Energetic Rigidity: a Unifying Theory of Mechanical Stability
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Rigidity regulates the integrity and function of many physical and biological systems. In this work, we propose that “energetic rigidity,” in which all non-trivial deformations raise the energy of a structure, is a more useful notion of rigidity in practice than two more commonly used rigidity tests: Maxwell-Calladine constraint counting (first-order rigidity) and second-order rigidity. We find that constraint counting robustly predicts energetic rigidity only when the system has no states of self stress. When the system has states of self stress, we show that second-order rigidity can imply energetic rigidity in systems that are not considered rigid based on constraint counting, and is even more reliable than shear modulus. We also show that there may be systems for which neither first nor second-order rigidity imply energetic rigidity. We apply our formalism to examples in two dimensions: random regular spring networks, vertex models, and jammed packings of soft disks. Spring networks and vertex models are both highly under-constrained and first-order constraint counting does not predict their rigidity, but second-order rigidity does. In contrast, jammed packings are over-constrained and thus first-order rigid, meaning that constraint counting is equivalent to energetic rigidity as long as prestresses in the system are sufficiently small. The formalism of energetic rigidity unifies our understanding of mechanical stability and also suggests new avenues for material design.

I. INTRODUCTION

How do we know if a material or structure is rigid? If we are holding it in our hands, we might choose to push on it to determine whether any small, applied displacement generates a proportional restoring force. If so, we say it is rigid. A structure that does not push back is floppy. In this paper, we call this intuitive definition of rigidity “energetic rigidity” by virtue of the fact that small deformations increase the elastic energy of the structure. In many situations of interest, it is impossible or impractical to push on a structure to measure the restoring force. In designing new mechanical metamaterials, for example, we would like to sort through possible designs quickly, without having to push on every variation of a structure. In biological tissues such as the cartilage of joints or the bodies of developing organisms, it is often difficult to develop non-disruptive experimental rheological tools at the required scale. Or we may wish to understand how some tissues can tune their mechanical rigidity in order to adapt such functionality into new bio-inspired materials.

To that end, we would like a theory that can predict whether a given structure is energetically rigid rapidly and without the need for large-scale simulations or experiments. Perhaps surprisingly, no such theory exists in even simple cases. Indeed, determining whether even a planar network of springs is rigid is NP-hard [1]. This has inspired the search for proxies: simple tests that, when satisfied, imply a structure is rigid [2,6]. Their existence indicates that, in a practical sense, identifying energetically rigid structures is possible in many, though not all cases.

The standard proxy for rigidity in particulate systems comes from Maxwell [6]. When two particles interact, for example through a contact, that interaction constrains each particle’s motion. If a system has fewer constraints than the particles have degrees of freedom, it is said to be under-constrained and therefore one expects it to be floppy. This thinking has been successfully applied to many examples of athermal systems, such as jammed granular packings, randomly diluted spring networks, and stress diluted networks [7,10]. A straightforward extension of Maxwell’s argument, known as the Maxwell-Calladine index theorem [2,11], shows that one should also subtract the number of states of self stress, equilibrium states of the system that can carry a load, because they arise from redundant constraints. In hinge-bar networks, these ideas can be exploited to design mechanical metamaterials with topologically protected mechanisms [11-15]. Indeed, the Maxwell-Calladine index theorem applies generically to spring networks, that is for almost every set of equilibrium edge lengths [5].

A strong challenge to using this constraint counting proxy to determine rigidity is provided by recent observations of rigidity transitions in experiments [16,20] and models [21,30] for biopolymer networks, and experiments [31,57] and models [58,14] for cellularized biological tissues. These rigidity transitions do not involve changes to constraints or network topology, and are driven instead by tuning a continuous control parameter – the applied strain in biopolymer networks and cell shape in biological tissues. Merkel et al. recently suggested that both types of rigidity transitions can be understood in terms of a geometric incompatibility between the constraints and the physical space available.
to the system, and showed that the transition coincides with the appearance of a system-spanning state of self stress [29]. For finite-size systems, the state of self stress can be used to predict scaling of elastic properties near the transition, though other numerical results suggest that different scaling may arise in the thermodynamic limit [45]. Materials that can be rigidified by tuning a continuous parameter provide an attractive path forward for designing metamaterials with programmed and dynamic properties [40, 47].

So how and why does naive constraint counting fail? Seminal work by Yan and Bi [44] emphasizes that the rank of the full Hessian matrix, the matrix of second derivatives of the energy including effects beyond first-order perturbations, determines rigidity in vertex models for cellularized biological tissues. In particular systems, weakly aspherical ellipsoids that are highly under-constrained show stable packings where finite-amplitude motions cost energy [8, [45]-[50]]. Even in over-constrained elastic networks, prestresses have been shown to affect the stability of the system [51]. Moreover, triangulated origami requires one to consider higher order perturbations to the constraints to correctly predict the number of degrees of freedom [52]. Taken together, these analyses highlight that rigidity is fundamentally nonlinear.

The importance of nonlinear rigidity has already been highlighted by mathematicians and engineers in the context of bar-joint frameworks, origami, and tensegrities [3-5, 52-54]. In such systems, the focus has been on so-called "structural rigidity"—whether the geometric constraints are preserved—rather than on "energetic rigidity"—whether the energy is preserved. In particular, Connelly and Whitely [4] demonstrate that in tensegrities there exist states where a different proxy, termed "second-order rigidity", is sufficient to ensure that the constraints are preserved. Importantly, that work focuses on the existence of such states, which do not have to be initialized in a state at the local minimum of an energy functional.

However, in many physical systems of interest, the dynamics or boundary conditions that drive the system towards rigidity select specific, non-generic states at the transition point [55]. Therefore, instead of demonstrating the existence of states where second-order rigidity implies structural rigidity, we instead ask a different question: what can we say about energetic rigidity for systems that are at an energy minimum and correspond to highly non-generic states selected by physical dynamics? In particular, is it possible to find or design structures where motions preserve the energy but not the individual constraints? In an important sense, such a structure would still be floppy.

To answer this question we develop a generalized formalism for understanding the rigidity of energetically stable physical materials, extending previous work on the theory of second-order rigidity. Specifically, we demonstrate that the onset of rigidity upon tuning a continuous parameter emerges from the effects of geometric incompatibility arising from higher-order corrections to Maxwell-Calladine constraint counting. Depending on the prestresses in the system and features of the eigenvalue spectrum, we identify different cases where first-order or second-order rigidity imply energetic rigidity. We then apply the formalism to three systems: under-constrained spring networks, vertex model, and jammed packings of 2D disks. We show that our formalism can explain the origin of rigidity in these systems and discuss new research directions suggested by this understanding.

II. FORMALISM

In this section, we will discuss what makes a physical system rigid. We assume the state of the system is described by $N_{\text{dof}}$ generalized coordinates, $x_n$. For example, the coordinates \{$x_n$\} might represent the components of the positions of all vertices in a spring network. We also introduce $M$ strains of the form $f_\alpha(\{x_n\})$ and assume the physical system is characterized by the Hooke-like energy, $E$, of the form

$$E = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{M} k_\alpha f_\alpha(\{x_n\})^2,$$

where $k_\alpha > 0$ is the stiffness associated with each strain.

It is important to note that, although structural rigidity depends on geometry only, energetic rigidity must depend on the particular energy functional. Though energies of the form of Eq. (1) encompass a broad array of physical systems, some details could change if a different functional was considered. Nevertheless, it is natural that a useful definition of floppiness would depend on the energy functional itself.

In Eq. (1), the functions $f_\alpha$ then serve as the constraints in Maxwell-Calladine counting arguments. Without loss of generality, we absorb $k_\alpha$ into $f_\alpha$ by rescaling it by $\sqrt{k_\alpha}$ and writing $E = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{M} f_\alpha^2/2$. Throughout this paper, we will assume that the system is at a local minimum of energy, meaning that no small perturbations can lower the energy.

As an example, for a $d$-dimensional spring network of $N$ vertices connected via $M$ springs with rest length $L_0$ in a fixed periodic box, $N_{\text{dof}} = dN$ and the strain associated with spring $\alpha$ connecting vertices $i$ and $j$ at positions $\mathbf{X}_i$ and $\mathbf{X}_j$ is simply the strain of the spring, $f_\alpha = L_\alpha - L_0$, where $L_\alpha = |\mathbf{X}_j - \mathbf{X}_i|$ is the actual length of the spring.

We can capture the intuitive notion of rigidity or floppiness by considering the behavior of Eq. (1) under deformations. A system is energetically rigid if any global motion that is not a trivial translation or rotation increases the energy. A global motion is one that extends through the entire system so as to exclude rattlers or danglers. If there exists a nontrivial, global motion that preserves the energy, we call the system floppy. If, for a given system at an energy minimum, all the strains
vanish, \( f_α = 0 \) for all \( α \), and the system is *unstressed*. Otherwise, we say the system is *prestressed*.

### A. Standard proxies of energetic rigidity

Experimentally, the standard proxy used to determine whether the system is energetically rigid is the shear modulus, \( G \), defined as the second derivative of energy with respect to a shear variable \( γ \) in the limit of zero shear [37, 43]:

\[
G = \frac{1}{V} \frac{d^2 E}{dγ^2} = \frac{1}{V} \left( \frac{∂^2 E}{∂γ^2} - \sum_1 λ_t \left[ \sum_n \frac{∂^2 E}{∂γ∂x_n} u_n^{(l)} \right] \right),
\]

where \( V \) is the volume of the system while \( λ_t \) and \( u_n^{(l)} \) are respectively the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of the Hessian matrix, \( H_{nm} = ∂^2 E/∂x_n∂x_m \), and the sum excludes eigenmodes with \( λ_t = 0 \). When \( G ≠ 0 \), the system is certainly energetically rigid. Note that this is closely allied with the mathematical notion of prestress stability [1] (see Appendix A). On the other hand, if \( H_{nm} \) has global, nontrivial zero eigenmodes (or more precisely, zero eigenmodes that overlap with the shear degree of freedom), \( G = 0 \) [44].

