

Geometry of bifurcation sets of generic unfoldings of corank two functions

Kentaro Saji

Samuel P. Santos

December 31, 2021

Abstract

We study the geometry of bifurcation sets of generic unfoldings of D_4^\pm -functions. Taking blow-ups, we show each of the bifurcation sets of D_4^\pm -functions admit a parametrization as a surface in \mathbf{R}^3 . Using this parametrization, we investigate the behavior of the Gaussian curvature and the principal curvatures. Furthermore, we investigate the number of ridge curves and subparabolic curves near their singular point.

1 Introduction

In recent decades, the differential geometry of fronts (wave fronts) has been studied by many authors. In the Euclidean space, the set consists of the collection of singular values of a front and its parallel surfaces is called the *caustic*. Front and caustics are both fundamental objects in Lagrangian and Legendrian singularity theory, and they are closely related (see [2, 7, 8, 15], and also [6, 9]). A front is a projection of the wave front set of an unfolding of a function, and a caustic is the bifurcation set of an unfolding of a function. Although sometimes a singular point of a bifurcation set is a singular point of a front, the bifurcation sets of the versal unfolding of D_4^\pm -functions do not appear as fronts. In this case, a parametrization of the bifurcation set has not been given in the literature to the best knowledge of the authors. In this paper, to see the geometry of the bifurcation set, we simplify a versal unfolding $(\mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^3, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, 0)$ of a function $(\mathbf{R}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, 0)$ which is \mathcal{R} -equivalent to the D_4^\pm -function

$$f(u, v) = u^3/3! \pm uv^2/2,$$

2020 Mathematics Subject classification. Primary 53A05; Secondary 58K05.

Keywords and Phrases: bifurcation set, caustics, principal curvature, parabolic curve.

KS is partly supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant numbered 18K03301 and the Japan-Brazil bilateral project JPJSBP1 20190103. SS is partly supported by the grant 2019/10156-4, São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP).

2020 Mathematics Subject classification. Primary 53A05; Secondary 58K05.

Keywords and Phrases: bifurcation set, caustics, principal curvature, parabolic curve.

by using a coordinate change on \mathbf{R}^2 and an isometry on \mathbf{R}^3 . By using the blow-up method, we give a parametrization of a generic versal unfolding of such a function, and we show that the parametrization is a front, and investigate its geometry. For fronts, one can define classical differential geometric invariants (Gaussian, mean and principal curvatures) even though they diverge on the set of singular points. We show:

Theorem A. *One of the two principal curvatures of the parametrization of the bifurcation set of a versal unfolding of a D_4^\pm -singularity C^∞ -extends across the set of singular points, and the other is unbounded near the singular point of the bifurcation set. Moreover, the principal directions of these principal curvatures C^∞ -extend across the set of singular points.*

By using the asymptotic behavior of the Gaussian curvature, we obtain the behavior of *parabolic curves* (the curves consisting of Gaussian curvature zero points) in Theorems 4.3 and 4.5. Moreover, by Theorem A, we can discuss the conditions for ridges and subparabolic curves near the singular point. Let g be an umbilic free regular surface, and let κ_i ($i = 1, 2$) be the principal curvatures, and V_i the principal vector fields corresponding to κ_i . A point p on g is called a *ridge point with respect to κ_i* if $V_i \kappa_i(p) = 0$. A point p on g is called a *subparabolic point with respect to κ_i* if $V_j \kappa_i(p) = 0$, where $j = 1, 2$ and $j \neq i$. A curve on g is called a *ridge curve* (respectively, *subparabolic curve*) if it consists of ridge points (respectively, subparabolic points). We show the following theorem under the assumption that the set of ridge points and the set of subparabolic points are curves. See Section 4.5 and Proposition 4.2 for the concrete conditions.

Theorem B. *We assume that the set of ridge points and the set of subparabolic points are curves. Then the number of ridge curves with respect to the unbounded principal curvature emanating from the singular point is at most 18; the number of ridge curves with respect to the bounded principal curvature emanating from the singular point is at most 18; there are no subparabolic points with respect to the unbounded principal curvature near the singular point; the number of subparabolic curves with respect to the bounded principal curvature emanating from the singular point is at most 10.*

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Unfoldings and bifurcation sets

Let $f : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function. A function $F : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is called an *unfolding* of f if $F(\mathbf{u}, 0) = f(\mathbf{u})$. The *catastrophe set* C_F of the unfolding F of f is

$$C_F = \left\{ (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \mid \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_1}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = \cdots = \frac{\partial F}{\partial u_m}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = 0 \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_m)$. An unfolding $F : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ of $f : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a *Morse family of f* if $0 \in \mathbf{R}^m$ is a critical point of f and

$$\text{rank} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_1^2} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_1 \partial u_m} & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_1 \partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_1 \partial x_n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_1 \partial u_m} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_m^2} & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_m \partial x_1} & \cdots & \frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_m \partial x_n} \end{pmatrix} = m, \quad (2.1)$$

at 0 holds, where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$. By the implicit function theorem, if F is a Morse family, then C_F is an r -dimensional submanifold of $(\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0)$. We set its parametrization $B_1 : C_F \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^3$ as an inclusion. Let $\pi : \mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ be the projection, and set $B_F = \pi \circ B_1$. The singular set of B_F is $S(B_F) = \{(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in C_F \mid \text{rank } H_F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) < m\}$, where

$$H_F = \left(\frac{\partial^2 F}{\partial u_i \partial u_j} \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq m}.$$

The image $B_F(S(B_F))$ is called the *bifurcation set*, and denoted by \mathcal{B}_F :

$$\mathcal{B}_F = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{R}^3 \mid \text{there exists } (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) \in C_F \text{ such that } \text{rank } H_F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) < m\}.$$

The following $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ equivalence plays a fundamental role in investigating bifurcation sets (see [2, Chapter 8], [8, Chapter 5] for details).

Definition 2.1. Let $F_i : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be Morse families of functions $f_i : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ($i = 1, 2$). They are said to be $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ equivalent if there exists a triple $(g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}), G(\mathbf{x}), h(\mathbf{x}))$, where $g : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^m, 0)$, $G : (\mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^r, 0)$ is a diffeomorphism-germ, and $h : (\mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, 0)$ such that

$$F_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = F_1(\bar{G}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x})) + h(\mathbf{x}), \quad (\bar{G}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = (g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}), G(\mathbf{x}))). \quad (2.2)$$

The following lemma is well-known (see [8, Proposition 3.1] and its proof):

Lemma 2.2. Let $F_i : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be Morse families of $f_i : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ($i = 1, 2$). If F_1, F_2 are $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -equivalent as in (2.2), then $G(\mathcal{B}_{F_1}) = \mathcal{B}_{F_2}$ as set germs at 0.

By this lemma, to investigate the geometry of bifurcation sets, with respect to Euclidean geometry in \mathbf{R}^3 , we introduce the following $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -isometricity:

Definition 2.3. Let $F_i : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be Morse families of functions $f_i : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ($i = 1, 2$). They are said to be $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -isometric if they are $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -equivalent, and the diffeomorphism-germ $G : (\mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^r, 0)$ in the triple $(g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}), G(\mathbf{x}), h(\mathbf{x}))$ which gives $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -equivalence is an isometry-germ.

We may simplify the functions f and F by $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -isometry. Two functions $f_i : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ($i = 1, 2$) are \mathcal{R} -equivalent if there exists a diffeomorphism-germ $\varphi : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^m, 0)$ such that $f_1 = f_2 \circ \varphi$. A function-germ f at 0 of two variables is a D_4^\pm -germ if it is \mathcal{R} -equivalent to $f(u, v) = u^3/3! \pm uv^2/2$, where (u_1, u_2) is denoted by (u, v) . Let $\varphi : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^m, 0)$ be a diffeomorphism-germ. Then a Morse family $F : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^r, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ of $f : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -equivalent to the unfolding $F(\varphi(\mathbf{u}), \mathbf{x})$. Since we study the geometry of the bifurcation set of a D_4^\pm -germ f , under the $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -isometricity, we may assume $f = u^3/3! \pm uv^2/2$ without loss of generality.

2.2 Simplification of an unfolding by $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -equivalence

Definition 2.4. Let $F_i : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^{r_i}, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ ($i = 1, 2$) be two unfoldings of $f : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$. An \mathcal{R}^+ - f -morphism from F_2 to F_1 is a triple $(g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}), G(\mathbf{x}), h(\mathbf{x}))$, where $g : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^{r_2}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^m, 0)$, $G : (\mathbf{R}^{r_2}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^{r_1}, 0)$, $h : (\mathbf{R}^{r_2}, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, 0)$, and they satisfy $g(\mathbf{u}, 0) = \mathbf{u}$ and

$$F_2(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = F_1(g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}), G(\mathbf{x})) + h(\mathbf{x}). \quad (2.3)$$

Definition 2.5. An unfolding $F_1 : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^{r_1}, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ of $f : (\mathbf{R}^m, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is an \mathcal{R}^+ -versal unfolding if for any unfolding $F_2 : (\mathbf{R}^m \times \mathbf{R}^{r_2}, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ of f , there exists an \mathcal{R}^+ - f -morphism from F_2 to F_1 .

