

# A conservation law for liquid crystal defects on manifolds.

Aaron Pim

September 2020

## 1 Introduction

The liquid crystalline phase is an intermediate state of matter between solid crystal and isotropic liquid, possessing orientational ordering but not positional [7, 18]. There are three major classes of liquid crystals, we shall consider the nematic phase only; liquid crystals in the nematic phase are aggregates of rod-like molecules whose preferred direction of alignment is parallel to its neighbour molecules. One of the key features of liquid crystals are point defects, which are points of discontinuity in the preferred direction of the liquid crystal, they can occur naturally in a system either by the geometry of the domain [1] or by boundary conditions [12]. We shall consider a thin film of nematic liquid crystal coating a curved surface, this is referred to as a nematic shell [14]. Nematic shells have a wide variety of technological applications ranging from catalysis, photonic band gap materials and creation of colloidal materials using DNA strands [15], however the most novel application is to contact lenses that can change their refractive index and dioptré [2].

This piece can be viewed in two parts, the first part is the derivation of a conservation law for defects in a nematic shell, this shall be similar to the Poincaré-Hopf theorem however we shall consider domains with boundaries and their impact on the sum total of defects. The second part is investigating the bulk energy of defects in a nematic shell, as we shall be considering an energy density similar to the one constant approximation of the Frank free energy [5] the presence of non-zero defects shall result in a divergence in the energy density. This allows us to consider local energies about defects and minimise the rate of divergence with respect to the defect strengths, thus allowing us to predict what families of defects shall appear.

## 2 Topology Preamble

### 2.1 Surface assumptions.

Consider  $S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ , an orientable two-dimensional manifold embedded in three dimensions, which is such that there exists an open, connected and bounded set  $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ , and a single smooth chart  $\mathbf{x}^{-1} : S \rightarrow \Omega$  with inverse  $\mathbf{x} \in C^2(\bar{\Omega}, \bar{S})$ . The regularity of the boundary  $\partial S$  shall be discussed in the next section. We can form a "natural trihedron", a set of local basis vectors  $\{\mathbf{e}^1, \mathbf{e}^2, \mathbf{N}\}$  relative to the surface

$$\mathbf{x}^i := \frac{\partial \mathbf{x}}{\partial \omega_i}, \quad \mathbf{e}^i := \frac{\mathbf{x}^i}{|\mathbf{x}^i|}, \quad \mathbf{N} := \frac{\mathbf{x}^1 \times \mathbf{x}^2}{|\mathbf{x}^1 \times \mathbf{x}^2|}, \quad \text{for } \underline{\omega} := (\omega_1, \omega_2) \in \Omega.$$


We shall assume that the parametrisation of the surface  $\mathbf{x}$  is such that the natural trihedron forms an orthogonal basis  $\mathbf{x}^1 \cdot \mathbf{x}^2(\underline{\omega}) = 0$  for all  $\underline{\omega} \in \Omega$ . The function

$$\mathbf{F} := \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}^2|} \frac{\partial |\mathbf{x}^1|}{\partial \omega_2} \\ \frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}^1|} \frac{\partial |\mathbf{x}^2|}{\partial \omega_1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

is such that  $\frac{\partial F_2}{\partial \omega_1} - \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \omega_2} \in L^1(\Omega)$ , this is a function of the first fundamental form's and is important in defining concepts such as the Gaussian Curvature. A notable example would be if  $S$  is a surface of revolution, for a sufficiently smooth cross-section.

### 2.2 Boundary assumptions.

The Poincaré-Hopf theorem [4], is a conservation law for tangential vector fields on a closed surface (such as a torus or a sphere) or for tangential fields with boundary data equal to the outward pointing normal of the boundary to the surface. We seek to generalise this principle for surfaces with piecewise smooth



boundaries and for vector fields with sufficiently regular boundary conditions. In this section we seek to parameterise the boundary  $\partial S$ , of the surface  $S$ , and describe its regularity.

Assume that the boundary  $\partial S \subset \mathbb{R}^3$  can be partitioned into a finite number of closed components, denoted  $\partial S_1, \dots, \partial S_M$  for  $M \in \mathbb{N}$ . We shall ignore the case when  $M = 0$ , as there is no boundary (a torus or a sphere are classic examples) and thus the Poincaré-Hopf theorem may be applied.