Importantly, defining rigidity based on \( G \) is not equivalent to energetic rigidity. Specifically, \( G ≠ 0 \) implies the system is energetically rigid, but \( G = 0 \) does not imply floppiness. As highlighted in Appendix A, there may be quartic corrections in \( δx_n \) that increase the energy even with vanishing shear modulus. Moreover, in many cases of interest these quartic corrections are expected to dominate precisely at the onset of rigidity.

A definition of rigidity based on \( G \) is equivalent to examining the Hessian matrix \( H \) directly: if \( H \) is positive definite on the global, non-trivial deformations, then the system is also energetically rigid. Writing out the Hessian matrix in terms of the constraints, we find

\[
H_{nm} = \frac{∂^2 E}{∂x_n∂x_m} = \sum_α \left[ \frac{∂f_α}{∂x_n} \frac{∂f_α}{∂x_m} + f_α \frac{∂^2 f_α}{∂x_n∂x_m} \right]
= (R^T R)_{nm} + P_{nm},
\]

where

\[
R_{αn} = \frac{∂f_α}{∂x_n}
\]

is known as the rigidity matrix. We call \((R^T R)_{nm}\) the Gram term (as it is the Gramian of rigidity matrix), and \(P_{nm}\) the prestress matrix because it is only nonzero if \( f_α ≠ 0 \) (Gram term and prestress matrix are sometimes called stiffness matrix and geometric stiffness matrix respectively in structural engineering [4, 53]). If the Hessian has at least one global nontrivial zero direction, we obtain the necessary (but not sufficient) condition for floppiness,

\[
\sum_{nm} P_{nm} δx_n δx_m = -\sum_{nm} (R^T R)_{nm} δx_n δx_m = -\sum_α \left( \sum_n \frac{∂f_α}{∂x_n} δx_n \right)^2,
\]

where the sum over \( α \) is over all constraints and, again, trivial Euclidean modes have been excluded. Analogous to our discussion of \( G \) above, a definition of rigidity based on \( H \) is also not equivalent to energetic rigidity, due to the importance of quartic terms in cases of interest (including at the transition point).

### B. First- and second-order rigidity tests

The existence of any global, non-trivial, and continuous motion of the system \( x_n(t) \) that preserves the constraints \( f_α(\{x_n(t)\}) \) implies the system is floppy. A system is structurally rigid when no such motions exist, a definition highlighted in Table I. Energetic rigidity is not necessarily equivalent to structural rigidity when the system is prestressed \((E > 0)\), though the two are the same when \( E = 0 \), as discussed in more detail later.

Though determining whether a system is structurally rigid is NP-hard [1], there are several simpler conditions that, if they hold true, imply that a system is structurally rigid [2, 5]. These tests (and more) are reviewed in more detail in Appendix A and summarized in Table I. In this section, we turn to the question: under what conditions do these structural rigidity tests, valid at first and second order in the vertex displacements, also imply energetic rigidity? We will conclude with classification of systems into those for which structural rigidity at first or second order is sufficient to imply energetic rigidity and those for which the question is still not easily determinable.

We first consider a first-order perturbation to the constraints, \( δf_α = \sum_n \frac{∂f_α}{∂x_n} δx_n \). We define a linear (first-order) zero mode (LZM) \( δx_n^{(0)} \) as one that preserves \( f_α \) to linear order,

\[
\sum_n \frac{∂f_α}{∂x_n} δx_n^{(0)} = \sum_n R_{αn} δx_n^{(0)} = 0.
\]

We can see that LZMs are in the right nullspace of the rigidity matrix. Excluding Euclidean motions, a nontrivial LZM is often called floppy mode (FM) in physics [11]. The Maxwell-Calladine index theorem (also known as the rigidity rank-nullity theorem) states that \( N_{dof} - M = N_0 - N_s \), where \( N_0 \) is the number of LZMs and \( N_s \) is the number of states of self stress [2]. A state of self stress is a vector \( σ_α \) in the left nullspace of the rigidity matrix:

\[
\sum_α σ_α R_{αn} = 0.
\]
A system is . . . when . . .

Energetically rigid  any nontrivial global motion increases the energy
Structurally rigid  no nontrivial global motion preserves the constraints $f_\alpha$
First-order rigid  no nontrivial global motion preserves the constraints $f_\alpha$ to first order
Second-order rigid  no nontrivial global motion preserves the constraints $f_\alpha$ to second order

TABLE I. Different definitions of rigidity.

For a system to be prestressed, it must have a state of self stress. In fact, if we write the Euler-Lagrange equations for the system at the energy minimum:

$$\sum_\alpha f_\alpha \frac{\partial f_\alpha}{\partial x_n} = \sum_\alpha f_\alpha R_{\alpha n} = 0, \forall n.$$  \hspace{1cm} (8)

Therefore, if $f_\alpha \neq 0$, $f_\alpha$ has to be a state of self stress. Note, however, the converse is not true. The existence of states of self stress only depends on the geometry of the system and does not imply that the system has to be prestressed. For example, take a system with constraints $f_\alpha(\{x_n\}) = f_\alpha(\{\bar{x}_n\}) - f_\alpha$ at a particular mechanically stable configuration $\{\bar{x}_n\}$ that has a state of self stress and choose $F_\alpha = f_\alpha(\{\bar{x}_n\})$. The system will be un-stressed at $\{\bar{x}_n\}$ but still has a state of self stress.

Maxwell constraint counting suggests that an over-constrained system ($N_{\text{dof}} < M$) must be rigid while an under-constrained system ($N_{\text{dof}} > M$) must be floppy. Generic states in over-constrained systems have no FMs. Such a system is called first-order rigid and, indeed, in such systems first-order rigidity implies structural rigidity as defined in Table 1 \cite{3, 4}. However, Eq. (5) leaves open the possibility that a system with negative pre-stresses could be first-order rigid with a zero shear modulus. Conversely, when the system is prestressed, the system may be energetically rigid even if it is not first-order rigid.

We thus study the variations to second order. If there are motions that preserve $f_\alpha$ to second order in $\delta x_n$, Taylor expansion of $f_\alpha$ results in:

$$\delta f_\alpha \approx \sum_n R_{\alpha n} \delta x_n + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{nm} \frac{\partial^2 f_\alpha}{\partial x_n \partial x_m} \delta x_n \delta x_m = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (9)

where we used Eq. [4] for the linear term in the expansion. If the only LZMs that satisfy Eq. (5) are trivial ones, the system is called second-order rigid and, consequently, is structurally rigid \cite{3, 4}. It can be shown that a LzM, $\delta x_n^{(0)}$, must satisfy

$$\sum_\alpha \sum_{nm} \sigma_{\alpha n} \frac{\partial^2 f_\alpha}{\partial x_n \partial x_m} \delta x_n^{(0)} \delta x_m^{(0)} = 0,$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

for all states of self stress $\sigma_{\alpha n}$ and solutions to Eq. (7) to be a second-order zero mode \cite{4, 5; Appendix A}.  

Finally, we note that going beyond second order is less helpful than one might suppose. There are examples of systems that are rigid only at third order or beyond yet remain floppy \cite{56}.

We now ask the question: when does second-order rigidity imply energetic rigidity? We identify three cases, which encompass several examples of physical interest, where second-order rigidity implies energetic rigidity, and demonstrate that second-order rigidity is a better proxy for energetic rigidity than the shear modulus. We identify a fourth case where second-order rigidity does not imply energetic rigidity – for example there may be systems with large prestresses that do not preserve $f_\alpha$ to second order but preserve energy. We classify these distinct cases using the eigenspectrum of $P_{nm}$ and the states of self stress. In all the cases, we will assume that if the system has FMs, at least one is global.

**Case 1: The system has no self stresses ($N_s = 0$)**

In this case, constraint counting alone provides a good proxy for energetic rigidity. From Eq. (5), the system is also un-stressed and Eq. (5) reduces to

$$\sum_\alpha (\sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \delta x_n)^2 = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

The solutions are LZMs, $\delta x_n^{(0)}$ (Eq. 9). If a system does not have any FMs, it is energetically rigid. An energetically rigid system with no states of self stress is also called isostatic. This also means that there are no motions that preserve $f_\alpha$ even to first order, thus the system is first-order rigid. Examples of systems belonging to Case 1 include under-constrained spring networks, unstressed vertex models with no area terms (which we will study below), and the special, non-generic frames described in Fig. 4(a)-(c) of \cite{11}.

**Case 2: The system has at least one self stress ($N_s \geq 1$)**

While configurations with self stresses are, in principle, rare, they still occur quite commonly in physical systems. Indeed, any local extremum of the energy necessarily leads to a self stress (Appendix A) and, consequently, any system whose configurations are determined by minimizing an energy can easily find itself in a state with one or more self stresses. As seen in Eq. (10), the existence of states of self stress puts additional constraints on zero modes. Here, we explore the implications of these constraints on energetic rigidity. To do so, we look at several sub-cases:
Case 2A: The system is unstressed ($P_{nm} = 0$)

This case includes systems with either no prestress, $f_\alpha = 0$, or systems for which the prestress is perpendicular to its second order expansion such that $P_{nm} = \sum_\alpha f_\alpha \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha = 0$. If the system is first-order rigid, it is again energetically rigid. If there are global FMs, $G > 0$; however, it can be shown (Appendix A) that the fourth order expansion of energy for these modes will be

$$\delta E \approx \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \sum_{\alpha,n,m} \sigma_{\alpha,1} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \delta x_n^{(0)} \delta x_m^{(0)} \right]^2 \quad (12)$$

Therefore, if the system is second-order rigid in the space of its global FMs, it is energetically rigid even though $G = 0$. Examples include random regular spring networks with coordination number $z = 3$ and vertex models exactly at the rigidity transition.

Case 2B: $P_{nm}$ is positive semi-definite

For a system with a positive semi-definite $P_{nm}$, the Hessian has a zero eigenmode if and only if both LHS and RHS of Eq. (5) are zero for $\delta x_n$. The RHS is zero only for LZMs. Then if the system is first-order rigid, it is again energetically rigid. For a system with global FMs, we reduce Eq. (5) to

$$\sum_{nm} P_{nm} \delta x_n^{(0)} \delta x_m^{(0)} = \sum_{nm} \sum_{\alpha} f_\alpha \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \delta x_n^{(0)} \delta x_m^{(0)} = 0, \quad (13)$$

where $x_n^{(0)}$ is now a global FM. We show below that second-order rigidity implies energetic rigidity, but depending on $N_s$, $G$ may be zero.