It is known that the function $F_{0,\varepsilon_1}(u, v, x, y, z) = u^3/3! + \varepsilon_1 uv^2/2 + xu + yv + z(u^2 - \varepsilon_1 v^2)/2$ is an \mathcal{R}^+ -versal unfolding of $u^3/3! + \varepsilon_1 uv^2/2$, where $\varepsilon_1 = \pm 1$ ([2, Chapter 8],[8, Chapter 5]). We call the bifurcation set of an \mathcal{R}^+ -versal unfolding of $u^3/3! \pm uv^2/2$ a D_4^\pm -singularity. The bifurcation set of F_{0,ε_1} is the set

$$B_{0,\varepsilon_1} = \{(-u^2/2 - \varepsilon_1 v^2/2 - zu, -\varepsilon_1 uv + \varepsilon_1 zv, z) \mid \varepsilon_1(u^2 - z^2) - v^2 = 0\}.$$

We can observe that $B_{0,1}$ consists of two sheets and they have intersection curves $c(t) = \{(-t, \pm t, 0) \mid t > 0\}$. All D_4^+ -singularities are locally diffeomorphic to $B_{0,1}$, we call the corresponding curves to $c(t)$ the *intersection curve*. See Figure 2.1 for the bifurcation sets of F_{0,ε_1} .




Figure 2.1: The bifurcation sets of $F_{0,-1}$ and $F_{0,1}$

We remark that \mathcal{R}^+ -versal unfolding $(\mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^3, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, 0)$ of the D_4^\pm -germ is unique ([2, Chapter 8],[8, Chapter 5]).

Let $f : (\mathbf{R}^2, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be $f(u, v) = u^3/3! + \varepsilon_1 uv^2/2$ ($\varepsilon_1 = \pm 1$) and let $F : (\mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^3, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be an \mathcal{R}^+ -versal unfolding of f . We have the following:

Proposition 2.6. *The function F is P - \mathcal{R}^+ -isometric to*

$$F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = F_0(\mathbf{u}, G(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{u^3}{3!} + \varepsilon_1 \frac{uv^2}{2} + P(\mathbf{x})u + Q(\mathbf{x})v + R(\mathbf{x})\frac{u^2 - \varepsilon_1 v^2}{2} \quad (2.4)$$

with the condition

$$g_{1,010} = g_{1,001} = g_{2,001} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad g_{1,100}, g_{2,010}, g_{3,001} > 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$G_n(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i+j+k \geq 1} \frac{g_{n,ijk}}{i!j!k!} x_1^i x_2^j x_3^k \quad (G_1 = P, G_2 = Q, G_3 = R, n = 1, 2, 3). \quad (2.6)$$

Proof. Since F_{0,ε_1} is a versal unfolding, there exist $g : (\mathbf{R}^2 \times \mathbf{R}^3, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^2, 0)$, $G : (\mathbf{R}^3, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^3, 0)$, $h : (\mathbf{R}^3, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}, 0)$, and they satisfy $g(\mathbf{u}, 0) = \mathbf{u}$ and $F(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}) = F_0(g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}), G(\mathbf{x})) +$

$h(\mathbf{x})$. By the triple $(g(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}), \mathbf{x}, h(\mathbf{x}))$, we see F is $P\text{-}\mathcal{R}^+$ -isometric to $F_0(u, G(\mathbf{x}))$ as in (2.4). Let us set

$$\mathbf{g}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} g_{1,100} \\ g_{1,010} \\ g_{1,001} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{g}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} g_{2,100} \\ g_{2,010} \\ g_{2,001} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{g}_3 = \begin{pmatrix} g_{3,100} \\ g_{3,010} \\ g_{3,001} \end{pmatrix},$$

and let $\overline{\mathbf{g}}_1, \overline{\mathbf{g}}_2, \overline{\mathbf{g}}_3$ be the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalized vectors, namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\mathbf{g}}_1 &= \frac{\mathbf{g}_1}{|\mathbf{g}_1|}, & \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_2 &= \mathbf{g}_2 - (\overline{\mathbf{g}}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_2) \overline{\mathbf{g}}_1, & \overline{\mathbf{g}}_2 &= \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_2}{|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_2|}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_3 &= \mathbf{g}_3 - \left((\overline{\mathbf{g}}_1 \cdot \mathbf{g}_3) \overline{\mathbf{g}}_1 + (\overline{\mathbf{g}}_2 \cdot \mathbf{g}_3) \overline{\mathbf{g}}_2 \right), & \overline{\mathbf{g}}_3 &= \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_3}{|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_3|}. \end{aligned}$$

We set

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\mathbf{g}}_1 \\ \overline{\mathbf{g}}_2 \\ \overline{\mathbf{g}}_3 \end{pmatrix}^t,$$

where ${}^t(\)$ stands for matrix transposition. Then M is an orthonormal matrix, and is identified with a linear map. By the triple $(\text{id}, M, 0)$, we see the first condition of (2.5) can be satisfied. By the versality, $g_{1,100}g_{2,010}g_{3,001} \neq 0$. The second condition of (2.5) can be satisfied by the linear map defined by the orthonormal matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \pm 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \pm 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

□

Geometric meanings of coefficients of G_1, G_2, G_3 are discussed in Section 4.

2.3 Fronts

Since we shall show the bifurcation sets are fronts, we give a fundamental definition of fronts. Let $f : (\mathbf{R}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^3, 0)$ be a map-germ. The map f is a *frontal* if there exists a unit normal vector field ν along f such that $\langle df_p(X), \nu(p) \rangle = 0$ for any $X \in T_p(\mathbf{R}^2, 0)$. A frontal f with a unit normal vector ν is a *front* if the pair (f, ν) is an immersion. Let f be a frontal. A function $\lambda : (\mathbf{R}^2, 0) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is called an *identifier of singularities* if it is a non-zero multiple of the function $\det(f_u, f_v, \nu)$. If a function is an identifier of singularities, then the set of singular points $S(f)$ satisfies $S(f) = \lambda^{-1}(0)$. Since the unit normal vector field is well-defined for frontals, one can define the Gaussian, mean and principal curvatures in a natural way. However, it may diverge on the set of singular points. See [10–14] for differential geometric study of these curvatures. Let $f : (\mathbf{R}^2, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^3, 0)$ be a front with a unit normal vector field ν , which is a cuspidal edge (by coordinate transformations on the source and the target space, it can be written as $(u, v) \mapsto (u, v^2, v^3)$). Let $\gamma : (J, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbf{R}^3, 0)$ be a parametrization of the set of singular points of f , where J is an open interval containing 0. We set $\hat{\gamma}(t) = f \circ \gamma(t)$ and $\hat{\nu}(t) = \nu \circ \gamma(t)$. The *singular curvature* κ_s and the (*limiting*) *normal curvature* κ_n are defined by

$$\kappa_s(t) = \pm \frac{\det(\hat{\gamma}', \hat{\gamma}'', \hat{\nu})}{|\hat{\gamma}'|^3}(t), \quad \kappa_n(t) = \frac{\hat{\gamma}'' \cdot \hat{\nu}}{|\hat{\gamma}'|^2}(t). \quad (2.7)$$

See [13] for details.

3 Description of bifurcation sets

We assume $f(u, v) = u^3/3! + \varepsilon_1 uv^2/2$ and F is written as (2.4) with the conditions (2.5). Then by the implicit function theorem, there exist two functions $x(u, v, z), y(u, v, z)$ such that

$$F_u(u, v, x(u, v, z), y(u, v, z), z) = F_v(u, v, x(u, v, z), y(u, v, z), z) = 0.$$

Thus C_F can be parametrized by $(u, v, z) \mapsto (u, v, x(u, v, z), y(u, v, z), z)$, and the map B_F is $B_F(u, v, z) = (x(u, v, z), y(u, v, z), z)$. Since

$$dB_F = \begin{pmatrix} x_u & x_v & x_z \\ y_u & y_v & y_z \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.1)$$

it holds that $S(B_F) = \{x_u y_v - x_v y_u = 0\}$. By the implicit function theorem,

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_{ux} & F_{uy} \\ F_{vx} & F_{vy} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_u & x_v \\ y_u & y_v \end{pmatrix} = - \begin{pmatrix} F_{uu} & F_{uv} \\ F_{uv} & F_{vv} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.2)$$

and by (2.5), the bifurcation set can be written as

$$\mathcal{B}_F = \{(x, y, z) \mid \text{there exists } (u, v) \in C_F \text{ such that } \det H_F(u, v, x, y, z) = 0\}. \quad (3.3)$$

