\left(F^{(7)}\right) \in \mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$ to $\pi_{5}\left(F^{\prime(7)}\right) \in$ $\mathscr{H}_{5}^{(6)}$. So the truncated action $\pi_{4}(f, g, \rho)$ should be in the stabilizer $R T_{4}^{(6)}$. That is to say

$$
f(z, \zeta)=r e^{i \theta} z+O(5), \quad g(z, \zeta)=e^{2 i \theta} \zeta+O(4), \quad \rho=r^{2}
$$

Recall the fundamental equation

$$
\rho F^{(7)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})=F^{\prime(7)}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \overline{f(z, \zeta)}, \overline{g(z, \zeta)})
$$

When we compare the coefficients of $z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}$ for any $n \geqslant 2$ and $0 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
0= & \operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}}\left\{F^{\prime(7)}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \overline{f(z, \zeta)}, \overline{g(z, \zeta)})\right\} \\
= & \operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}}\{f(z, \zeta) \overline{f(z, \zeta)}\}+\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j}}\left\{\sum_{c=0, d=1}(\ldots) \overline{g(z, \zeta)}^{d}\right\} \\
& +\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}}\left\{\sum_{c+d \geqslant 2}(\ldots) \overline{f(z, \zeta)^{c}} \overline{g(z, \zeta)}^{d}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

The last two terms are 0 because they only contain monomials with $\operatorname{deg}_{\bar{z}}=0$ or $\operatorname{deg}_{\bar{z}}+$ $\operatorname{deg}_{\bar{\zeta}} \geqslant 2$. The first term gives us $0=r e^{-i \theta} \frac{f_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!}$. Hence $f(z, \zeta)=r e^{i \theta} z$.

When we compare the coefficients of $z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}^{2}$ for any $n \geqslant 2$ and $0 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
0= & \operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}^{2}}\left\{F^{\prime(7)}(f(z, \zeta), g(z, \zeta), \overline{f(z, \zeta)}, \overline{g(z, \zeta)})\right\} \\
= & \operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}^{2}}\{f(z, \zeta) \overline{f(z, \zeta)}\}+\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}^{2}}\left\{\sum_{c=0, d=1}(\ldots) \overline{g(z, \zeta)}\right\} \\
& +\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j}} \bar{z}^{2}\left\{\frac{1}{2} g(z, \zeta) \overline{f(z, \zeta)}^{2}\right\}+\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j}} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}^{2}\left\{\sum_{c=1, d=1}(\ldots) \overline{f(z, \zeta)} \overline{g(z, \zeta)}\right\} \\
& +\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j} \zeta^{n-j} \bar{z}^{2}}\left\{\sum_{c=0, d=2}(\ldots) \overline{g(z, \zeta)}^{2}\right\}+\operatorname{Coef}_{z^{j}} \zeta^{n-j}\left\{\sum_{c+d \geqslant 3}(\ldots) \overline{f(z, \zeta)}\right.
\end{aligned}
$$

Each term, except the third, is 0 . The third term gives us $0=\frac{1}{2} r^{2} \frac{g_{j, n-j}}{j!(n-j)!}$. Hence $g(z, \zeta)=$ $e^{2 i \theta} \zeta$.
10.2. Branches: $I_{0} \neq 0, V_{0} \neq 0$ and $I_{0} \equiv 0 \equiv V_{0}$. To get a normal form under the full rigid transformation group, including rotations and dilations

$$
z^{\prime}=r e^{i \theta} z, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=e^{2 i \theta} \zeta, \quad \rho=r^{2}
$$

we should normalize $I_{0}$ or $V_{0}$. Such a rotation and a dilation would send $\left(I_{0}, V_{0}, Q_{0}\right)$ to $\left(I_{0}^{\prime}, V_{0}^{\prime}, Q_{0}^{\prime}\right)$ with

$$
I_{0}^{\prime}=r^{-1} e^{-i \theta} I_{0}, \quad V_{0}^{\prime}=r^{-2} e^{2 i \theta} V_{0}, \quad Q_{0}^{\prime}=r^{-2} Q_{0}
$$

We avoid the mixed type and focus on the 3 possible branches:

- $I_{0} \neq 0$;
- $I_{0} \equiv 0$ but $V_{0} \neq 0$;
- $I_{0} \equiv 0 \equiv V_{0}$.
10.2.1. Branch $I_{0} \neq 0$. In this branch we can normalize $I_{0}$ to 1 by choose $r e^{i \theta}=I_{0}$. More precisely, for any surface in $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ graphed by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(7)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})= & z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta \bar{z}^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{6} Q_{0} z \zeta \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} Q_{0} z^{3} \bar{z} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{24} V_{0} \zeta \bar{z}^{4}+\frac{1}{24} \overline{V_{0}} z^{4} \bar{\zeta} \\
& +\frac{1}{12} I_{0} \zeta^{2} \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{12} \overline{I_{0}} z^{3} \bar{\zeta}^{2} \\
& +\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\ldots)+O(6),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $I_{0} \neq 0$, after the transformation

$$
z^{\prime}=I_{0} z, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\frac{I_{0}^{2}}{\left|I_{0}\right|^{2}} \zeta, \quad, \rho=\left|I_{0}\right|^{2}
$$

the polynomial $F^{(7)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(8,1)}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)= & z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2}{\zeta^{\prime}}_{\bar{z}^{\prime}}{ }^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{6} i n v Q_{0}{z^{\prime}}^{\zeta^{\prime}}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} i n v Q_{0} z^{\prime 3} \overline{z^{\prime}} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{24} i n v V_{0} \zeta^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}} 4+\frac{1}{24} \overline{i n v V_{0}} z^{\prime 4} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& +\frac{1}{12} \zeta^{\prime 2} \overline{z^{\prime}} 3+\frac{1}{12} z^{\prime 3} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& +\zeta^{\prime} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}(\ldots)+O(6),
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
i n v V_{0}=\frac{V_{0}}{{\overline{I_{0}}}^{2}}, \quad i n v Q_{0}=\frac{Q_{0}}{\left|I_{0}\right|^{2}},
$$

We define $\mathscr{H}^{(8,1)}$ a codimension 2 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ by requiring $I_{0}=1$.
For any fixed element $F^{(8,1)} \in \mathscr{H}^{(8,1)}$, the stabilizer $R T^{(8,1)}$ is the identity.
10.2.2. Branch $I_{0} \equiv 0$ but $V_{0} \neq 0$. In this branch we can normalize $V_{0}$ to 1 by choose $r^{2} e^{-2 i \theta}=V_{0}$. This equation has two solutions: $r e^{i \theta}= \pm x$, where $x^{2}=\overline{V_{0}}$ and $\arg (x) \in$ $[0, \pi)$. More precisely, for any surface in $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ graphed by:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(7)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})= & z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta \bar{z}^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{6} Q_{0} z \zeta \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} Q_{0} z^{3} \bar{z} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{24} V_{0} \zeta \bar{z}^{4}+\frac{1}{24} \overline{V_{0}} z^{4} \bar{\zeta} \\
& +\underbrace{\frac{1}{12} I_{0} \zeta^{2} \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{12} \overline{I_{0}} z^{3} \bar{\zeta}^{2}}_{=0, \text { when } I_{0} \equiv 0} \\
& +\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\ldots)+O(6),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $V_{0} \neq 0$, after the transformation

$$
z^{\prime}=x z, \quad \zeta^{\prime}=\frac{\overline{V_{0}}}{\left|V_{0}\right|} \zeta, \quad, \rho=\left|V_{0}\right|,
$$