We parameterise each boundary component  $\partial S_i$  by the function  $\underline{\gamma}_i \in C([0, l_i], \partial S_i)$  where:

- $l_i > 0$  is the arclength of the curve  $\partial S_i$  and the function  $\underline{\gamma}_i$  is parameterised by its arclength, consequently  $|\underline{\gamma}'_i| = 1$ .
- $\underline{\gamma}_i(0) = \underline{\gamma}_i(l_i)$  because  $\partial S_i$  is a closed curve.
- There exist a finite number of values  $0 =: l_i^0 < \dots < l_i^n := l_i$  where the curve is not twice differentiable:

$$\underline{\gamma}_i \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_i} C^2((l_i^{j-1}, l_i^j), \partial S_i),$$

these are called the *vertices* of  $\partial S_i$ .

We notice that the parameterisation is twice differentiable on closed intervals that implies that the Geodesic curvature is integrable:

$$kg_i := \underline{\gamma}_i'' \cdot \left( (\mathbf{N} \circ \mathbf{x}^{-1} \circ \underline{\gamma}_i) \times \underline{\gamma}_i' \right) \in L^1((0, l_i)).$$

The function  $\tau_i^S : [0, l_i] \rightarrow (-\pi, \pi)$  describes the exterior angle of the boundary  $\partial \Omega$ , and is defined point-wise by

$$\tau_i^S(s) := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \begin{cases} \text{sign}(\det(B^i(s, \delta))) |\arccos(\underline{\gamma}'_i(s - \delta) \cdot \underline{\gamma}'_i(s + \delta))| & \text{if } s \in (0, l_i) \\ \text{sign}(\det(B^i(s, \delta))) |\arccos(\underline{\gamma}'_i(l_i - \delta) \cdot \underline{\gamma}'_i(\delta))| & \text{if } s = \{0\} \end{cases}$$

where the matrix

$$B^i(s, \delta) := \begin{cases} \left( \underline{\gamma}'_i(s - \delta), \underline{\gamma}'_i(s + \delta), \frac{\underline{\gamma}'_i(s - \delta) \times \underline{\gamma}'_i(s + \delta)}{|\underline{\gamma}'_i(s - \delta) \times \underline{\gamma}'_i(s + \delta)|} \right) & \text{if } s \in (0, l_i) \\ \left( \underline{\gamma}'_i(l_i - \delta), \underline{\gamma}'_i(\delta), \frac{\underline{\gamma}'_i(l_i - \delta) \times \underline{\gamma}'_i(\delta)}{|\underline{\gamma}'_i(l_i - \delta) \times \underline{\gamma}'_i(\delta)|} \right) & \text{if } s = \{0\} \end{cases}$$

From our earlier assumptions about the continuity of  $\underline{\gamma}_i$  the set  $\text{supp}(\tau_i^S)$  is finite. These points are the vertices of  $\partial S$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, M$  let the set  $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{V_{\partial S}}$  be the set of exterior angles of  $\partial S$  given by:

$$\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{V_{\partial S}} := \bigcup_{i=1}^M \{ \tau_i^S(s) \mid s \in \text{supp}(\tau_i^S) \},$$

for  $V_{\partial S} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

## 2.3 Triangulation Definition.

**Definition 1.** An open subregion  $S_R \subset S$  is simple if it is homeomorphic to a disk and its boundary  $\partial S_R$  is parameterised by  $\underline{\gamma} : [0, l] \rightarrow \partial S_R$  which satisfies the assumptions from section 2.2. The simple subregion  $S_R \subset S$  is a triangle if the corresponding exterior angle function  $\tau : [0, l] \rightarrow (-\pi, \pi)$  is such that  $|\text{supp}(\tau)| = 3$ . For a triangle  $T \subset S$ , let  $\{s_1, s_2, s_3\} = \text{supp}(\tau)$  be such that  $s_1 < s_2 < s_3$ . We define the set of vertices  $\mathcal{V}_T \subset \partial T$  and the set of edges  $\mathcal{E}_T \subset \partial T$  by:

$$\mathcal{V}_T := \{\underline{\gamma}(s_i)\}_{i=1}^3, \quad \mathcal{E}_T := \left\{ \{\underline{\gamma}(s) \mid s \in (0, s_1) \cup (s_3, l)\}, \{\underline{\gamma}(s) \mid s \in (s_1, s_2)\}, \{\underline{\gamma}(s) \mid s \in (s_2, s_3)\} \right\} \quad (2)$$

In this piece we derive our main result by considering partitioning the domain into simple triangular subregions, we then derive a smaller result for each simple region and use that to derive the main result. The simple subregions will be important in the integration of various curvatures and angles, additionally they are used in the definition of a particular partition, known as a Triangulation of the surface, those familiar with finite element methods would have an illustration of this principle.