3.1 D_4^- singularity

We give a parametrization of the bifurcation set by using the blow-up method at a singular point [3] (see also [5, Example (a) in p. 221]). Let $S^1 = \mathbf{R}/2\pi\mathbf{Z}$ be a circle, and let $I = (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ be an open interval. Two points $(\theta_i, r_i) \in S^1 \times I$ ($i = 1, 2$) are equivalent (\sim) if $(\theta_2, r_2) = (\theta_1 + \pi, r_1)$. The quotient space $\mathcal{M} = S^1 \times I / \sim$ is topologically a Möbius strip. There is a natural map $\pi : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$, where $\pi([\theta, r]) = (r \cos \theta, r \sin \theta)$. This is usually called a blow-up. Furthermore, we take a double cover $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ of \mathcal{M} , and consider a natural map $\hat{\pi} : \hat{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$, where $\hat{\pi}([\theta, r]) = (r \cos 2\theta, r \sin 2\theta)$. Then $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ is topologically an annulus. We assume $\varepsilon_1 = -1$ in (2.4). Then $\det H_F = -u^2 - v^2 + R(x, y, z)^2$. We set

$$u = r \cos 2\theta, \quad v = r \sin 2\theta, \quad (3.4)$$

where $(\theta, r) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}$. Then $-r^2 + R^2 = 0$ can be solved by $r = \varepsilon_2 R(x, y, z)$, where $\varepsilon_2 = \pm 1$. Then the equation for the bifurcation set is

$$F_u(2\theta, r, x, y, z) = 0, \quad F_v(2\theta, r, x, y, z) = 0, \quad r = \varepsilon_2 R(x, y, z). \quad (3.5)$$

This is equivalent to

$$X_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, z) = 0, \quad Y_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, z) = 0, \quad (3.6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} X_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, z) &= F_u(\varepsilon_2 R(x, y, z), 2\theta, x, y, z) \\ &= P(x, y, z) + R(x, y, z)^2 \alpha_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta), \\ Y_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, z) &= F_v(\varepsilon_2 R(x, y, z), 2\theta, x, y, z) \\ &= Q(x, y, z) + R(x, y, z)^2 \beta_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta), \\ \alpha_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta) &= \frac{\cos^2 2\theta - \sin^2 2\theta}{2} + \varepsilon_2 \cos 2\theta, \\ \beta_{-1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta) &= -\cos 2\theta \sin 2\theta + \varepsilon_2 \sin 2\theta. \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

By the condition (2.5), there exist functions $x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$, $y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$ such that $X_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) = Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) = 0$ holds identically. In this setting, we have:

Lemma 3.1. *It holds that*

$$x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) = y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) = (x_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z(\theta, 0) = (y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z(\theta, 0) = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

and

$$R(x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0), 0) = 0. \quad (3.9)$$

Proof. We consider equations $X_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, 0) = Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, 0) = 0$. Then since (2.5), we have functions $\bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta)$, $\bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta)$ such that

$$X_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, \bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta), \bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta), 0) = Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, \bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta), \bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta), 0) = 0.$$

We remark that by the implicit function theorem, each $\bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta)$, $\bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta)$ is unique. On the other hand, since $P(0, 0, 0) = Q(0, 0, 0) = 0$, the equality $X_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0, 0, 0) = Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0, 0, 0) = 0$ is satisfied. Thus $\bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = \bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = 0$ is a solution of $X_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, 0) = Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x, y, 0) = 0$. By the uniqueness, $\bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = \bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = 0$ holds. By the definition of the functions $\bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta)$, $\bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta)$, it holds that $\bar{x}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0)$, $\bar{y}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0)$. This shows $x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) = 0$ and $y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) = 0$. Moreover, by (3.7) and (2.5), it holds that $(x_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z(\theta, 0) = (y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z(\theta, 0) = 0$. The equation (3.9) is obvious by (3.8). \square

Thus a double cover of the bifurcation set can be parameterized by

$$b_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z) = b(\theta, z) = (x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) : \hat{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3 \quad (\varepsilon_2 = \pm 1). \quad (3.10)$$

We define the source space $\hat{\mathcal{M}}$ of b_{-1,ε_2} by $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{\varepsilon_2}$. On the other hand, since $R_z(0, 0, 0) = g_{3,001} \neq 0$, and

$$\alpha_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = \alpha_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta + \pi/2), \quad \beta_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) = \beta_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta + \pi/2),$$

we can regard $(\theta, z) \in \mathcal{M}$ as a parameter of the bifurcation set. We have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *The map $b_{-1,\varepsilon_2} : \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{\varepsilon_2} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ is a front near $\{z = 0\} \subset \hat{\mathcal{M}}$.*

Proof. By (3.9), there exists a function $\tilde{R}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$ such that $R(\theta, x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) = z\tilde{R}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$. By (3.8) and $R_z(0, 0, 0) \neq 0$, it holds that $\tilde{R}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) \neq 0$. By a direct calculation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left((X_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_\theta(x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z), \right. \\ & \quad \left. (Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_\theta(x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z), 0 \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 4z^2\tilde{R}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)^2 \sin 3\theta {}^t(-\cos \theta, \sin \theta, 0) & (\varepsilon_2 = 1), \\ -4z^2\tilde{R}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)^2 \cos 3\theta {}^t(\sin \theta, \cos \theta, 0) & (\varepsilon_2 = -1) \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.11)$$

holds. By the implicit function theorem,

$$\begin{pmatrix} (x_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_\theta \\ (y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_\theta \end{pmatrix} = -z^2\lambda_{-1,\varepsilon_2}a_{-1,\varepsilon_2}\tilde{A}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}V_{-1,\varepsilon_2}, \quad (3.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{A}_{-1,\varepsilon_2} &= \begin{pmatrix} (Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_y & -(X_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_y \\ -(Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_x & (X_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_x \end{pmatrix}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} (x_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z \\ (y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z \end{pmatrix} &= \frac{-1}{\det \tilde{A}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}} \tilde{A}_{-1,\varepsilon_2} \begin{pmatrix} (X_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z \\ (Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}\tag{3.13}$$

$$V_{-1,\varepsilon_2} = \begin{cases} {}^t(-\cos \theta, \sin \theta) & (\varepsilon_2 = 1) \\ {}^t(\sin \theta, \cos \theta) & (\varepsilon_2 = -1), \end{cases}\tag{3.14}$$

$$\lambda_{-1,\varepsilon_2} = \begin{cases} \sin 3\theta & (\varepsilon_2 = 1) \\ \cos 3\theta & (\varepsilon_2 = -1), \end{cases}\tag{3.15}$$

$$a_{-1,\varepsilon_2} = \frac{4\tilde{R}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)^2}{\det \tilde{A}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}}\tag{3.16}$$

hold. Thus $b_\theta \times b_z$ is proportional to

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\nu}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z) & \\ = \begin{cases} (\sin \theta dX_{-1,\varepsilon_2} + \cos \theta dY_{-1,\varepsilon_2})(\theta, x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) & (\varepsilon_2 = 1), \\ (\cos \theta dX_{-1,\varepsilon_2} - \sin \theta dY_{-1,\varepsilon_2})(\theta, x_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) & (\varepsilon_2 = -1), \end{cases}\end{aligned}\tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}dX_{-1,\varepsilon_2} &= {}^t((X_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_x, (X_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_y, (X_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z), \\ dY_{-1,\varepsilon_2} &= {}^t((Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_x, (Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_y, (Y_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_z).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) \neq 0$, the unit vector $\nu_{-1,\varepsilon_2} = \tilde{\nu}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}/|\tilde{\nu}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}|$ is a unit normal vector of b . Since $b_\theta(\theta, 0) = 0$, to show that b is a front it is enough to see $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0)$ and $(\tilde{\nu}_{-1,\varepsilon_2})_\theta(\theta, 0)$ are linearly independent. It is easy to see by dX and dY are linearly independent at $(\theta, 0)$. This shows the assertion. \square

The singular set $S(b)$ is

$$\begin{aligned}S(b) & \\ = \begin{cases} \{(\theta, z) \mid \sin 3\theta = 0\} = \{(n\pi/3, z) \mid n = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} & (\varepsilon_2 = 1), \\ \{(\theta, z) \mid \cos 3\theta = 0\} = \{(n\pi/3 + \pi/2, z) \mid n = -1, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4\} & (\varepsilon_2 = -1). \end{cases}\end{aligned}\tag{3.18}$$

3.2 D_4^+ singularity

We will give a parametrization of the bifurcation set by a similar method to that of Section 3.1 in the case of $\varepsilon_1 = 1$. Let $I = (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon)$ be an open interval. We consider a map $\pi : \mathbf{R} \times I \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^2$ defined by $\pi_1((\theta, r)) = (r \cosh \theta, r \sinh \theta)$.