If the system has a single self stress: Calling this state of self stress $\sigma_\alpha$, we conclude from Eq. (8) that $f_\alpha \propto \sigma_\alpha$, meaning Eq. (13) is identical to Eq. (10) in this case. This means that if this system is second-order rigid, it is energetically rigid and $G > 0$. We will demonstrate in Section III that both spring networks under tension and vertex models with only the perimeter term fall into this category.

If the system has multiple self stresses: In Appendix A we show that if the system is second-order rigid in the space of global FMs, it is energetically rigid (Eq. (12)). However, the Hessian may still have zero eigenmodes if in the minimized state $f_\alpha$ is a linear combination of self stresses that satisfies Eq. (13). This suggests that the system may be energetically rigid but with $G = 0$. We have not been able to identify an example of a second-order rigid system with multiple self stresses and $G = 0$, but if one exists, it may lead to interesting ideas for material design.

Case 2C: $P_{nm}$ has negative eigenvalues

In this case, we have been unable to derive analytic results for whether first-order or second-order rigidity implies energetic rigidity. As the models that fall into this class are quite diverse, it is likely that more restrictive conditions are necessary in specific cases to develop analytic results.

One example in this category is vertex models with an area term in addition to a perimeter term when prestressed. In Section III, we demonstrate numerically that in such models there is always only one state of self stress that is non-trivial, and that $P_{nm}$ has negative eigenvalues. However, the Hessian itself is still positive-definite (excluding trivial LZMs) and therefore the system is energetically rigid. Another example is a rigid jammed packing, which exhibits quite different behavior for the eigenspectra of $P_{nm}$.

More generally, we cannot rule out the possibility that there may be examples where the Hessian of a first-order or second-order rigid system could have global zero directions for non-zero modes. Such a system would be marginally stable because if any negative eigenmode of $P_{nm}$ becomes too negative, the Hessian would have a negative direction and the system would not be at an energy minimum anymore. Furthermore, states of self stress place the same constraints as in Eq. (10) on these non-zero modes. If those constraints are not satisfied, the energy would increase at fourth order (Appendix A), suggesting that again the shear modulus could be zero while the energy is not preserved. Even though it is highly nongeneric, this case could aid in the design of structures that become unstable by varying the prestress or new materials that are flexible even though individual constraints are not preserved.

Fig. 1 summarizes the cases describing when either first-order or second-order rigidity imply energetic rigidity. In Appendix A we provide another flowchart (Fig. 7) to clearly establish the connection between energetic rigidity and structural rigidity as understood by mathematicians. We also provide several propositions to show that energetic rigidity and structural rigidity are interchangeable when $E = 0$ but not necessarily otherwise. For instance, it can be shown that first-order and second-order rigidity both imply structural rigidity, but we saw that they do not always imply energetic rigidity. This is because for a system which possesses self stress at an energy minimum, mathematicians only require the existence of a linear combination of self stresses that would make the system rigid, however, that particular self stress may not be the linear combination of self stresses that the system chooses as its prestress based on external forces.

In the next section, we apply this formalism to study rigidity in three important examples previously discussed in the literature: 2D spring networks, vertex model, and jamming.
For this system, \( L \) is over-constrained and first-order rigid. For simplicity, the results are valid for any \( z < 3 \) so that the system is under-constrained and the network is regular, and there are no dangling vertices, but \( z > 3 \) so that the system possesses a self stress and becomes energetically rigid.

We will see that for a range of spring rest lengths, the incline to conclude that the system is floppy. However, we then briefly examine rigidity of jammed packings in the context of this new formalism.

III. EXAMPLES

We use the formalism introduced in the previous section to study two examples of under-constrained systems, 2D random regular spring networks and vertex models, from analytical and numerical perspectives and examine whether their linear zero modes make them floppy. We then briefly examine rigidity of jammed packings in the context of this new formalism.

A. 2D Spring Network

Our first example is a 2D spring network comprised of \( N \) vertices connected by springs with coordination number \( z \) in a periodic square of fixed length. We choose \( z = 3 \) so that the system is under-constrained and the network is regular, and there are no dangling vertices, but the results are valid for any \( z < 4 \) (for \( z > 4 \) the system is over-constrained and first-order rigid). For simplicity, we assume the springs are identical with rest lengths \( L_0 \).

For this system, \( N_{dof} = 2N \) and \( M = 3N/2 \). From constraint counting, the number of LZMs, \( N_0 \geq N/2 \), so there are many system spanning FMs and one might be inclined to conclude that the system is floppy. However, we will see that for a range of spring rest lengths, the system possesses a self stress and becomes energetically rigid.

1. Analytical Results

Calling the length of the \( \alpha \)-th spring \( L_\alpha \), the energy of this spring network is

\[
E = K_L \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3N/2} (L_\alpha - L_0)^2,
\]

which defines the constraints \( f_\alpha = L_\alpha - L_0 \). Here, spring constants are identical and equal to \( 2K_L \). In Appendix B we show that the condition for FMs to be second-order (Eq. (10)) can be written as

\[
\sum_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha,I} (\delta L_\alpha)^2 / L_\alpha = 0.
\]

Assuming the edge \( \alpha \) connects vertices \( n \) and \( m \), \( \delta L_\alpha = \delta X_{n} - \delta X_{m} \) is the vector displacement of the edge in response to FM \{\( \delta X_{\alpha}^{(v)} \)\}. Since trivial LZMs are excluded, this displacement must be perpendicular to the edge, \( \delta L_\alpha = \delta L_{\alpha}^\perp \). An important observation is that if there exists a positive self stress (\( \sigma_{\alpha,I} > 0 \)), no FMs will satisfy the system Eqs. 15.

It can similarly be shown (Appendix B) that the \( G = 0 \) condition for spring networks is (Eq. 13)

\[
\sum_\alpha (L_\alpha - L_0) (\delta L_{\alpha}^{\perp})^2 / 2L_\alpha = - \sum_\alpha (\delta L_{\alpha})^2 / L_\alpha,
\]

for any global mode of motion, where \( \delta L_{\alpha}^\parallel \) is the component of \( \delta L_\alpha \) parallel to the edge. The left-hand side of Eq. (16) is equivalent to \( \sum_{mn} P_{mn} \delta x_n \delta x_m \) from the previous section.

Next, using numerics we show that even though the system has at least \( N/2 \) LZMs, there exists a positive self stress for \( L_0 \leq L_0^* \) which implies energetic rigidity.

2. Numerical Results

We simulate the spring network by a random Voronoi tessellation of space in two dimensions which is guaranteed to produce networks with \( z = 3 \). Details are given in Appendix D. Defining the rigidity matrix as \( R_{\alpha m} = \partial f_\alpha / \partial X_m \), where \( X_m \) is the position vector of vertex \( m \), the LZMs are found by solving for the zero modes of \( R^T R \). The states of self stress similarly are zero modes of \( RR^T \). Fixing the box size, we vary \( L_0 \) and minimize the network, observing that the system goes through a transition from \( f_\alpha = 0 \) for \( L_0 > L_0^* \) to \( f_\alpha > 0 \) for \( L_0 < L_0^* \).

From constraint counting, the number of LZMs \( N_0 \) minus the number of states of self stress \( N_s \) is \( N_0 - N_s = N/2 \), which is confirmed numerically: we find \( N_0 = N/2 \) and \( N_s = 0 \) for \( L_0 > L_0^* \) and \( N_0 = N/2 + 1 \) and \( N_s = 1 \) for \( L_0 < L_0^* \). There are two trivial LZMs (no
shear modulus $G$ of the Hessian, which then allows us to calculate the energetic rigidity of the system. Specifically, we first calculate the eigenmodes to quantify the energetic rigidity of the system. Rotation is allowed because of periodic boundary conditions.

Consistent with previous work [37, 43], we use the shear modulus of the Hessian to quantify the energetic rigidity of the system. Specifically, we first calculate the eigenmodes of the system. Rotation is allowed because of periodic boundary conditions.

Numerical results indicate that the system only has one state of self stress, consistent with previous work [29]. Therefore it falls under Case 2B, where second-order rigidity would imply energetic rigidity, and Eq. (5) reduces to Eq. (15) with $\sigma_{\alpha,\ell} \rightarrow f_\alpha$. Due to the existence of the positive self stress, the system is second-order rigid and energetically rigid. Exactly at the transition $L_0 = L_0^*$, the system is unstressed and $G = 0$ (see [29]). However, at $L_0 \rightarrow L_0^*$, since the system has a positive self stress and is second-order rigid, it is energetically rigid as well (Case 2A).

### B. 2D Vertex Model

Here we discuss rigidity of another highly under-constrained system, the 2D vertex model. The 2D vertex model consists of $N_{\text{cell}}$ polygonal cells tiling a 2D periodic square. The energy of the system is

$$E = \sum_{\alpha = 1}^{N_{\text{cell}}} \left[ K_A (A_\alpha - A_0)^2 + K_P (P_\alpha - P_0)^2 \right], \quad (17)$$

where $A_\alpha$ and $P_\alpha$ are the area and perimeter of the $\alpha^{th}$ cell, respectively. We have assumed that $A_\alpha$ has a preferred value $A_0$ and $P_\alpha$ has a preferred value $P_0$. The energy is still of the form Eq. (1) only with two sets of constraints $f_{\alpha,1} = A_\alpha - A_0$ and $f_{\alpha,2} = P_\alpha - P_0$. The total number of constraints is thus $M = 2N_{\text{cell}}$. In the vertex model, DOFs are the vertices. Thus, in a periodic box, $N_{\text{dof}} = 4N_{\text{cell}}$ and we have at least $2N_{\text{cell}}$ LZMs from constraint counting. These constraints are not all independent, however, because they act on the same vertices. In the numerical section, we will show by looking at the rank of the rigidity matrix that there is in fact one redundant constraint and there is a state of self stress and an extra zero mode because of it. We will also show that for $P_0 < P_0^*$, a second state of self stress appears due to geometric incompatibility, similar to spring networks.