**Definition 2.** Let us assume that  $S$  is such that there exists a finite partition  $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^F$ , for such that each face  $T_i \subset S$  is a triangle, let  $F \in \mathbb{N}$  denote the number of faces, and that the edge of a triangle is not "split" by a vertex of another triangle:

$$\partial T_i \cap \partial T_j = \overline{\mathcal{E}_{T_i} \cap \mathcal{E}_{T_j}}, \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

We denote the number of vertices of this triangulation by  $V := \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^F \mathcal{V}_{T_i} \right|$  and the number of edges similarly  $E := \left| \bigcup_{i=1}^F \mathcal{E}_{T_i} \right|$ . For a given triangulation of  $S$ , the number

$$\chi := F - E + V,$$

is called the Euler characteristic of the triangulation. It is important to note that the Euler characteristic is invariant with respect to the choice of triangulation and thus is referred to as the Euler characteristic of the surface  $S$ .

We wish to define our admissible class of unit vector fields, which are tangential to the surface  $S$  permit the existence of "point defects" but no defects of any other type, and can satisfy the Poincaré–Hopf theorem.

**Definition 3.** We say that  $\mathbf{u} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$  is of the class  $\mathcal{A}_{tan}$  if and only if there exists a vector field  $\mathbf{A} : \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$  whose components are real analytic with isolated zeros, such that

$$\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{x}(\underline{\omega})) \cdot \mathbf{N}(\underline{\omega}) = 0, \quad \forall \underline{\omega} \in \Omega, \quad \mathbf{u} := \frac{\mathbf{A}}{|\mathbf{A}|}, \quad a.e \ S. \quad (3)$$

The choice of isolated zeros, of the corresponding analytic function, implies that there exists a discrete finite set  $J_{\mathbf{u}} \subset \bar{S}$  such that  $\mathbf{u} \in C^\infty(\bar{S} \setminus J_{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbb{S}^2)$ , which is the set of discontinuities of the vector field  $\mathbf{u}$  and corresponds to the isolated zeros of  $\mathbf{A}$ :

$$J_{\mathbf{u}} := \{\underline{s} \in \bar{S} \mid \mathbf{A}(\underline{s}) = \underline{0}\}. \quad (4)$$

The parameterisation  $\mathbf{x}$  was assumed to be bijective, as such there exists a  $\mathbf{x}^{-1} \in C^\infty(\bar{S}, \Omega)$  such that  $\mathbf{x} \circ \mathbf{x}^{-1} = \text{Id}_\Omega$  and  $\mathbf{x}^{-1} \circ \mathbf{x} = \text{Id}_{\bar{S}}$ , we use this to construct the following decomposition. As  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$  is orthogonal to the normal  $\mathbf{N}$ , we may construct the following decomposition, there exists  $(u_1, u_2) \in C^\infty(\bar{S} \setminus J_{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbb{S}^1)$  such that

$$\mathbf{u}(\underline{s}) = u_1(\underline{s})\mathbf{e}^1(\mathbf{x}^{-1}(s)) + u_2(s)\mathbf{e}^2(\mathbf{x}^{-1}(s)), \quad \forall \underline{s} \in \bar{S} \setminus J_{\mathbf{u}}. \quad (5)$$

## 2.4 Curvature definitions.

As we are considering a vector field on a curved surface, this motivates the question "how do we differentiate with respect to curved space?", the answer is the covariant derivative and Christoffel symbols. For  $i, j, k = 1, 2$ , we define the Christoffel symbols of the second kind  $\Gamma_{ij}^k$  and the functions of the second fundamental form  $L_{ij}$ , by the following:

$$\mathbf{x}^{ij} := \frac{\partial^2 \mathbf{x}}{\partial \omega_i \partial \omega_j} = \Gamma_{ij}^k \mathbf{x}^k + L_{ij} \mathbf{N}, \quad \Gamma_{ij}^k := \frac{\mathbf{x}^{ij} \cdot \mathbf{x}^k}{|\mathbf{x}^k|^2}, \quad L_{ij} := \mathbf{x}^{ij} \cdot \mathbf{N}, \quad \Gamma_{1j}^2 \frac{|\mathbf{x}^2|}{|\mathbf{x}^1|} = F_j.$$

as a direct consequence we have that

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{e}^1}{\partial \omega_j} = F_j \mathbf{e}^2 + \frac{L_{1j}}{|\mathbf{x}^1|} \mathbf{N}, \quad \frac{\partial \mathbf{e}^2}{\partial \omega_j} = -F_j \mathbf{e}^1 + \frac{L_{2j}}{|\mathbf{x}^2|} \mathbf{N}$$