We assume $\varepsilon_1 = 1$ in (2.4). Then $\det H_F = u^2 - v^2 + R(x, y, z)^2$. We set

$$u = r \cosh 2\theta, \quad v = r \sinh 2\theta.\tag{3.19}$$

Then $r^2 + R^2 = 0$ can be solved by $r = \varepsilon_2 R$, where $\varepsilon_2 = \pm 1$. We set

$$\begin{aligned}X_{1,\varepsilon_2} &= P(x, y, z) + R(x, y, z)^2 \alpha_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta), \\ Y_{1,\varepsilon_2} &= Q(x, y, z) + R(x, y, z)^2 \beta_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta), \\ \alpha_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) &= \frac{\cosh 2\theta^2 + \sinh 2\theta^2}{2} + \varepsilon_2 \cosh 2\theta, \\ \beta_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta) &= \cosh 2\theta \sinh 2\theta - \varepsilon_2 \sinh 2\theta.\end{aligned}\tag{3.20}$$

There exist $x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$ and $y = y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$ such that

$$X_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) = Y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) = 0$$

holds identically. By the same proof as for Lemma 3.1, we have $x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) = y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0) = 0$, $(x_{1,\varepsilon_2})_z(\theta, 0) = (y_{1,\varepsilon_2})_z(\theta, 0) = 0$, $R(x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0), y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, 0), 0) = 0$. Thus there exists a function $\tilde{R}_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$ such that

$$R(\theta, x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) = z\tilde{R}_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z).$$

The bifurcation set, except for its intersection set, can be parameterized by $b(\theta, z) = b_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z) = (x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z)$. We define the source space $\mathbf{R} \times I$ of b_{1,ε_2} by $\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_2}$. By a similar argument as in the case of a D_4^- singularity, setting

$$V_{1,\varepsilon_2} = \begin{cases} {}^t(\cosh \theta, \sinh \theta) & (\varepsilon_2 = 1) \\ {}^t(\sinh \theta, \cosh \theta) & (\varepsilon_2 = -1), \end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

$$\lambda_{1,\varepsilon_2} = \begin{cases} \sinh 3\theta & (\varepsilon_2 = 1) \\ \cosh 3\theta & (\varepsilon_2 = -1), \end{cases} \quad (3.22)$$

$$a_{1,\varepsilon_2} = \frac{4\tilde{R}_{1,\varepsilon_2}^2}{\det \tilde{A}_{1,\varepsilon_2}}, \quad \tilde{A}_{1,\varepsilon_2} = \begin{pmatrix} (Y_{1,\varepsilon_2})_y & -(X_{1,\varepsilon_2})_y \\ -(Y_{1,\varepsilon_2})_x & (X_{1,\varepsilon_2})_x \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.23)$$

we have

$$((x_{1,\varepsilon_2})_\theta, (y_{1,\varepsilon_2})_\theta) = -z^2 \lambda_{1,\varepsilon_2} a_{1,\varepsilon_2} \tilde{A}_{1,\varepsilon_2} V_{1,\varepsilon_2}. \quad (3.24)$$

We set

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{\nu}_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z) \\ &= \begin{cases} (-\cosh \theta dY_{1,\varepsilon_2} + \sinh \theta dX_{1,\varepsilon_2})(x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) & (\varepsilon_2 = 1) \\ (-\sinh \theta dY_{1,\varepsilon_2} + \cosh \theta dX_{1,\varepsilon_2})(x_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), y_{1,\varepsilon_2}(\theta, z), z) & (\varepsilon_2 = -1). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

Then $\nu_{1,\varepsilon_2} = \tilde{\nu}_{1,\varepsilon_2}/|\tilde{\nu}_{1,\varepsilon_2}|$ is a unit normal vector field for b . We can see $b_{1,\varepsilon_2} : \mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_2} \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^3$ are fronts by a similar method as in Section 3.1. The singular set $S(b)$ are

$$S(b) = \begin{cases} \{(\theta, z) \mid \sinh 3\theta = 0\} = \{(0, z)\} & (\varepsilon_2 = 1), \\ \{(\theta, z) \mid \cosh 3\theta = 0\} = \{z = 0\} & (\varepsilon_2 = -1). \end{cases} \quad (3.26)$$

4 Geometry of bifurcation sets

4.1 Asymptotic behavior of parametrization near singular points

Let $b = b_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}$ be the parametrization of the bifurcation set as in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, and $\nu = \nu_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}$ its unit normal vector field. We set the coefficients of the first and second fundamental forms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E &= E_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} = b_\theta \cdot b_\theta, & F &= F_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} = b_\theta \cdot b_z, & G &= G_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} = b_z \cdot b_z, \\ L &= L_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} = -b_\theta \cdot \nu_\theta, & M &= M_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} = -b_\theta \cdot \nu_z, & N &= N_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} = -b_z \cdot \nu_z. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *The coefficients of the first and second fundamental forms satisfy*

$$E = z^4 \lambda(\theta)^2 a(\theta, z)^2 (E_0(\theta) + zE_1(\theta) + z^2 E(\theta, z)), \quad (4.1)$$

$$F = z^3 \lambda(\theta) a(\theta, z) (F_0(\theta) + zF_1(\theta, z)), \quad (4.2)$$

$$G = 1 + z^2 G_0(\theta, z) + z^3 G_1(\theta) + z^4 G_2(\theta, z), \quad (4.3)$$

$$L = z^2 \lambda(\theta) a(\theta, z) |\tilde{\nu}|^{-1} (L_0 + zL_1(\theta) + z^2 L_2(\theta) + z^3 L_3(\theta) + z^4 L_4(\theta, z)), \quad (4.4)$$

$$M = z^2 \lambda(\theta) a(\theta, z) |\tilde{\nu}|^{-1} (M_0(\theta) + zM_1(\theta, z)), \quad (4.5)$$

$$N = |\tilde{\nu}|^{-1} (N_0(\theta) + zN_1(\theta) + z^2 N_2(\theta, z)), \quad (4.6)$$

where $E_i, F_i, G_i, L_i, M_i, N_i$ ($i = 0, 1, \dots, 4$) are functions of variables θ or (θ, z) as indicated, and $a(\theta, z) = a_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$, $\lambda(\theta) = \lambda_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta)$, $\tilde{\nu}(\theta, z) = \tilde{\nu}_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}(\theta, z)$ are defined in (3.14), (3.15), (3.16), (3.21), (3.22), (3.23) respectively. Moreover, $E_0(\theta) > 0$ and L_0 is a non-zero constant.

Proof. By (3.12) and (3.24), it holds that the first two components of b_θ are $z^2 a \lambda A V$, and the third component of b_θ is zero, where $A = A_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}$, $V = V_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2}$. Then we see (4.1), (4.4), (4.5) and $E_0 > 0$. By $x_z(\theta, 0) = y_z(\theta, 0) = 0$, it holds that $b_z(\theta, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$, and this shows (4.3). To show (4.2), since the third component of b_θ is zero, and $b_z(\theta, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$, we see (4.2). We show L_0 is a non-zero constant in the case of $\varepsilon_2 = 1$. It is sufficient to show

$$A^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} -\cos \theta \\ \sin \theta \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot (\tilde{\nu})_\theta \neq 0. \quad (4.7)$$

Since $X_{x\theta} = Y_{x\theta} = X_{y\theta} = Y_{y\theta} = 0$ on $z = 0$, the right-hand side of (4.7) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} -\cos \theta Y_y \\ \cos \theta Y_x + \sin \theta X_x \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -\sin \theta Y_x + \cos \theta X_x \\ -\sin \theta Y_y \end{pmatrix} = X_x(\theta, 0) Y_y(\theta, 0) = g_{1,100} g_{2,010}$$

on $\{z = 0\}$. Thus this is a non-zero constant, and the other cases can be shown by the same calculation. Finally, (4.6) is clear. \square

4.2 Principal curvatures and principal directions

In this section, we first show Theorem A.

Proof of Theorem A. Let K and H be the Gaussian curvature and the mean curvature. By Lemma 4.1, one can see $z^2 \lambda(\theta) K(\theta, z)$ and $z^2 \lambda(\theta) H(\theta, z)$ are C^∞ functions. We define $\tilde{K}, \tilde{H}, \tilde{I}$ by

$$K = \frac{\tilde{K}}{z^2 \lambda a |\tilde{\nu}|^2 \tilde{I}}, \quad H = \frac{\tilde{H}}{2z^2 \lambda a |\tilde{\nu}| \tilde{I}}, \quad \tilde{I} = \frac{EG - F^2}{z^4 \lambda^2 a^2}, \quad (4.8)$$

where we include the variables (θ) and (θ, z) in the notation for functions, when it is clear. Here,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= L_0 + L_1 z + (G_0 L_0 + L_2 + \lambda a E_0 N_0) z^2 + H_3 z^3 + z^4 O(0), \\ H_3 &= G_0 L_1 + L_0 G_1 + L_3 + \lambda (-2a F_0 M_0 + a E_1 N_0 + a E_0 N_1 + (a)_z E_0 N_0), \\ \tilde{K} &= L_0 N_0 + (L_1 N_0 + L_0 N_1) z + z^2 O(0), \\ \tilde{I} &= E_0 + z E_1 + z^2 O(0), \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

where the term $z^i O(0)$ stands for a function of the form $z^i h(\theta, z)$. Then

$$\sqrt{H^2 - K} = \frac{1}{2z^2|\lambda a||\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}} \sqrt{\tilde{H}^2 - 4z^2\lambda a\tilde{I}\tilde{K}}.$$

We note that the function $f(x) = \sqrt{b_1(\theta, z)^2 - 4xb_2(\theta, z)}$ of the variable x ($b_1 \neq 0$) satisfies that $f(0) = |b_1(\theta, z)|$. Thus there exists a function $\tilde{f}(\theta, z, x)$ such that

$$f(x) = |b_1(\theta, z)| - x\tilde{f}(\theta, z, x). \quad (4.10)$$

Substituting $x = z^2\lambda(\theta)$ into (4.10), there exists a function $\tilde{h}(\theta, z)$ such that

$$\sqrt{\tilde{H}^2 - 4z^2\lambda a\tilde{I}\tilde{K}} = |\tilde{H}| - z^2\lambda\tilde{h}.$$