In the analytical results section, we limit ourselves to the more tractable version of the model with no area constraints so that $K_A = 0$, and in the numerical section we will study the general version given by Eq. (17).

#### 1. Analytical Results

We look the equations governing second-order zero modes and the $G = 0$ condition (Eq. (5)) for the vertex model with no area term ($K_A = 0$), thus $M = N_{\text{cell}}$. The constraints on the vertices are given by $f_\alpha = P_\alpha - P_0$.

The self stresses of $R_{x\alpha}$ impose the following quadratic constraints on LZMs, $\delta X_\alpha$ (Appendix C):

![Spring Network Density of states $D$ as a function of the eigenvalue $\lambda$ for the Hessian matrix (solid black line), Gram matrix (dashed yellow line) and prestress matrix (dashed-dotted red line), averaged over 10 samples with $N = 1000$ and $K_l = 2$. (a) In the Floppy regime ($L_0 = 0.65$), the Hessian and the Gram term both possess $N/2$ zero modes and their DOS curves overlap as there is no prestress in the network. (b) In the rigid regime ($L_0 = 0.61$), the Gram term possesses $N/2 + 1$ zero modes and $N_\alpha = 1$, while the Hessian only possesses two trivial (translational) zero modes. The Hessian DOS is dominated by the Gram term at high frequency and by the prestress matrix at low frequencies.](image)
FIG. 3. Spring Network Comparison of Density of States as a function of the eigenvalue $\lambda$ for the Hessian matrix ($D_H$), Gram matrix ($D_G$) and prestress matrix ($D_P$), averaged over 10 samples with $N = 1000$ and $K_L = 2$ for different values of $L_0$. (a) Shear modulus ($G$) of spring networks as a function of $L_0$ shows a transition from fluid to solid at $L^*_0 \approx 0.63$. The error bars represent the standard deviation over 10 samples. (b) Transitioning from floppy to rigid coincides with the appearance of low frequency eigenmodes in the Hessian DOS that shift to higher frequencies as the system becomes stiffer. (c) Even though in the rigid regime there is only one new zero mode, the Gram matrix DOS looks significantly different when compared to systems with $L_0 < L^*_0$ because the geometry of the system does not change significantly in the rigid regime. (d) Unlike the Gram matrix, the prestress increases linearly as $L_0$ is decreased in the rigid regime, as reflected by the shift in the prestress matrix DOS towards higher frequencies.

\[ \sum_{\alpha} \sigma_{\alpha,I} \sum_{\text{edge } j \in \text{cell } \alpha} \frac{(\delta L_j^I)^2}{L_j} = 0. \]  

(18)

Since all vertices are connected to three edges and the box size is fixed, for a generic system, there are no non-trivial motions that do not introduce a $\delta L_j^I$ and thus the inner sum is positive definite. Hence, similar to spring networks, if a self stress $\sigma_{\alpha,I} > 0$ exists, the system is second-order rigid. To see if its shear modulus is zero, we again look at Eq. 5:

\[ \sum_{\alpha} \sigma_{\alpha,I} \sum_{\text{edge } j \in \text{cell } \alpha} \frac{(\delta L_j^I)^2}{L_j} = - \sum_{\alpha} \left( \sum_{m} R_{\alpha m} \cdot \delta X_m \right)^2. \]  

(19)

We will see in the numerical results section that similar to spring networks, vertex model with $K_A = 0$ has a positive state of self stress for $P_0 \leq P^*_0$, and thus is both second-order rigid and energetically rigid. For $P_0 > P^*_0$ however, all constraints are satisfied and the system has no state of self stress (Case 1). Therefore the system is floppy because it has many $(3N_{\text{cell}})$ LZMs. We will also see that vertex model with $K_A = 1$ belongs to Case 2C when prestressed ($P_0 < P^*_0$), but it is still second-order rigid and energetically rigid.

2. Numerical Results

We simulate the vertex model (with both area and perimeter terms) using the same algorithm as spring networks but with the energy function given in Eq. 17 with $A_0 = 1$ and varying $P_0$ in a fixed periodic box ($A_{\text{box}} = N_{\text{cell}}$). Details, along with numerical results for systems with no area constraints ($K_A = 0$), are given in Appendix C and D. Each component of the rigidity matrix $R_{\alpha m}$ now is a $2 \times 2$ matrix: two components for the area and perimeter constraints associated with each cell $\alpha$ and two spatial components for each vertex $m$.

We find that for $P_0 > P^*_0$, all constraints are satisfied and the Hessian zero eigenmodes are the same as the LZMs ($N_0 = 2N_{\text{cell}} + 1$) (Fig. 4b). Even though there are no prestresses, we find $N_s = 1$ (satisfying the rank-nullity theorem). To understand the source of this self stress, note that the sum of all the cell areas must be equal to the fixed box size. Thus $A_0$ merely changes the overall pressure of the system \[57\] and we can rewrite the energy function as:

\[ E = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_{\text{cell}}} \left[ K_A \left( A_0 - \frac{A_{\text{box}}}{N_{\text{cell}}} \right)^2 + K_P (P_0 - P_0)^2 \right] + K_A N_{\text{cell}} \left( \frac{A_{\text{box}}}{N_{\text{cell}}} - A_0 \right)^2. \]  

(20)
Gram matrix (dashed yellow line) and prestress matrix (dash-stress) are not. For prestresses are all positive (Fig. 4b). The perimeter in the network. The analysis presented in section III A can also be used to describe the energetic rigidity in jammed packings of soft harmonic disks/spheres. One difference between a spring network under tension and a critically jammed packing under compression (with one state of self stress only) is that all of the prestress forces in a jammed packing are negative and therefore any terms in the expansion

Therefore, changing \( A_0 \) amounts to increasing the overall tissue pressure without breaking force balance and by definition there must be a self stress associated with it. Indeed, we see that the area components of self stress are 1 while its perimeter components are 0: \( \sigma = (1, 0, \ldots, 1, 0) \). This also means that one of the area constraints is redundant: if \( N_{\text{cell}} - 1 \) cells have satisfied their constraints, the last cell automatically does as well.

For \( P_0 < P_0^* \), none of the constraints are satisfied due to geometric incompatibility (Fig. 4b). The perimeter prestresses are all positive \( (f_{n,2} > 0) \), but the area prestresses are not. For \( A_0 = 1 \) and \( A_{\text{box}} = N_{\text{cell}} \), the average, \( f_{n,1} = 0 \). We find \( N_s = 2 \) and \( N_0 = 2N_{\text{cell}} + 2 \). One of the self stresses is due to the geometric incompatibility we already saw in the spring network, \( \sigma_1 = (A_1 - A_{\text{box}}/N_{\text{cell}}, P_1 - P_0, \ldots, A_{N_{\text{cell}} - A_{\text{box}}/N_{\text{cell}}, P_{N_{\text{cell}} - P_0}}. \)

The other one arises from the area constraint redundancy, \( \sigma_2 = (1, 0, \ldots, 1, 0) \), and does not play an important role. We find \( G = 0 \) for \( P_0 > P_0^* \), and \( G > 0 \) for \( P_0 < P_0^* \) (Fig. 5) suggesting that the system is second-order rigid when \( \sigma_2 \) appears. Decreasing \( P_0 \) further shifts the Hessian eigenmodes to higher frequency and increases \( G \) similar to spring networks (Fig. 5c). This is again due to a shift in \( \mathcal{P}_{nm} \) and not the Gram term (Fig. 5c, d).

Looking at the spectrum of \( \mathcal{P}_{nm} \), we can see that it has negative eigenvalues (Fig. 5d) and thus the system falls under Case 2C. It is empirically still rigid because \( \mathcal{P}_{nm} \) does not have directions negative enough to satisfy Eq. 5. Even though its negative eigenvalues become more negative as \( P_0 \) is decreased, its positive ones dominate (Fig. 5d).

One way to identify whether it is the Gram or prestress matrix that is responsible for rigidity is to multiply the prestress matrix \( \mathcal{P}_{nm} \) by an arbitrary \( \epsilon > 1 \). This suggests that the Hessian is dominated by the positive eigenvalues of the prestress matrix and not from a competition with the Gram term. For \( K_A = 0 \) with \( P_0 < P_0^* \), \( \mathcal{P}_{nm} \) is positive semi-definite and \( N_s = 1 \), so it falls under Case 2B similar to spring networks. At the onset of rigidity, \( P_0 \rightarrow P_0^* \), both vertex models will show \( G \to 0 \), but since they both have a nontrivial self stress (Case 2A) and are second-order rigid, our formalism indicates they are energetically rigid as well.

### C. 2D Jammed Packings

Athermal packings of soft or hard spheres are a useful model for studying granular matter and glasses at zero temperature. A 2D disk packing with one state of self stress is in a way very similar to the spring networks that we studied above. States of self stress in jammed systems are extended over the entire system with compressive forces everywhere which resembles the case of spring networks under tension. Here, the energy is given by:

\[
E = \frac{k}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{2N-1} h_{\alpha}^2 \Theta(h_{\alpha}),
\]

where \( h_{\alpha} = (1 - \sigma_{\alpha}) \) is the dimensionless overlap between particle pair \( \alpha \equiv i, j \), with \( \rho_{\alpha} \) being the distance between two disk centers and \( \sigma_{\alpha} \) being the sum of their radii. The Heaviside step function is used to count contributions from positive overlaps only.