the polynomial $F^{(7)}(z, \zeta, \bar{z}, \bar{\zeta})$ becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
F^{(8,2)}\left(z^{\prime}, \zeta^{\prime}, \overline{z^{\prime}}, \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}\right)= & z^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} z^{\prime 2} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta^{\prime}{\overline{z^{\prime}}}^{2}+\frac{1}{6} i n v Q_{0} z^{\prime} \zeta^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{6} i n v Q_{0} z^{\prime 3} \overline{z^{\prime}} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}} \\
& +\frac{1}{24} \zeta^{\prime} \overline{z^{\prime}}+\frac{1}{24} z^{\prime 4} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}+\zeta^{\prime} \overline{\zeta^{\prime}}(\ldots)+O(6),
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\operatorname{inv} Q_{0}=\frac{Q_{0}}{\left|V_{0}\right|}$. We define $\mathscr{H}^{(8,2)}$ a codimension 2 submanifold of $\mathscr{H}^{(7)}$ by requiring $V_{0}=1$. For any fixed element $F^{(8,2)} \in \mathscr{H}^{(8,2)}$, the stabilizer $R T^{(8,2)}$ is a group of two elements: the identity and $(-z, \zeta, 1)$.
10.2.3. Branch $I_{0} \equiv 0 \equiv V_{0}$. Since $Q_{0}$ can be generated by $I_{0}, V_{0}$ and their differentials, we have $Q_{0} \equiv 0$. The structure equations degenerate to the model case. The surface is equivalent as the Gaussier-Merker model $u=\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta^{2} \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}$.

To conclude, we draw the branches from our root assumption.

where $I_{0}$ and $V_{0}$ are relative invariants of order 5 .
Theorem 10.11. Within the branch $I_{0} \equiv 0$ :
(1) When $V_{0} \equiv 0$, the surface is equivalent to the Gaussier-Merker model $u=$ $\frac{z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta^{2} \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}}{1-\zeta \bar{\zeta}}$, and conversely;
(2) When $V_{0} \neq 0$, the surface is, up to $z \mapsto-z$, equivalent to:

$$
\begin{aligned}
u= & z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta \bar{z}^{2}+\frac{1}{6} \frac{Q_{0}}{\left|V_{0}\right|} z \zeta \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} \frac{Q_{0}}{|V|_{0} \mid} z^{3} \bar{z}+\frac{1}{24} \zeta \bar{z}^{4}+\frac{1}{24} z^{4} \bar{\zeta} \\
& +\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\ldots)+\sum_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 6, b d=0} \frac{F_{a, b, c, d}}{a!b!c c c l d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d},
\end{aligned}
$$

without any harmonic monomial $z^{j} \zeta^{n-j}, \forall n \geqslant 0,0 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ and any monomial $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c}, \forall a+b \geqslant 2, c \in\{1,2\}$. Pairs of collection of coefficients:

$$
\frac{Q_{0}}{\left|V_{0}\right|},\left\{F_{a, b, c, d}\right\}_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 6, b d=0}, \quad \frac{Q_{0}}{\left|V_{0}\right|},\left\{(-1)^{a+c} F_{a, b, c, d}\right\}_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 6, b d=0}
$$

are in one-to-one correspondence with equivalent classes.
Within the branch $I_{0} \neq 0$, the surface is, in a unique way, equivalent to:

$$
\begin{aligned}
u= & z \bar{z}+\frac{1}{2} z^{2} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{2} \zeta \bar{z}^{2}+\frac{1}{6} \frac{Q_{0}}{\left|I_{0}\right|^{2}} z \zeta \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{6} \frac{Q_{0}}{\left|I_{0}\right|^{2}} z^{3} \bar{z} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{24} \frac{V_{0}}{\bar{I}_{0}^{2}} \zeta \bar{z}^{4}+\frac{1}{24} \frac{\overline{0_{0}}}{I_{0}^{2}} z^{4} \bar{\zeta}+\frac{1}{12} \zeta^{2} \bar{z}^{3}+\frac{1}{12} z^{3} \bar{\zeta}^{2} \\
& +\zeta \bar{\zeta}(\ldots)+\sum_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 6, b d=0} \frac{F_{a, b, c, c}}{a!b!c l d!} z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c} \bar{\zeta}^{d},
\end{aligned}
$$

without any harmonic monomial $z^{j} \zeta^{n-j}, \forall n \geqslant 0,0 \leqslant j \leqslant n$ and any monomial $z^{a} \zeta^{b} \bar{z}^{c}$, $\forall a+b \geqslant 2, c \in\{1,2\}$. Collections of coefficients: $\frac{V_{0}}{\bar{I}_{0}^{2}}, \frac{Q_{0}}{\left|I_{0}\right|^{2}}$ and $\left\{F_{a, b, c, d}\right\}_{a+b+c+d \geqslant 6, b d=0}$, are in one-to-one correspondence with equivalent classes.
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