Thus

$$H \pm \sqrt{H^2 - K} = \begin{cases} \frac{\tilde{H}}{z^2\lambda a|\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}} \pm \operatorname{sgn} \lambda \frac{\tilde{h}}{2|a||\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}} \\ \pm \operatorname{sgn} \lambda \frac{\tilde{h}}{2|a||\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}} \end{cases}.$$

We see $\tilde{H}(\theta, 0) \neq 0$ and $|a||\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}(\theta, 0) \neq 0$. This implies that one of the principal curvatures of f is unbounded near $z = 0$ and $S(f)$, and the other is bounded. This proves the assertion. \square

By (4.9), we see that there are no vanishing mean curvature points, no umbilic points, and no points with zero unbounded principal curvature near the singular point. We call the *unbounded principal curvature* the unbounded one, and the *bounded principal curvature* the bounded one. We give evaluation formulas for these principal curvatures, such as $\tilde{h}(\theta, z)$ when $\tilde{H}(0) > 0$. By the square root function ($b_0 \neq 0$) is expanded as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{b_0^2 + b_1z + b_2z^2 + b_3(z)z^3} \\ &= |b_0| + z\frac{b_1}{2|b_0|} + z^2\frac{-b_1^2 + 4b_0^2b_2}{8|b_0|^3} + z^3\frac{b_1^3 - 4b_0^2b_1b_2 + 8b_0^4b_3(0)}{16|b_0|^5} + z^4O(0), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\tilde{H}^2 - 4z^2\lambda a\tilde{I}\tilde{K}} &= L_0 + L_1z + (G_0L_0 + L_2 - \lambda aE_0N_0)z^2 \\ &\quad + (G_0L_1 + G_1L_0 + L_3 - 2\lambda aF_0M_0 - \lambda aE_0N_1 \\ &\quad - aE_1\lambda N_0 - N_0E_0\lambda(a)_z)z^3 + z^4O(0). \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Hence

$$\tilde{h}(\theta, z) = 2aE_0N_0 + 2(aE_0N_1 + aE_1N_0 + E_0N_0(a)_z)z + z^2O(0).$$

Thus the unbounded principal curvature κ_1 and the bounded principal curvature κ_2 can be written as

$$\kappa_1 = \frac{1}{\lambda a|\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}z^2} (L_0 + L_1z + z^2O(0)), \quad (4.12)$$

$$\kappa_2 = \frac{1}{a|\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}} (aE_0N_0 + (aE_1N_0 + aE_0N_1 + (a)_zE_0N_0)z + z^2O(0)). \quad (4.13)$$

By a direct calculation, the principal directions with respect to κ_1 and κ_2 are

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &= a\lambda|\tilde{\nu}|\tilde{I}z^2(-N + \kappa_1 G, M - \kappa_1 F) = (L_0 + zO(0), z^2O(0)), \\ V_2 &= \frac{|\tilde{\nu}|}{z^2\lambda a}(-M + \kappa_2 F, L - \kappa_2 E) = (-M_0 + zO(0), L_0 + zO(0)), \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$

respectively, under the identification $\partial_\theta = (1, 0)$ and $\partial_z = (0, 1)$. Since the zero set of a function $\delta(\theta, z)$ is a regular curve and is transverse to the θ -axis if $\delta_\theta(\theta, 0) \neq 0$ at $(\theta, 0)$ which satisfies $\delta(\theta, 0) = 0$, setting $' = \partial/\partial\theta$, the following proposition holds:

Proposition 4.2. *The ridge curve with respect to the unbounded principal curvature emanates from the direction θ satisfying $a(\theta, 0)(2\lambda'E_0 + 3\lambda E'_0) + 2\lambda E_0 a'(\theta, 0) = 0$ under the condition $(a(\theta, 0)(2E_0\lambda' + 3E'_0\lambda) + 2E_0\lambda a'(\theta, 0))' \neq 0$. The ridge curve with respect to the bounded principal curvature emanates from the direction θ satisfying $-E_1L_0N_0 + E'_0M_0N_0 + 2E_0(L_0N_1 - M_0N'_0) = 0$ under the condition $(-E_1L_0N_0 + E'_0M_0N_0 + 2E_0(L_0N_1 - M_0N'_0))' \neq 0$. There are no subparabolic curves with respect to the unbounded principal curvature. The subparabolic curve with respect to the bounded principal curvature emanates from the direction θ satisfying $2E_0N'_0 - E'_0N_0 = 0$ under the condition $(2E_0N'_0 - E'_0N_0)' \neq 0$.*

Proof. Using (4.12), (4.13) and (4.14), we have the assertions by direct calculations. We note that $\tilde{\nu} \cdot \tilde{\nu} = E_0$, $(\tilde{\nu} \cdot \tilde{\nu})' = E'_0$, $(\tilde{\nu} \cdot \tilde{\nu})_z = E_1$ at $(\theta, 0)$. \square

4.3 Singular curvature and limiting normal curvature

As the set of singular points near the singular point consists of a cuspidal edge, we calculate the singular curvature and limiting normal curvature. For simplicity, we just give conditions for whether their limits vanish or not. By (2.7), κ_n vanishes if and only if N_0 vanishes. Thus if $\varepsilon_1 = -1$, then $\kappa_n = 0$ at $(0, 0)$ (respectively, $(\pi/3, 0)$, $(2\pi/3, 0)$) if and only if $g_{2,002} = 0$ (respectively, $-\sqrt{3}g_{1,002} - g_{2,002} = 0$, $-\sqrt{3}g_{1,002} + g_{2,002} = 0$). These will appear as conditions for the configurations of parabolic curves in Section 4.4. Furthermore, if $\varepsilon_1 = 1$, then $\kappa_n = 0$ at $(0, 0)$ if and only if $g_{2,002} = 0$. On the other hand, by (2.7), (3.17), (3.25) and ${}^t(x_{zz}, y_{zz}) = \det A_{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2} {}^t(X_{zz}, X_{zz})$ at $z = 0$, we obtain that $\kappa_s = 0$ at $(0, 0)$ (respectively, $(\pi/3, 0)$, $(2\pi/3, 0)$) if and only if $K_1 = 0$ (respectively, $K_2 + 2\sqrt{3}K_3 = 0$, $-K_2 + 2\sqrt{3}K_3 = 0$), where

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= g_{1,100}g_{2,002}g_{2,100} - (g_{2,010}^2 + g_{2,100}^2)(g_{1,002} + 3g_{3,001}) \\ K_2 &= (-2g_{1,002} + 3g_{3,001}^2)(g_{2,010}^2 + g_{2,100}^2) + g_{1,100}(2g_{2,002}g_{2,100} + 9g_{1,100}g_{3,001}) \\ K_3 &= g_{1,100}(g_{1,100}g_{2,002} - g_{1,002}g_{2,100} + 3g_{2,100}g_{3,001}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, if $\varepsilon_1 = 1$, then $\kappa_n = 0$ at $(0, 0)$ if and only if $K_1 = 0$.

4.4 Configurations of parabolic curves emanating from D_4^\pm -singularities

In this section, we consider configurations of parabolic curves emanating from D_4^\pm -singularities. By (4.8) and (4.9), and the same reason just before Proposition 4.2, if $N'_0(\theta) \neq 0$ for any θ satisfying $N_0(\theta) = 0$, then the parabolic curve emanating out at the singular point emanates in the direction θ satisfying $N_0(\theta) = 0$ at $(\theta, 0)$ in \hat{M}_{ε_2} or $\mathcal{D}_{\varepsilon_2}$. We set $\xi = g_{2,002}$, $\eta = g_{1,002}$ and $\zeta = g_{3,001}$. We assume $\xi \neq 0$ and $\eta - \zeta^2 \neq 0$. Moreover, we assume $N'_0(\theta) \neq 0$ for any θ such that $N_0(\theta) = 0$. By $b_z(\theta, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$, (3.13) and (3.17), we see that $N_0(\theta) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\xi \cos \theta + \eta \sin \theta + \zeta^2 \sin 3\theta = 0 \quad (\varepsilon_1 = -1, \varepsilon_2 = 1), \quad (4.15)$$

$$-\xi \sin \theta + \eta \cos \theta - \zeta^2 \cos 3\theta = 0 \quad (\varepsilon_1 = -1, \varepsilon_2 = -1), \quad (4.16)$$

$$-\xi \cosh \theta + \eta \sinh \theta + \zeta^2 \sinh 3\theta = 0 \quad (\varepsilon_1 = 1, \varepsilon_2 = 1), \quad (4.17)$$

$$-\xi \sinh \theta + \eta \cosh \theta - \zeta^2 \cosh 3\theta = 0 \quad (\varepsilon_1 = 1, \varepsilon_2 = -1), \quad (4.18)$$

by the assumption $\xi \neq 0$ and $\eta - \zeta^2 \neq 0$, and we see $\cos \theta = 0$, $\sin \theta = 0$ are not the solutions of (4.15), (4.16), and also $\sinh \theta = 0$ is not the solution of (4.17), (4.18).