#### 1. Analytical Results

The analysis presented in section III A can also be used to describe the energetic rigidity in jammed packings of soft harmonic disks/spheres. One difference between a spring network under tension and a critically jammed packing under compression (with one state of self stress only) is that all of the prestress forces in a jammed packing are negative and therefore any terms in the expansion

\[
\sigma \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[ F_{\alpha,2} \rho_{\alpha} \sqrt{\sigma_{\alpha}} \right] \Theta(h_{\alpha}),
\]

where \( F_{\alpha,2} \) is the average force associated with \( \alpha \). Since \( \rho_{\alpha} \) is the distance between two center disks and \( \sigma_{\alpha} \) is the sum of their radii, the condition for rigidity is the same: in tension (Case 2A) there must be a nontrivial self stress, and in compression (Case 2B) it is sufficient to have a positive self stress. In jammed systems, all states of self stress have an energetic component which is second-order rigid.

\[
\sigma \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}} \left[ F_{\alpha,2} \rho_{\alpha} \sqrt{\sigma_{\alpha}} \right] \Theta(h_{\alpha}),
\]

where \( F_{\alpha,2} \) is the average force associated with \( \alpha \). Since \( \rho_{\alpha} \) is the distance between two center disks and \( \sigma_{\alpha} \) is the sum of their radii, the condition for rigidity is the same: in tension (Case 2A) there must be a nontrivial self stress, and in compression (Case 2B) it is sufficient to have a positive self stress. In jammed systems, all states of self stress have an energetic component which is second-order rigid.
FIG. 5. Vertex Model Comparison of Density of States as a function of the eigenvalue $\lambda$ for the Hessian matrix ($D_H$), Gram matrix ($D_G$) and prestress matrix ($D_P$), averaged over 10 samples with $N_{\text{cell}} = 500$ and $K_A = K_P = 1$ for different values of $P_0$. (a) Shear modulus ($G$) of vertex model with as a function of $P_0$ shows a transition from fluid to solid at $P_0^* \approx 3.84$. The error bars represent standard deviation over 10 samples. (b-d) Comparison between DOS of Hessian and its components for different values of $P_0$. (b) Transition from floppy to rigid coincides with the appearance of low frequency eigenmodes in the Hessian DOS that shift to higher frequencies as the system becomes more rigid. (c) Even though in the rigid regime there is only one new zero mode, the Gram matrix DOS looks significantly different when compared to systems with $P_0 < P_0^*$ because the geometry of the system does not change significantly in the rigid regime. (d) Unlike the Gram matrix, the prestress increases linearly as $L_0$ is decreased in the rigid regime, as reflected by the shift in the prestress matrix DOS towards higher frequencies (both positive and negative).

We create an ensemble of ten 2D disk packings very close to the critical jamming using standard methods as described in Appendix D so that there is one state of self stress in each packing. We calculate the eigenspectra of the Hessian matrix as well as the Gram and prestress terms; the results are presented in Fig. 6.

Unlike spring networks that have many non-zero modes in their floppy regime, a critically jammed packing will completely unjam and reach a global minimum with zero energy and zero eigenmodes everywhere if the density is lowered. Therefore, we do not report data from the floppy side of the transition. As can be seen from Fig. 6, the density of states of the full Hessian almost matches the density of states of Gram term in the Hessian. This is because at critical jamming, the prestress forces are infinitesimal and the magnitude of the eigenvalues of prestress term are several orders of magnitude smaller than their equivalent eigenvalues in the Gram term. At this point, the rigidity of the system is mainly determined by the Gram term in the Hessian. Since both Gram and prestress terms have two zero eigenmodes, the full Hessian also has two zero eigenmodes which is typical of a rigid body in 2D.

A consequence of this is that the energetic rigidity of jammed systems can be fully described using the Maxwell-Calladine count, since even at the jamming point where the pressure is zero and the prestress forces are infinitesimal, the system is first-order rigid. The prestress forces can only play a role in the energetic rigidity of the system when the pressure is large enough to push the system to an instability. This marks another difference between the spring networks under tension and soft harmonic particles under compression at one state of self stress.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We term an “energetically rigid” structure as one where any sufficiently small applied displacement increases the structure’s energy. Our focus on motions that preserve energy contrasts with previous work on structural rigidity that has focused on motions that preserve constraints. There are interesting differences between the two approaches. Unlike structural rigidity, energetic rigidity is not defined solely by the geometry – predictions also depend on the energy functional. Here we studied a Hooke-like energy that is quadratic in the constraints, which is the simplest nontrivial energy func-
the shear modulus is zero) and in the rigid regime (when rigidity precisely at the rigidity transition (even though tive semi-definite, second-order rigidity implies energetic guarantee energetic rigidity, while in others it is not. Of interest, we show second-order rigidity is sufficient to controls whether first- or second-order rigidity (or neither) the eigenvalue spectrum of the prestress matrix ever, when the system does possess states of self stress, demonstrate that first-order rigidity always implies ener-
etic rigidity, which checks whether constraints can be satisfied to first order. Another test is second-order the constraints fα that define the energy functional can α specifically increase the prestresses in a structure, multiply-
ing Pnm by a coefficient ε > 1, which will only increase the overall magnitude of the state of self stress but not change the geometry of the network or the Gram term in the Hessian. Such a perturbation does not destabilize vertex models with an area term, where second-order rigidity is observed to guarantee energetic rigidity, but it does destabilize jammed packings where first-order rigidity governs energetic rigidity [53]. This also suggests that it may be possible to program transitions between minima in the potential energy landscape via careful design of applied load. For example, while the type of spring network we studied was completely tensile for L0 < L0*, one could create spring networks with both tensile and compressed edges [51] or a tensegrity with tensile cables and compressed rods. It will be interesting to see if we can design such systems to have a negative-definite prestress matrix. If so, applied loads may destabilize the structure along a specified mode towards a new stable configuration. A related question is whether we can move such a system from one energy minimum to another in a more efficient manner. Traditionally, to push a system out of its local minimum into a nearby minimum, one rearranges the internal components of the system locally or globally, while it is rigid, by finding a saddle point on the energy landscape. An alternate design could be to (1) apply a global perturbation that makes the system floppy, (2) rearrange its components at no energy cost, and (3) apply a reverse global perturbation to make it rigid again. In other words, the fact that the system can transition from rigid to floppy using very small external forces without adding or removing constraints could help us generate reconfigurable materials with very low energy cost. Another interesting avenue for design is to perturb the energy functional itself. In this work we focused on an energy that is Hookean in the constraints, but it would be interesting to explore whether different choices of energy functional still generate the same relationships between energetic rigidity and first- or second-order rigidity identified in Fig[1] If not, such functionals may enable

![FIG. 6. Jammed packing Density of states D as a function of the eigenvalue λ for the Hessian matrix (solid black line), Gram matrix (dashed yellow line) and prestress matrix (dash-dotted red line), in the rigid regime (at one state of self stress) averaged over 10 samples with N = 1000 and k = 1. Each of these three data sets only have 2 zero modes per sample.](image-url)
structures with interesting floppy modes.

Taken together, this highlights that the subtleties involved in determining energetic rigidity could be exploited to drive new ideas in material design. With the framework described here, we now fully understand when we can use principles based on first-order constraint counting or second-order rigidity to ensure energetic rigidity in designed materials. Moreover, there may be some new design principles available, especially for dynamic and activated structures, if we focus on cases where these standard proxies fail.

Appendix A: Derivation of second-order rigidity condition and implications for energetic rigidity

Here we first provide a careful connection between our work and the structural rigidity of bar-joint frameworks. We start with definitions and important theorems and then establish relationships between energetic rigidity and various relevant results from the rigidity literature (summarized in Fig. 7). Several of these theorems are adapted from [4]. We also provide derivations of second-order rigidity and energetic rigidity that we have omitted from the main text.

1. Basic results on structural rigidity

Let $x_n$ be a point in a space of configurations and let $F_α(\{x_n\})$ be a set of measures (for example, in a fiber network $F_α(\{x_n\})$ might give the length of the fibers). From now on we denote the configuration $\{x_n\}$ as $x$ for simplicity. We start with some basic definitions:

Definition: A nontrivial isometry (or, sometimes, flex) is a one-parameter family of deformations, $x(t)$, such that $F_α(x(t)) = F_α$ (for some $F_α$) and $x(t)$ is not a translation or rotation. We similarly refer to a nontrivial deformation as any deformation $\delta x(t)$ that is not a translation or rotation.

Definition: A linear zero mode, also known as a first-order isometry or a first-order flex, at a configuration $\bar{x}$, $\dot{x}$, is a solution to the equation $\sum_n \partial_n F_α(\bar{x}) \dot{x}_n = 0$. A system is first-order rigid if there are no solutions to this equation.

Definition: A self stress, $σ_α$, at $\bar{x}$ is a solution to $\sum_α σ_α \partial_n F_α(\bar{x}) = 0$.

Definition: A second-order isometry (or a second-order flex) at $\bar{x}$ is a first-order isometry such that $\sum_α \sum_{n,m} σ_α,1 \partial_n \partial_m F_α(\bar{x}) \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m = 0$ has a solution where $\{σ_α,1,σ_α,2,\cdots,σ_α,N\}$ is a basis of self stresses at $\bar{x}$. A system is second-order rigid if it has nontrivial zero modes but no nontrivial second-order isometries.

We finally have the main result that we want: a system that is either first-order or second-order rigid, is structurally rigid [4]. It can be hard – still – to test for structural rigidity at second order because it involves solving a system of quadratic equations. It is, therefore, convenient to introduce a stronger condition:

Definition: A system is prestress stable at $\bar{x}$ if there is a self stress at $\bar{x}$, $σ_α$, such that $\sum_α σ_α \partial_n \partial_m F_α(\bar{x})$ is positive definite on every nontrivial zero mode.

With this definition, we prove that a system that is prestress stable at $\bar{x}$ is also second-order rigid at $\bar{x}$ (and hence, structurally rigid). This follows because there is a self stress $σ_α$ such that $\sum_α σ_α \partial_n \partial_m F_α(\bar{x})$ is positive definite on nontrivial first-order flexes. We can construct a basis for the self stresses with $σ_α$ as one of its elements. Therefore, it is second-order rigid as well.

According to Connelly and Whitely [4], there are examples of second-order rigid structures that are not prestress stable in 2D and, especially, 3D. The notion of prestress stability is related to notions of an energy.
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FIG. 7. Relations between various definitions for a given configuration $\bar{x}$. The numbers on arrows refers to propositions with the same numbers. We can see that only when the system is unstressed ($E(\bar{x}) = 0$), energetic rigidity and structural rigidity are equivalent (one is always guaranteed to imply the other). Dotted arrows labeled with $\exists F_\alpha$ mean that the implication is only valid for specific choices of $F_\alpha$ and thus prestress. $E''(\bar{x}) > 0$ denotes energetic rigidity at quadratic order (positive-definite Hessian). Dashed arrow with $N_s = 1$ means that the implication is guaranteed when there is only one state of self stress.

a. Energetic rigidity

We define an energy functional $E(x) = \sum_\alpha f_\alpha(x)^2/2 = \sum_\alpha (F_\alpha(x) - F_\alpha)^2/2$; this energy functional implicitly depends on our choice of $F_\alpha$. Any stiffnesses can be absorbed into the definitions of $F_\alpha$ and $F_\alpha$. We say that a system is energetically rigid at $\bar{x}$ if there exists a $c$ such that $E(\bar{x} + \epsilon \delta x) > E(\bar{x})$ for any nontrivial deformation $\delta x$ and any $0 < \epsilon < c$. In other words, it is energetically rigid if all sufficiently small, finite deformations increase the energy. Similarly, a system is energetically rigid at n$^{th}$ order at the configuration $\bar{x}$ if $\sum_{i_1 \cdots i_n} \partial_{i_1} \cdots \partial_{i_n} E(\bar{x}) \delta x_{i_1} \cdots \delta x_{i_n} > 0$ for any nontrivial deformation, $\delta x$.

With the definitions above, we can start relating energetic rigidity to other notions of rigidity. These relationships are summarized in Fig. 7. Important to note is that the dashed arrows signify that while the implication can be proved for some choice of self stress, it is not guaranteed that a given system has picked that particular self stress at the energy minimum (i.e. the actual prestress may be a different linear combination of self stresses). The numbers labeling the propositions below refer to the arrows in Fig. 7 labeled with the same number.

Proposition: (1) Energetic rigidity at $\bar{x}$ with $E(\bar{x}) > 0$ implies $\bar{x}$ is a critical point of the energy.

Let $\bar{x}$ be a point that is energetically rigid. This means that $E(\bar{x} + \epsilon \delta x) > E(\bar{x})$ for all nontrivial $\delta x$ and for all $0 < \epsilon < c$. Taking the derivative with respect to $\epsilon$ gives

$$\lim_{\epsilon \to 0^+} \partial_\epsilon E(\bar{x} + \epsilon \delta x) = \sum_n \partial_n E(\bar{x}) \delta x_n.$$ (A1)

If this were not a critical point then taking $\delta x \to -\delta x$ would give us a nontrivial deformation that decreases the energy for some $\epsilon$ that was small enough. Therefore, it must be a critical point.

Proposition: (2) The point $\bar{x}$ is a critical point of some energy with $E(\bar{x}) > 0$ if there is a self stress at $\bar{x}$. The converse is also true for specific choices of $F_\alpha$. 

We first assume $\bar{x}$ is a critical point with $E(\bar{x}) > 0$. Then $\partial_n E(\bar{x}) = 0$, which requires

$$0 = \sum_\alpha [F_\alpha(\bar{x}) - F_\alpha] \partial_n F_\alpha(\bar{x}). \quad (A2)$$

Since $E(\bar{x}) \neq 0$, $F_\alpha(\bar{x}) \neq F_\alpha$. Therefore, $F_\alpha(\bar{x}) - F_\alpha$ is a self stress.

Now assume that we have a point $\bar{x}$ where $\sigma_\alpha$ is a self stress. Then choose $F_\alpha = F_\alpha(\bar{x}) + c\sigma_\alpha$. We can now verify that $\bar{x}$ is a critical point of $E(x) = \sum_\alpha [F_\alpha(x) - F_\alpha(\bar{x}) + c\sigma_\alpha]^2$ for any $c$.

**Proposition:** (3) The configuration $\bar{x}$ is energetically rigid at $E(x)$ with $E(\bar{x}) = 0$ if and only if $\bar{x}$ is rigid.

We first assume that $\bar{x}$ is rigid. Then let $F_\alpha = F_\alpha(\bar{x})$. We get $E(\bar{x}) = 0$. Let $\delta x$ be any nontrivial deformation. Since $F_\alpha(\bar{x} + c\delta x) \neq F_\alpha$ for sufficiently small $c$ we must have $E(\bar{x} + c\delta x) > 0$ implying the system is energetically rigid.

Now assume we have an energy such that $\bar{x}$ is energetically rigid with $E(\bar{x}) = 0$. Then $F_\alpha(\bar{x}) = F_\alpha$. Since $E(\bar{x} + c\delta x) > 0$ for appropriately chosen $c$, we must have $F_\alpha(\bar{x} + c\delta x) \neq F_\alpha$.

**Proposition:** (4) Let $\bar{x}$ be an extremum of $E(x)$ such that $E(\bar{x}) \neq 0$ and suppose that $\bar{x}$ is energetically rigid. Then the system is structurally rigid at $\bar{x}$ as well.

Suppose that $\bar{x}$ is an extremum of $E(x)$ such that $E(\bar{x}) \neq 0$ but such that $\bar{x}$ is energetically rigid. That is, all nontrivial directions raise the energy further. Then there cannot be any nontrivial isometries $x(t)$ passing through $\bar{x}$ since if there were $E$ would have to be constant along them and this contradicts the assumption.

Note that this can be extended to energy maxima as well. The converse need not be true though. If a system is rigid at $\bar{x}$, choosing $F_\alpha$ so that $\bar{x}$ is an extremum does not mean that it will be energetically rigid. Let’s suppose that $x(t)$ is a one-parameter family of constant energy trajectories. Then

$$\partial_t E[x(t)] = 0 = \sum_\alpha \sum_n [F_\alpha(x(t)) - F_\alpha] \partial_n F(x(t)) \dot{x}_n. \quad (A3)$$

This can only be true if $x(t)$ are all extrema of $E$ with $E(x(t)) \neq 0$. In addition, there must be at least one self stress along the entire trajectory $x(t)$.

The notion of prestress stability is intimately related to energetic rigidity at quadratic order. The next proposition establishes the equivalence of prestress stability (as defined above) and energetic rigidity to quadratic order:

**Proposition:** (5) A system is prestress stable at $\bar{x}$ if and only if there is a choice $F_\alpha$ such that it is an extremum of the energy with $E(\bar{x}) \neq 0$ and is energetically rigid at quadratic order.

To prove this we first assume that the system is prestress stable and let $\sigma_\alpha$ be the self stress such that $\sum_\alpha \sigma_\alpha \partial_n \partial_m F_\alpha(\bar{x})$ is positive definite on nontrivial first-order flexes. Then define an energy functional

$$E(x) = \sum_\alpha [F_\alpha(x) - F_\alpha(\bar{x}) + c\sigma_\alpha]^2, \quad (A4)$$

where $c > 0$ is some arbitrary number. We can now check that $\bar{x}$ is an extremum, $\partial_n E(\bar{x}) = c \sum_\alpha \sigma_\alpha \partial_n F_\alpha(\bar{x}) = 0$. Computing the Hessian, we find

$$H_{nm} = \sum_\alpha \partial_n F_\alpha(\bar{x}) \partial_m F_\alpha(\bar{x}) + c \sum_\alpha \partial_\alpha \partial_n \partial_m F_\alpha(\bar{x}). \quad (A5)$$

This is positive definite on nontrivial first-order flexes by the assumption of prestress stability, for any $c$. On modes that are not nontrivial first-order flexes, we can always choose $c > 0$ sufficiently small that the first term dominates (choose $c$ to be smaller than the smallest eigenvalue of the Gram term). Therefore, $\bar{x}$ is an energetically stable extremum of $E(x)$ when $F_\alpha = f_\alpha(\bar{x}) - c\sigma_\alpha$.

Going the other way, let’s assume that our system is energetically rigid at quadratic order at an extremum $\bar{x}$. Then let $\dot{x}_n$ be any nontrivial, first-order flex. We have

$$\sum_{nm} H_{nm} \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m = \sum_{nm} \sum_\alpha [F_\alpha(\bar{x}) - F_\alpha] \partial_n F(\bar{x}) \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m > 0. \quad (A6)$$

That implies that $F_\alpha(\bar{x}) - F_\alpha$ is a self stress and that it is prestress stable.

It is worth noting that prestress stability at $\bar{x}$ does not mean that a system is energetically rigid at $\bar{x}$ for a particular choice of $F_\alpha$, only for some choice.

However, we also have the following two examples of showing to what extent these arrows are reversible.
1. A system that is second-order rigid is not necessarily prestress stable. Examples appear in Connelly and Whitely. However, 

**Proposition:** A system that is second-order rigid but has one self stress is prestress stable. This is also in [1].

We must have $c\sigma_\alpha \partial_n \partial_m f(\bar{x})$ positive definite for some, potentially negative, $c$. Then choosing $F_\alpha = F_\alpha(\bar{x}) - c\sigma_\alpha$ is energetically rigid to quadratic order and, hence, prestress stable.

2. A system that is prestress stable may not be energetically rigid for a particular choice of $F_\alpha$. Suppose that a system is prestress stable but has a self stress $\sigma_\alpha$ for which the prestress matrix is not positive definite on the nontrivial first-order flexes. Choose $F_\alpha = F_\alpha(\bar{x}) - c\sigma_\alpha$. This shows that the system with this choice is not energetically rigid at quadratic order. In other words, the prestress that the system picks at $\bar{x}$ may not be one that makes the system prestress stable.

Finally, the following proposition deals with the nonlinear nature of rigidity:

**Proposition:** A system is energetically rigid at $\bar{x}$ with $E(\bar{x}) = 0$ to fourth order if it is second-order rigid.

This proposition shows that even if the standard checks of energetic rigidity (e.g. shear modulus) suggest floppiness, the system may still be energetically rigid to finite deformations. We will prove this proposition in the following section, where we also show a more detailed derivation of the equations in section [1].

### 2. Second-order rigidity and energetic rigidity

Our goal here is to derive conditions for second-order zero modes and study the energy of systems that are second-order rigid. We will show that a system that has no prestress (Case 2A) but is second-order rigid is energetically rigid as well at fourth order in deformations. For prestressed systems, we show derivations of our claims for Case 2B and 2C.