4.4.1 The case of D_4^- -singularities

Setting $\varepsilon_2 = 1$ and $t = \cot \theta$, the equation (4.15) is equivalent to

$$p(t) = \xi t^3 + (\eta + 3\zeta^2)t^2 + \xi t + \eta - \zeta^2 = 0. \quad (4.19)$$

Thus the number of asymptotic curves emanating from the singular point is generically 3 or 1. In this case, the singular set is $t = \pm 1/\sqrt{3}$. We consider where the solutions t of (4.19) are in $(-\infty, -1/\sqrt{3})$, $(-1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3})$ or $(1/\sqrt{3}, \infty)$. Let D_{-1} be the cubic discriminant of (4.19):

$$D_{-1}/4 = -\xi^4 - 2\xi^2\eta^2 - \eta^4 + 24\xi^2\eta\zeta^2 - 8\eta^3\zeta^2 - 18\xi^2\zeta^4 - 18\eta^2\zeta^4 + 27\zeta^8.$$

We set the following notation for the direction of the parabolic curves. We dividing $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_1$ into $\Omega_1 = \{(\theta, r) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_1 \mid \cot \theta < -1/\sqrt{3}\}$, $\Omega_2 = \{(\theta, r) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_1 \mid -1/\sqrt{3} < \cot \theta < 1/\sqrt{3}\}$, $\Omega_3 = \{(\theta, r) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_1 \mid \cot \theta > 1/\sqrt{3}\}$. For the case of $\varepsilon_2 = -1$, setting $t = \tan \theta$, the equation (4.16) is equivalent to $p(-t) = 0$. Thus the cubic discriminant is the same as D_{-1} . We also divide $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{-1}$ into $\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \{(\theta, r) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{-1} \mid \tan \theta < -1/\sqrt{3}\}$, $\tilde{\Omega}_2 = \{(\theta, r) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{-1} \mid -1/\sqrt{3} < \tan \theta < 1/\sqrt{3}\}$, $\tilde{\Omega}_3 = \{(\theta, r) \in \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{-1} \mid \tan \theta > 1/\sqrt{3}\}$. By (3.17) and (3.18), the directions defined by $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,1}(0, z)$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,-1}(\pi/2, z)$ (respectively, $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,1}(\pi/3, z)$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,-1}(\pi/2 + \pi/3, z)$, $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,1}(2\pi/3, z)$ and $\tilde{\nu}_{-1,-1}(\pi/2 + 2\pi/3, z)$) are continuously connected across $\{z = 0\}$. Thus, the region Ω_1 corresponds to Ω_3 , Ω_3 corresponds to $\tilde{\Omega}_1$, and Ω_2 corresponds to $\tilde{\Omega}_2$. The notation $(ijk|lmn)$, $(i, j, k, l, m, n \in \{1, 2, 3\})$ stands for three parabolic curves of $b_{1,1}$ emanating from the singular point, as they emanate into the regions $\Omega_i, \Omega_j, \Omega_k$, and three parabolic curves of $b_{1,-1}$ emanating from the singular point, as they emanate into the regions $\tilde{\Omega}_l, \tilde{\Omega}_m, \tilde{\Omega}_n$, respectively. We set $c_1 = \sqrt{3}\xi + \eta + 3\zeta^2$, $c_2 = \sqrt{3}\xi - \eta - 3\zeta^2$. We have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.3. *The regions $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3, \tilde{\Omega}_1, \tilde{\Omega}_2, \tilde{\Omega}_3$ that the parabolic curves emanating from the singular point which emanate into are summarized as in the “configurations” column of Table 4.1 according to the sign of D_{-1} .*

Needless to say, geometrically, all of the cases (iij) ($i \neq j$) are the same. Thus we can draw the pictures of the configurations of parabolic curves in Figure 4.2. We draw “open” pictures instead of the usual pictures as in Figure 4.1, with the parabolic curves drawn as thick lines, the set of singular points drawn thin as lines, and the intersection curves drawn as thin dotted lines. To show the theorem, we use the following fact, known as Budan’s theorem or Descartes’ rule of signs (see [1], for example):

Fact 4.4. *Let $p(t)$ be a polynomial in t . Then the number of roots of $p(t)$ that are greater than α is the same or less than the number of sign changes in the sequence of the coefficients of $p(t + \alpha)$, and their difference is an even number. Furthermore, the number of roots of $p(t)$ that are less than α is the same or less than the number of sign changes in the sequence of the coefficients of $p(-t + \alpha)$, and their difference is an even number.*

Case name	ξ	$-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta$	$\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta$	c_1	c_2	configurations	
						$D_{-1} > 0$	$D_{-1} < 0$
(I-1)	+	+	+	+	any	(223 122)	(3 1)
(I-2-1-1)	+	-	+	+	+	(222 222)	(2 2)
(I-2-1-2)	+	-	+	+	-	(233 112)	(2 2)
(I-2-2-1)	+	-	-	any	+	(122 223)	(1 3)
(I-2-2-2)	+	-	-	+	-	(133 113)	(1 3)
(II-1-1-1)	-	+	+	any	-	(122 223)	(1 3)
(II-1-2-1)	-	+	-	+	-	(112 233)	(2 2)
(II-1-2-2)	-	+	-	-	-	(222 222)	(2 2)
(II-2-2-1)	-	-	-	+	-	(113 133)	(3 1)
(II-2-2-2)	-	-	-	-	any	(223 122)	(3 1)

Table 4.1: Configurations of parabolic curves.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. We assume $\varepsilon_2 = 1$. Using Fact 4.4, to study the numbers of roots of $p(t) = 0$ in each interval $(-\infty, -1/\sqrt{3})$, $(-1/\sqrt{3}, 1/\sqrt{3})$, $(1/\sqrt{3}, \infty)$, we look at the numbers of sign changes of

$$\begin{aligned}
p_1(t) &= 9p(t + 1/\sqrt{3}) = 9\xi t^3 + 9c_1 t^2 + 6\sqrt{3}c_1 t + 4\sqrt{3}(\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta), \\
p_2(t) &= 9p(t - 1/\sqrt{3}) = 9\xi t^3 - 9c_2 t^2 + 6\sqrt{3}c_2 t + 4\sqrt{3}(-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta), \\
p_3(t) &= 9p(-t + 1/\sqrt{3}) = -9\xi t^3 + 9c_1 t^2 - 6\sqrt{3}c_1 t + 4\sqrt{3}(\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta), \\
p_4(t) &= 9(-t - 1/\sqrt{3}) = -9\xi t^3 - 9c_2 t^2 - 6\sqrt{3}c_2 t + 4\sqrt{3}(-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta).
\end{aligned}$$

We look at the number of sign changes of these polynomials under the conditions of each case. It is summarized in Table 4.2.

case	p_1	p_2	p_3	p_4
(I-1) (II-2-2-2)	0			1
(I-2-1-1)	0			0
(I-2-1-2)	0	1		
(I-2-2-1) (II-1-1-1)	1			0
(I-2-2-2)	1	1		
(II-1-2-1)			1	0
(II-2-2-1)			1	1

Table 4.2: Necessary number of sign changes.

We first consider the case (I): $\xi > 0$. We assume (I-1): $-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta > 0$. Then $\eta > 0$, $\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta > 0$ and $c_1 > 0$ hold. Since the number of sign changes in the sequence $\xi, c_1, c_1, \xi + \sqrt{3}\eta$ of the coefficients of p_1 (the number of sign changes in p_1) is zero, there are no roots in $(1/\sqrt{3}, \infty)$, since the number of sign changes in p_4 i.e., the number of sign changes in $-\xi, -c_2, -c_2, -\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta$ is one for any of the cases of c_2 , thus the configuration of the roots is (223) or (3) according to the sign of D_{-1} . We assume (I-2): $-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta < 0$. We consider the case (I-2-1): $\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta > 0$. Then $\sqrt{3}c_1 = 2\xi + \xi + \sqrt{3}\eta + 3\sqrt{3}\zeta^2 > 0$. Since the number of sign changes in p_1 is zero, there are no roots in $(1/\sqrt{3}, \infty)$. If $c_2 > 0$, then the number of sign changes in p_4 is 0. So, in this




Figure 4.1: Usual pictures (left) and “open” pictures (right)




Figure 4.2: The configurations (112), (222), (1) (left to right) of parabolic curves ($\varepsilon_1 = -1$)

case we have the configuration is (222) or (2). If $c_2 < 0$, then the number of sign changes in p_2 is 1. So, in this case we have (233) or (2). We consider the case (I-2-2): $\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta < 0$. Then the number of sign changes in p_1 is 1. If $c_2 > 0$, then the number of sign changes in p_4 is 0. So, in this case we have (122) or (1). If $c_2 < 0$, then the number of sign changes in p_2 is 1. So, in this case we have (133) or (1). We second consider the case (II): $\xi < 0$. We assume (II-1): $-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta > 0$. We consider the case (II-1-1): $\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta > 0$. Then $\eta > 0$ and $c_2 < 0$. The number of sign changes in p_1 is 1 for any c_1 , and there are no sign changes in p_4 . So, in this case we have (122) or (1). We consider the case (II-1-2): $\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta < 0$. Then $c_2 < 0$ holds. If $c_1 > 0$ (II-1-2-1), then the number of sign changes in p_3 is 1, and that in p_4 is zero. So, in this case we have (112) or (2). If $c_1 < 0$ (II-1-2-2), then the number of sign changes in p_1 and p_3 are both 0. So, in this case we have (222) or (2). We assume (II-2): $-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta < 0$. Then $\eta > 0$ and $\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta < 0$. If $c_1 > 0$, then the number of sign changes in p_3 and p_4 are both 1 for any c_2 . So this case (113), (3). If $c_1 < 0$, then there is no sign changes in p_1 and the number of sign changes in p_4 is 1. So this case (223), (3). Since the above takes all the possibilities of signs of ξ , $-\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta$, $\xi + \sqrt{3}\eta$, c_1 and c_2 , we see the assertion. For the case of $b_{-1,-1}$, since the equation which we have to consider is $p(-t)$, the configurations of this case can be obtained by interchanging Ω_1 with $\tilde{\Omega}_3$, Ω_2 with $\tilde{\Omega}_2$ and Ω_3 with $\tilde{\Omega}_1$. \square

4.4.2 The case of D_4^+ -singularity

Setting $t = \coth \theta$, the equation (4.17) is equivalent to

$$q(t) = -\xi t^3 + (\eta + 3\zeta^2)t^2 + \xi t - \eta + \zeta^2 = 0, \quad (4.20)$$

and setting $t = \tanh \theta$, the equation (4.18) is equivalent to $q(t) = 0$. Thus the number of asymptotic curves emanating from the singular point in $(\mathcal{D}_1 \cup \mathcal{D}_{-1}) \cap \{r > 0\}$ is generically 3 or 1 according to the cubic discriminant D_1 of $q(t) = 0$:

$$D_1/4 = \xi^4 - 2\xi^2\eta^2 + \eta^4 + 24\xi^2\eta\zeta^2 + 8\eta^3\zeta^2 - 18\xi^2\zeta^4 + 18\eta^2\zeta^4 - 27\zeta^8.$$

We divide \mathcal{D}_1 and \mathcal{D}_{-1} into the regions $\Omega_1 = \{(\theta, r) \in \mathcal{D}_1 \mid r > 0, \coth \theta < -1\}$, $\Omega_2 = \{(\theta, r) \in \mathcal{D}_{-1} \mid r > 0\}$, $\Omega_3 = \{(\theta, r) \in \mathcal{D}_1 \mid r > 0, \coth \theta > 1\}$, $\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \{(\theta, r) \in \mathcal{D}_1 \mid r < 0, \coth \theta < -1\}$, $\tilde{\Omega}_2 = \{(\theta, r) \in \mathcal{D}_{-1} \mid r < 0\}$, $\tilde{\Omega}_3 = \{(\theta, r) \in \mathcal{D}_1 \mid r < 0, \coth \theta > 1\}$. The notation $(ijk|lmn)$, $(i, j, k, l, m, n \in \{1, 2, 3\})$ stands for three parabolic curves of $b_{1,1}|_{\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \{r > 0\}}$ (if i, j, k is 1 or 3) or $b_{1,-1}|_{\mathcal{D}_{-1} \cap \{r > 0\}}$ (if i, j, k is 2) emanating from the singular point, as they emanate into the regions $\Omega_i, \Omega_j, \Omega_k$, and three parabolic curves of $b_{1,1}|_{\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \{r < 0\}}$ (if l, m, n is 1 or 3) or $b_{1,-1}|_{\mathcal{D}_1 \cap \{r < 0\}}$ (if l, m, n is 2) emanating from the singular point, as they emanate into the regions $\tilde{\Omega}_l, \tilde{\Omega}_m, \tilde{\Omega}_n$. We set $c_3 = \eta + 3\zeta^2$, $c_4 = -\eta + \zeta^2$. We have the following theorem:

Theorem 4.5. *The regions $\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \Omega_3, \tilde{\Omega}_1, \tilde{\Omega}_2, \tilde{\Omega}_3$ that the way how the parabolic curves emanate from the singular point to the regions are summarized as in the “configurations” columns in the Tables 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 according to the sign of D_1 .*

assumption I: $\xi > 0, c_3 > 0$	$3\xi + c_3$	$3\xi - c_3$	$\xi + c_3$	$\xi - c_3$	c_4	configurations	
						$D_1 > 0$	$D_1 < 0$
(I-1-1)	+	+	+	any	+	(122 223)	(1 3)
(I-1-2)	+	+	+	any	−	(122 223)	no
(I-2-1)	+	−	+	−	+	(122 223)	(1 3)
(I-2-2)	+	−	+	−	−	(122 223)	no

Table 4.3: Configurations of parabolic curves when $\xi > 0, c_3 > 0$.

assumption II: $\xi < 0, c_3 > 0$	$3\xi + c_3$	$3\xi - c_3$	$\xi + c_3$	$\xi - c_3$	c_4	configurations	
						$D_1 > 0$	$D_1 < 0$
(II-1-1)	+	−	+	−	+	(223 122)	(3 1)
(II-2-1)	−	−	+	−	+	(223 122)	(3 1)
(II-3-1)	−	−	−	−	+	(223 122)	(3 1)
(II-1-2)	+	−	+	−	−	(223 122)	no
(II-2-2)	−	−	any	−	−	(223 122)	(3 1)

Table 4.4: Configurations of parabolic curves when $\xi < 0, c_3 > 0$.

The pictures of the configurations of parabolic curves are in Figure 4.3.

Proof. We show the assertion by the same method as in the proof of Theorem 4.3. Since the method is completely the same, we state here just the information about sign changes. We set

assumption III: $\xi < 0, c_3 < 0$	$3\xi + c_3$	$3\xi - c_3$	$\xi + c_3$	$\xi - c_3$	c_4	configurations	
						$D_1 > 0$	$D_1 < 0$
(III-1-1)	—	—	—	—	+	(223 122)	(3 1)
(III-2-1)	—	any	—	+	+	(113 133)	(3 1)

Table 4.5: Configurations of parabolic curves when $\xi < 0, c_3 < 0$.

assumption IV: $\xi > 0, c_3 < 0$	$3\xi + c_3$	$3\xi - c_3$	$\xi + c_3$	$\xi - c_3$	c_4	configurations	
						$D_1 > 0$	$D_1 < 0$
(IV-1-1)	any	+	—	+	+	(133 133)	(1 3)
(IV-2-1)	+	+	+	+	+	(122 223)	(1 3)

Table 4.6: Configurations of parabolic curves when $\xi > 0, c_3 < 0$.

$q_1(t) = q(t)$ as in (4.20), $q_2(t) = q_1(-t)$, $q_3(t) = q_1(t+1)$, $q_4(t) = q_1(t-1)$, $q_5(t) = q_1(-t+1)$ and $q_6(t) = q_1(-t-1)$. Then each coefficient of these polynomials is one of $\xi, c_3, 3\xi + c_3, 3\xi - c_3, \xi + c_3, \xi - c_3$ and c_4 . The necessary number of sign changes of these polynomials under the conditions of each case are given in Table 4.7, and it takes all the possibilities of signs of $\xi, c_3, 3\xi + c_3, 3\xi - c_3, \xi + c_3, \xi - c_3$ and c_4 , the assertion for the case of $r > 0$ is proven. Since

case	q_1	q_2	q_3	q_4	q_5	q_6
(I-1-1), (I-2-1), (IV-2-1)	1		1			0
(I-1-2), (I-2-2)		1	1			0
(II-1-1), (II-2-1), (II-3-1), (III-1-1)		1	0			1
(II-1-2), (II-2-2)	1		0			1
(III-2-1)		1			1	1
(IV-1-1)	1		1	1		

Table 4.7: Necessary number of sign changes.

$(-r \cosh \theta, -r \sinh \theta)$ is a π -rotation of $(r \cosh \theta, r \sinh \theta)$, the configurations of the case $r < 0$ can be obtained by interchanging Ω_1 with $\tilde{\Omega}_3$, Ω_2 with $\tilde{\Omega}_2$ and Ω_3 with $\tilde{\Omega}_1$. \square

4.5 Number of ridges and subparabolic curves

Here we show Theorem B. A pair of two hyperbolic-trigonometric polynomials

$$g_n(s) = \sum_{1 \leq i+j \leq n} a_{i,j} \cosh^i s \sinh^j s \text{ and } h_n(s) = \sum_{1 \leq i+j \leq n} b_{i,j} \cosh^j s \sinh^i s,$$

satisfying $a_{i,j} = b_{i,j} = 0$ for any odd $i+j$, or $a_{i,j} = b_{i,j} = 0$ for any even $i+j$, are said to be *adapted* if by setting $\cosh s = 1/(1-t^2)^{1/2}$, $\sinh s = t/(1-t^2)^{1/2}$, ($t = \tanh s$), the polynomial $(1-t^2)^{n/2}g_n(s)$ with respect to t , and the polynomial $(1-t^2)^{n/2}h_n(s)/t^n$ with respect to $1/t$, are the same. For example, since $\cosh 3s = (1-t^2)^{-3/2}(1+3t^2)$, $\sinh 3s = (1-t^2)^{-3/2}t^3(1+3t^{-2})$, the pair $\cosh 3s$ and $\sinh 3s$ is adapted.