Take constraints $f_\alpha$ on a given system, e.g., $f_\alpha(\{x_n\})$ may be the displacements of edges of a graph from their equilibrium lengths. The energy functional is $E = k\sum_{m=1}^M f_m^2/2$ where $M$ is the number of constraints. We set $k = 1$ without loss of generality. For a more general case with constraint dependent stiffnesses $k_\alpha$, we can simply rescale the constraints to $f_\alpha' = \sqrt{k_\alpha}f_\alpha$. Imagine that $\bar{x}_n$ is at a critical point of $E$.

At a critical point, $\sum_\alpha f_\alpha(\{\bar{x}_n\}) \partial_m f_\alpha(\{\bar{x}_n\}) = 0$. Let $\{\sigma_{\alpha,1}, \ldots, \sigma_{\alpha,N}, e_{\alpha,1}, \ldots, e_{\alpha,M-N}\}$ be an orthonormal basis in $\mathbb{R}^M$ where $\sum_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha,l} \partial_n f_\alpha(\{\bar{x}_n\}) = 0$ (so $\sigma_{\alpha,l}$ are self stresses). Let us further assume $f_\alpha(\{\bar{x}_n\}) = C\sigma_{\alpha,1}$ with $C > 0$, which we can do without loss of any generality.

To find zero modes, we Taylor expand $f_\alpha$ for small perturbations around $\bar{x}_n$. To easily keep track of the order of expansion, we parametrize deformations in time so that at an infinitesimal time $\delta t$ we have a deformation $x_n(\delta t)$ such that $x_n(0) = \bar{x}_n$. We then have

$$f_\alpha(\{x_n(\delta t)\}) \approx C\sigma_{\alpha,1} + \sum_\alpha \partial_n f_\alpha \bar{x}_n \delta t + \frac{1}{2} \left[ \sum_\alpha \partial_n f_\alpha \bar{x}_n + \sum_\alpha \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \bar{x}_n \bar{x}_m \right] \delta t^2 + O(\delta t^3), \quad (A7)$$

where partial derivatives are evaluated at $\bar{x}_n$. Also, $\dot{x}_n$ is short hand for $x_n(0)$ and $\ddot{x}_n$ is short hand for $\dot{x}_n(0)$. That is, these are explicitly independent vectors that determine the first two terms in a Taylor expansion of $x_n(t)$ around $t = 0$.

It is useful to project $f_\alpha(\{x_n(\delta t)\})$ along the orthonormal basis vectors

$$\sum_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha,l} f_\alpha(\{x_n(\delta t)\}) \approx C\delta t + \sum_\alpha \sum_{n,m} \sigma_{\alpha,l} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \bar{x}_n \bar{x}_m \delta t^2, \quad (A8)$$

$$\sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} f_\alpha(\{x_n(\delta t)\}) \approx \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \bar{x}_n \delta t + \frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \left[ \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \bar{x}_n + \sum_{n,m} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \bar{x}_n \bar{x}_m \right] \delta t^2. \quad (A9)$$
To find second-order zero modes, modes that preserve \( f_\alpha \) to second-order, Eqs. (A8-A9) imply the system

\[
\sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \dot{x}_n = 0
\]

\[
\sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \left[ \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \dot{x}_n + \sum_{nm} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \ddot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] = 0
\]

\[
\sum_\alpha \sum_{nm} \sigma_{\alpha,l} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m = 0
\]

where the first equation implies \( \dot{x}_n \) is along a linear zero mode (note that \( \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \) must have a nonzero projection on at least one \( e_{\alpha,l} \) since it is perpendicular to all self stresses \( \sigma_{\alpha,l} \) by definition), the middle equation is associated to the curvature of the linear zero mode as we proceed along \( t \), and the last equation gives an additional quadratic constraint that these tangents must satisfy to be second-order zero modes. Multiplying the last equation by \( \delta t^2 \), we recover Eq. (10).

Notice that the middle equation always has a solution. To see this, we note that it is a linear equation of the form \( A \dot{x} = 0 \). Since \( A \) is explicitly in the image of \( A \), \( \dot{x} \) has a solution that is unique up to zero modes. Since the linear zero modes are already included in \( \dot{x}_n \), we can choose \( \dot{x}_n \) to be orthogonal to them without loss of generality. With that choice, the matrix \( \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \partial_n f_\alpha \) is invertible.

Putting all of this into the energy, we find that

\[
E \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{M-N_e} \left[ \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \dot{x}_n + \frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \left[ \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \ddot{x}_n + \sum_{nm} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] \delta t \right]^2 \delta t^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[ C + \frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha \sum_{nm} \sigma_{\alpha,l} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \ddot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \delta t^2 \right] + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{l=1}^{N_e} \left[ \sum_\alpha \sum_{nm} \sigma_{\alpha,l} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] \delta t^4.
\]  

(A10)

What we are interested in is whether we can find a solution \( x_n(t) \) such that \( E(t) \) increases, decreases, or stays constant to a particular order in \( \delta t \).

Let us consider what happens when \( C \rightarrow 0 \) first. Note that some systems may not be able to achieve a state with \( C = 0 \) because of the way they are prepared. Here, we assume that the energy can be continuously modulated to zero. Such a system is not prestressed, but can still possess self stresses (e.g. the onset of geometric incompatibility \[24\]). In that case,

\[
E \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^{M-N_e} \left[ \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \dot{x}_n + \frac{1}{2} \sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \left[ \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \ddot{x}_n + \sum_{nm} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] \delta t \right]^2 \delta t^2 + \frac{1}{8} \sum_{l=1}^{N_e} \left[ \sum_\alpha \sum_{nm} \sigma_{\alpha,l} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] \delta t^4.
\]  

(A11)

The energy is constant as long as the coefficients of \( \delta t^2, \delta t^3 \), and so on vanish. These lead to

\[
\sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \dot{x}_n = 0,
\]  

(A12)

to second order, and we have the two equations

\[
\sum_\alpha e_{\alpha,l} \left[ \sum_n \partial_n f_\alpha \ddot{x}_n + \sum_{nm} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] = 0,
\]  

(A13)

and

\[
\sum_\alpha \sum_{nm} \sigma_{\alpha,l} \partial_n \partial_m f_\alpha \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m = 0,
\]  

(A14)

to fourth order. The third order term already vanishes if the quadratic term vanishes. These are the three equations that defined a quadratic isometry previously. Hence, \( E \) is constant along any quadratic isometry. Similarly, if \( E \)
constant along a direction, the trajectory must be along a quadratic isometry. So at the critical point, second-order rigidity implies energetic rigidity to this order in $\delta t$. This also proves the last proposition in the previous section.

Now, one might wonder what happens as $C$ increases. We then have

$$E = \frac{C^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \delta t^2 \left[ \sum_{l=1}^{M-N_x} \left( \sum_{\alpha} e_{\alpha,l} \sum_{n} \partial_n f_{\alpha} \dot{x}_n \right)^2 + \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{m} C \sigma_{\alpha,m} \partial_m f_{\alpha} \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] + \frac{1}{2} \delta t^3 \sum_{l=1}^{M-N_x} \left( \sum_{\alpha} e_{\alpha,l} \sum_{n} \partial_n f_{\alpha} \dot{x}_n \right) \left( \sum_{\alpha'} \sum_{\alpha} e_{\alpha',l} \left[ \sum_{n} \partial_n f_{\alpha'} \dot{x}_n + \sum_{nm} \partial_n \partial_m f_{\alpha'} \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right] \right) + \frac{1}{8} \delta t^4 \sum_{l=1}^{M-N_x} \left( \sum_{\alpha} \sum_{nm} \sigma_{\alpha,m} \partial_n \partial_m f_{\alpha} \dot{x}_n \dot{x}_m \right)^2.$$

(A15)

The second-order term is the Hessian. If that has a direction that is negative, then we have not expanded around a local minimum. However, one can ask whether or not zero directions might arise even if the system is second-order rigid. For that to happen, however, $\dot{x}_n$ cannot be along a zero mode. If it was along a zero mode and the Hessian was zero, the fact that the system is second-order rigid would imply that the energy increases to fourth order. If $\dot{x}_n$ was not along a zero mode and the Hessian was zero, for it to not increase the energy to the fourth order, it has to satisfy Eq. (A14) similar to second-order zero modes (this system would belong to Case 2C).

**Appendix B: Analytical calculations for spring networks**

Here we provide the details of our spring network calculations discussed in Section IIIA.1.

It is useful to express $f_{\alpha}$ explicitly in terms of the DOFs, i.e. the vertex positions $X_n$ (note that here we are using a vectorial notation so $n \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$). To do so, we define the incidence matrix of the network, $I_{\alpha n}$

$$I_{\alpha n} = \begin{cases} 1, & \alpha \text{ leaves vertex } n \\ -1, & \alpha \text{ enters vertex } n \\ 0, & \text{ otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{(B1)}$$

With this definition, we can rewrite the spring length as

$$L_{\alpha} = \left| \sum_n I_{\alpha n} X_n \right| = \left[ \sum_{n,m} I_{\alpha m} I_{\alpha n} X_n \cdot X_m \right]^{1/2} \quad \text{(B2)}$$

and the constraints as

$$f_{\alpha} = \left[ \sum_{n,m} I_{\alpha m} I_{\alpha n} X_n \cdot X_m \right]^{1/2} - L_0 \quad \text{(B3)}$$

Now we study behavior of the zero modes. To do that, we first perturb the network $X_n \rightarrow X_n + \delta X_n$. Taylor expanding Eq. (B3) to second order in $\delta X_n$, we find

$$\delta f_{\alpha} = \left( \sum_n I_{\alpha n} X_n \right) \cdot \left( \sum_m I_{\alpha m} \delta X_m \right) / L_{\alpha} + \left( \sum_n I_{\alpha n} \delta X_n \right)^2 / 2L_{\alpha} - \left( \sum_n I_{\alpha n} X_n \right) \cdot \left( \sum_m I_{\alpha m} \delta X_m \right)^2 / 2L_{\alpha} \quad \text{(B4)}$$

By comparing with Eq. (9) we determine the rigidity matrix of the system is defined as

$$R_{\alpha m} = \frac{\sum_n I_{\alpha n} I_{\alpha m} X_n}{L_{\alpha}}. \quad \text{(B5)}$$

We can then simplify Eq. (B1)

$$\delta f_{\alpha} = \sum_m R_{\alpha m} \cdot \delta X_m + \frac{\left( \sum_n I_{\alpha n} \delta X_n \right)^2 - \left( \sum_m R_{\alpha m} \cdot \delta X_m \right)^2}{2L_{\alpha}} \quad \text{(B6)}$$

Linear zero modes are the solutions to $\sum_m R_{\alpha m} \cdot \delta X_m = 0$. If a linear zero mode is also a second-order zero mode, it must additionally satisfy (Eq. (10))

$$\sum_n \sigma_{\alpha,n} \left( \sum_m I_{\alpha m} \delta X_n \right)^2 / L_{\alpha} = 0. \quad \text{(B7)}$$

$(\sum_n I_{\alpha n} \delta X_n)^2 > 0$ for any nontrivial motion, therefore if a positive state of self stress ($\sigma_{\alpha,n} > 0$) exists, no zero mode will satisfy Eq. (15) The $G = 0$ condition is (Eq. (3))

$$\sum_\alpha f_{\alpha} \left( \sum_n I_{\alpha n} \delta X_n \right) - \left( \sum_m R_{\alpha m} \cdot \delta X_m \right)^2 / 2L_{\alpha} = - \sum_\alpha \left( \sum_m R_{\alpha m} \cdot \delta X_m \right)^2 \quad \text{(B8)}$$

for any mode $\delta X_n$. To retrieve Eqs. (15) and (16) we define $L_\alpha = \sum_n I_{\alpha n} X_n$ to be the vector along the edge $\alpha$, and $\delta L_\alpha = \sum_n I_{\alpha n} \delta X_n$ to be its change due to perturbation $\delta X_n$. The component of $\delta L_\alpha$ parallel to $L_\alpha$ is $\delta L_\parallel = \delta L_\alpha - \sum_m R_{\alpha m} \cdot \delta X_m + O(\delta^2)$.
Appendix C: Analytic calculations for Vertex models

1. Second-order rigidity of vertex model with $K_A = 0$

Here, we look the equations governing second-order zero modes and the $G = 0$ condition for the vertex model with no area term ($K_A = 0$) discussed in section III B I thus $M = N_{cell}$. The constraints on the vertices are given by

$$f_\alpha = P_\alpha - P_0 = \sum_{\text{edge } j \in \text{ cell } \alpha} L_j - P_0$$

$$= \sum_{\text{edge } j \in \text{ cell } \alpha} \left| \sum_n I_{jn} \delta X_n \right| - P_0. \quad \text{(C1)}$$

If we define a cell-edge adjacency matrix $A_{\alpha j}$ by:

$$A_{\alpha j} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{edge } j \in \text{ cell } \alpha \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{(C2)}$$

it allows us to rewrite $f_\alpha$ to show the dependence on $\alpha$ more explicitly:

$$f_\alpha = \sum_j A_{\alpha j} \left| \sum_n I_{jn} \delta X_n \right| - P_0, \quad \text{(C3)}$$

where $j$ now runs through all the edges and $n$ through all vertices.

Now, we perturb vertex positions $X_n \to X_n + \delta X_n$. We get for $\delta f_\alpha$ an expression that is similar to Eq. (B4):

$$\delta f_\alpha = \sum_m R_{am} \cdot \delta X_m + \frac{1}{2} \sum_j A_{\alpha j} \left[ \left( \sum_n I_{jn} \delta X_n \right)^2 \frac{L_j}{L_j} \right]$$

$$- \left( \sum_{am} I_{jn} I_{jm} \delta X_n \cdot \delta X_m \right) \frac{L_j^3}{L_j^3} \quad \text{(C4)}$$

Where we have defined the rigidity matrix as

$$R_{am} = \sum_j \sum_n A_{\alpha j} I_{jn} \frac{I_{jm} \delta X_n}{L_j}. \quad \text{(C5)}$$

Note that the last term in Eq. (C4) cannot be written in terms of $R_{am}$ anymore.

The self stresses of $R_{am}$ impose the following quadratic constraints on zero modes $\delta X_n$:

$$\sum_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha, l} \sum_j A_{\alpha j} \left[ \left( \sum_n I_{jn} \delta X_n \right)^2 \frac{L_j}{L_j} - \left( \sum_{am} I_{jn} I_{jm} \delta X_n \cdot \delta X_m \right) \frac{L_j^3}{L_j^3} \right] = 0, \quad \text{(C6)}$$

which simplifies to

$$\sum_\alpha \sigma_{\alpha, l} \sum_j A_{\alpha j} \left( \frac{\delta L_j^l}{L_j} \right)^2 = 0. \quad \text{(C7)}$$

FIG. 8. Vertex Model ($K_A = 0$) Density of states $D$ as a function of the eigenvalue $\lambda$ for the Hessian matrix (solid black line), Gram matrix (dashed yellow line) and prestress matrix (dash-dotted red line), averaged over 10 samples with $N_{cell} = 500$ and $K_F = 1$. (a) In the Floppy regime ($P_\alpha = 3.90$), the Hessian and the Gram term both possess $3N_{cell}$ zero modes and their DOS curves overlap as there is no prestress in the network. (b) In the rigid regime ($P_\alpha = 3.70$), the Gram term possesses $3N_{cell} + 1$ zero modes and $N_\alpha = 1$, while the Hessian only possesses two trivial (translational) zero modes. The Hessian DOS is dominated by the Gram term at high frequency and by the prestress matrix at low frequencies.

Since all vertices are connected to three edges and the box size is fixed, there are no nontrivial motions that do not introduce a $\delta L_j^l$ and thus the inner sum is positive definite. Thus, similar to spring networks, if a self stress $\sigma_{\alpha, l} > 0$ exists, the system is second-order rigid. To see if the shear modulus is nonzero, we again look at the $G = 0$ condition (Eq. (5)):

$$\sum_\alpha f_\alpha \sum_j A_{\alpha j} \left( \frac{\delta L_j^l}{L_j} \right)^2 = - \sum \alpha \left( \sum_m R_{am} \cdot \delta X_m \right)^2, \quad \text{(C8)}$$

which cannot be satisfied for any nontrivial zero mode if $f_\alpha > 0$. In Fig. 8 and 9 we show plots for vertex model simulations with $K_A = 0$ similar to Fig. 4 and 5.

2. Prestresses in the floppy regime of vertex model with $K_A \neq 0$

It is numerically possible for vertex model configurations in the $P_\alpha > P_0$ regime to be prestressed locally.
This phenomenon has been reported before [29]. Likewise, we have encountered some cases with four-sided polygons that were prestressed at \( P_0 = 3.90 \). This is because those four-sided polygons could not achieve both their preferred area and perimeters, \( A_0 \) and \( P_0 \), even with a zero shear modulus as the prestress is localized. Fig. 4 and 5 in the main text excludes such cases.

**Appendix D: Numerical methods**

**1. Structure initialization for spring networks and vertex model**

For both spring networks and vertex model, we use cell-GPU [59] to initialize \( N_{\text{cell}} \) cell centers randomly in a periodic box of size \( L_x L_y = N_{\text{cell}} \) with \( L_x = L_y = \sqrt{N_{\text{cell}}} \). A Voronoi tessellation is applied to get \( N_{\text{cell}} \) polygon cells with \( 2N_{\text{cell}} \) vertices with coordination number \( z = 3 \). The final step in the initialization process involves moving the cell centers for a few time steps using a self-propelled Voronoi model [41] to make cell areas more uniform. After the initialization process, the energy (Eq. 14 for spring networks and Eq. 17 for vertex model) is minimized by moving the vertices using the FIRE minimizer [60] with a force cutoff of \( 10^{-12} \). For vertex model, a \( T_1 \) transition was performed when an edge length became smaller than 0.01. The size of the time steps for the simulations were dynamically decided by the minimizer, starting from \( dt = 0.001 \), but allowed to be increased up to \( dt_{\text{max}} = 0.1 \).

**2. Structure initialization for jammed packings**

We create 2D disk packings using a quad-precision GPU implementation of the FIRE algorithm [61, 62]. First, \( N \) particles with a polydispersity of 20% are randomly distributed in a periodic box of size \( L = 1 \) and then radii are re-scaled to a packing density well above jamming transition which is typically \( \phi_J \approx 0.84 \) for 2D systems. Finally, the system is minimized to its inherent structure using the FIRE minimizer with a force cutoff of \( 10^{-20} \). At densities far from jamming, a packing will have many states of self stress. To bring the system to the critical jamming with one state of self stress, we successively re-scale the density to smaller values and re-minimize the energy. Once the system reaches one state of self stress, the pressure will be in order of \( p \approx 10^{-8} \) and the initialization process is halted.

**3. Density of states and shear modulus**

To find the eigenvalue spectrum of the Hessian, Gram term and prestress matrix, we calculate the Hessian matrix and its components for a given system at an energy minimum and consider eigenvalues with an absolute value
smaller than $10^{-10}$ as zero eigenmodes. For the density of states plot, we sort all the eigenvalues and use equiprobable (Dirichlet) binning with 150 bins such that there is an equal number of eigenvalues in each bin, from which we can plot a normalized histogram representing the density of states. We also apply a centered moving average with window size 3 to smooth the curves. Zero modes would represent a peak at 0 which are not plotted. For the shear modulus plots, we modify the periodic boundary conditions to accommodate a skew (i.e. Lees-Edwards boundary conditions) with a simple shear parameter $\gamma$, which allows us to write the energy function as a function of $\gamma$. We then use Eq. (2) to calculate the shear modulus.

4. Numerical results for vertex models with no area constraints ($K_A = 0$)

Using the same analyses as discussed for Figures 4 and 5 we calculate the contributions to the Hessian density of vibrational states for vertex models where there are no area constraints, ($K_A = 0$). These data are shown in Fig 8 and 9, respectively.
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