Lemma 4.6. (1) *The number of roots of $f_n(s) = \sum_{i+j=1}^n a_{i,j} \cos^i s \sin^j s$ is at most n for $s \in [0, \pi)$ if $d(f_n)/ds(s) \neq 0$ for all s satisfying $f_n(s) = 0$.* (2) *We assume that the pair of two*




Figure 4.3: The configurations (113), (122), (1), (2) (left to right) of parabolic curves in the case of $\varepsilon_1 = -1$

hyperbolic-trigonometric polynomials $g_n(s)$ and $h_n(s)$ is adapted. Then the sum of the numbers of roots $s \in \mathbf{R}$ of $g_n(s) = 0$ and $h_n(s) = 0$ is at most n under the condition $d(g_n)/ds(s) \neq 0$ (respectively, $d(h_n)/ds(s) \neq 0$) for all s satisfying $g_n(s) = 0$ (respectively, $h_n(s) = 0$).

Proof. If $s = \pm\pi/2$ are solutions, factoring out $\cos s$ from $f_n(s)$, and we may assume $s = \pm\pi/2$ are not solutions of $f_n(s) = 0$. Setting $\cos s = \pm 1/(1 + \tan^2 s)^{1/2}$ and $\sin s = \pm \tan s/(1 + \tan^2 s)^{1/2}$, twice the number of roots of the equation $f_n(s) = 0$ can be reduced to a polynomial equation with respect to $\tan s$ with degree $2n$. This shows (1). See [4, Lemma 2] for a detailed proof. For a proof of (2), setting $\cosh s = 1/(1 - t)^{1/2}$ and $\sinh s = t/(1 - t)^{1/2}$, ($t = \tanh s$), since g_n and h_n consist only of the terms where $i + j$ is odd or even, and the equations $g_n(s) = 0$, $h_n(s) = 0$ are reduced to the same polynomial equations with respect to t and $1/t$, respectively, with degree n . Since $\tanh s$ takes value in $(-1, 1)$, we see the assertion. \square

The number n of the above f_n (respectively, g_n , h_n), is called the *degree*, and it is denoted by $\deg(f_n)$ (respectively, $\deg(g_n)$, $\deg(h_n)$). We give a proof of Theorem B under the same assumption as in Proposition 4.2.

Proof of Theorem B. We see the degrees of

$$\begin{aligned} C_1(\theta) &= a(\theta, 0)(2\lambda'E_0 + 3\lambda E'_0) + 2\lambda E_0 a_z(\theta, 0), \\ C_2(\theta) &= -E_1 L_0 N_0 + E'_0 M_0 N_0 + 2E_0(L_0 N_1 - M_0 N'_0), \\ C_3(\theta) &= 2E_0 N'_0 - E'_0 N_0. \end{aligned}$$

These appear as the conditions of Proposition 4.2. We easily see $\deg(L_0) = \deg(a) = 0$, $\deg(\lambda) = \deg(\lambda') = 3$, and λ, λ' have only odd degree terms. Furthermore, we see $\deg(E_0) = \deg(E'_0) = 2$, $\deg(E_1) = 4$ and these have only even degree terms. For the degree of a_z , by (3.16) and (3.23), the degrees of a_z is the same as that of α and β . Thus $\deg(a_z) = 4$, and it has only even degree terms. We now consider the degrees of M_0, N_0, N'_0, N_1 . We assume $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_2 = 1$. Since $M_0 = \langle \tilde{A}V, \tilde{\nu}_z \rangle(\theta, 0)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nu}_z &= (-\cosh \theta dY + \sinh \theta dX)_z \\ &= -\cosh \theta (dY_x x_z + dY_y y_z + dY_z) + \sinh \theta (dX_x x_z + dX_y y_z + dX_z) \end{aligned}$$

at $(\theta, 0)$ which has degree 3, together with $\deg(V) = 1$, $\deg(dY_z) = \deg(dX_z) = 2$, we have $\deg(M_0) = 4$. Moreover, we see M_0 has only even degree terms. Similarly, we see $\deg(N_0) = \deg(N'_0) = 3$ and they have only odd degree terms. Since $\deg(\alpha) = \deg(\beta) = 4$, it holds

that $\deg(x_{zz}) = \deg(y_{zz}) = \deg(X_{zz}) = \deg(Y_{zz}) = 4$ and they have only even degree terms. Furthermore, since $b_z(\theta, 0) = (0, 0, 1)$, $b_{zz} = (x_{zz}, y_{zz}, 0)$,

$$\tilde{\nu}_{zz} = -\cosh \theta(dY_x x_{zz} + dY_y y_{zz} + dY_{zz}) + \sinh \theta(dX_x x_{zz} + dX_y y_{zz} + dX_{zz})$$

at $(\theta, 0)$ and $2(\alpha \sinh \theta - \beta \cosh \theta) = \sinh 3\theta$, we have $\deg(N_1) = 7$, and has only odd degree terms. Thus $\deg(C_1) = \deg(C_2) = 9$ and $\deg(C_3) = 5$. On the other hand, by (3.20), (3.21) and (3.22), the degrees of C_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) in the case of $\varepsilon_2 = -1$ are the same as the case of $\varepsilon_2 = 1$. Moreover, for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, the pair C_i ($\varepsilon_2 = \pm 1$) of hyperbolic-trigonometric polynomial is adapted, so we have the assertion. For the case of $\varepsilon_1 = -1$, we can obtain the degrees by similar calculations. Summarizing up these degrees, Proposition 4.2 and the fact that each D_4^\pm singularity consists of two sheets which correspond to $\varepsilon_2 = \pm 1$ respectively, we have the assertion. \square

References

- [1] B. Anderson, J. Jackson and M. Sitharam *Descartes' rule of signs revisited*, Amer. Math. Monthly **105** (1998), 447–451.
- [2] V. I. Arnold, S. M. Gusein-Zade, and A. N. Varchenko, *Singularities of differentiable maps*, Vol. **1**, Monographs in Mathematics **82**, Birkhäuser, Boston, 1985.
- [3] T. Fukui and M. Hasegawa, *Fronts of Whitney umbrella — a differential geometric approach via blowing up*, J. Singul. **4** (2012), 35–67.
- [4] M. Hasegawa, *Parabolic, ridge and sub-parabolic curves on implicit surfaces with singularities*, Osaka J. Math. **54** (2017), no. 4, 707–721.
- [5] H. Hironaka, *Stratification and flatness*. Real and complex singularities (Proc. Ninth Nordic Summer School/NAVF Sympos. Math., Oslo, 1976), pp. 199–265. Sijthoff and Noordhoff, Alphen aan den Rijn, 1977.
- [6] S. Izumiya and M. Takahashi, *Spacelike parallels and evolutes in Minkowski pseudo-spheres*, J. Geom. Phys. **57** (2007), no. 8, 1569–1600.
- [7] S. Izumiya, *The theory of graph-like Legendrian unfoldings: equivalence relations*, Singularities in generic geometry, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., **78** (2018), 107–161.
- [8] S. Izumiya, M. C. Romero-Fuster, M. A. S. Ruas and F. Tari, *Differential Geometry from a Singularity Theory Viewpoint*. World Scientific Pub. Co Inc. 2015.
- [9] M. Kokubu, W. Rossman, M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *Flat fronts in hyperbolic 3-space and their caustics*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **59** (2007), no. 1, 265–299.
- [10] L. F. Martins and K. Saji, *Geometric invariants of cuspidal edges*, Canad. J. Math. **68** (2016), no. 2, 445–462.
- [11] L. F. Martins, K. Saji, M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *Behavior of Gaussian curvature and mean curvature near non-degenerate singular points on wave fronts*, Geometry and topology of manifolds, 247–281, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., **154**, Springer, 2016.

- [12] R. Oset Sinha and F. Tari, *On the flat geometry of the cuspidal edge*, Osaka J. Math. **55** (2018), no. 3, 393–421.
- [13] K. Saji, M. Umehara and K. Yamada, *The geometry of fronts*, Ann. of Math. **169** (2009), no. 2, 491–529.
- [14] K. Teramoto, *Principal curvatures and parallel surfaces of wave fronts*, Adv. Geom. **19** (2019), no. 4, 541–554.
- [15] V. M. Zakalyukin, *Lagrangian and Legendre singularities*, Funcational Anal. Appl. **10** (1976), no. 1, 23–31.

(Saji)
 Department of Mathematics,
 Graduate School of Science,
 Kobe University,
 Rokkodai 1-1, Nada, Kobe
 657-8501, Japan
 E-mail: saji@math.kobe-u.ac.jp

(Santos)
 Departamento de Matemática, Ibilce,
 Universidade Estadual Paulista (Unesp),
 R. Cristóvão Colombo, 2265, Jd Nazareth,
 15054-000 São José do Rio Preto, SP, Brazil
 E-mail: samuelp.santos@hotmail.com