Consider a curve  $\underline{\gamma} \in C^1([0, L], \bar{S})$  parametrised by its arclength, we wish to consider the derivative  $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}(\mathbf{u} \circ \underline{\gamma}(t))$  and understand how it is affected by the curvatures  $\Gamma_{ij}^k$  and  $L_{ij}$ . We shall establish some notation before we proceed, recall that we assumed that  $\mathbf{x}$  is bijective, thus there exists a curve  $\underline{\beta} \in C^1([0, L], \Omega)$  such that  $\underline{\gamma} = \mathbf{x} \circ \underline{\beta}$ ; additionally we denote the following restrictions  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} := \mathbf{u} \circ \underline{\gamma}$ ,  $\hat{u}_i := u_i \circ \underline{\gamma}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}^i := \mathbf{e}^i \circ \underline{\beta}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{N}} := \mathbf{N} \circ \underline{\beta}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{F}} := \mathbf{F} \circ \underline{\beta}$  and  $\hat{A}_{ij} := \frac{L_{ij}}{|\mathbf{x}^i|} \circ \underline{\beta}$ .

For a given  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$  with components  $(u_1, u_2) \in C^\infty(\bar{S} \setminus J_{\mathbf{u}}, \mathbb{S}^1)$  the derivative is given by

$$\frac{d\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} = \left( \frac{d\hat{u}_1}{dt} - \hat{u}_2 \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{e}}^1 + \left( \frac{d\hat{u}_2}{dt} + \hat{u}_1 \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{e}}^2 + \sum_{i,j=1}^2 (\hat{u}_i A_{ij} \beta_j') \hat{\mathbf{N}}.$$

In this piece we wish to consider derivatives with respect to the curved surface, as our vector field is tangent and does not have a normal component, this motivates us to consider a derivative with the same property. Consequently we define the co-variant derivative as the projection of the derivative into the tangent plane

$$\frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} := \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} - \left( \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{N}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{N}} = \left( \frac{d\hat{u}_1}{dt} - \hat{u}_2 \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{e}}^1 + \left( \frac{d\hat{u}_2}{dt} + \hat{u}_1 \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{e}}^2$$



As  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  is both unit length and tangential to the surface we have that  $\frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt}$  is orthogonal to both  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{N}}$ . Thus there exists a real function  $\left[ \frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \right] : [0, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} = \left[ \frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \right] (\hat{\mathbf{N}} \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}), \quad \left[ \frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \right] := \frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{N}} \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}). \quad (6)$$

This function is known as the Algebraic value, and can be used to define important curvatures. One such curvature is the "Geodesic curvature" denoted  $kg : [0, L] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , which is the Algebraic value of the vector  $\underline{\gamma}'$ , which shall be used later in the derivation of the main result. Additionally, the Algebraic value can be used to define the angle between two unit tangent vectors. For  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$  let  $\hat{\mathbf{v}} := \mathbf{v} \circ \underline{\gamma}$ , the Algebraic value can be used to define the derivative of the angle  $\phi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  from  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  to  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ ,

$$\frac{d\phi_{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}}}{dt} = \left[ \frac{D\hat{\mathbf{v}}}{dt} \right] - \left[ \frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \right]. \quad (7)$$

As a direct consequence of the above and the orthogonality of our basis, the derivative of the angle from  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  to  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}^1$ , denoted  $\phi : (0, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$\left[ \frac{D\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \right] = \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}} + \frac{d\phi}{dt}, \quad (8)$$

The function  $\phi$  will be key in defining the index of a vector field on a manifold.

**Lemma 1.** *If the parametrisation is orthogonal, the Gaussian Curvature, denoted  $K : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , of the surface  $S$  is given by*

$$K := -\frac{1}{|\mathbf{x}^1||\mathbf{x}^2|} \left( \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial \omega_1} - \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \omega_2} \right) \quad (9)$$

*Proof.* See [4]. □

## 2.5 Strength of a defect

We can characterise a discontinuity by its Index (or defect strength in the context of liquid crystals, winding number if the surface is planar or degree of the mapping).

**Definition 4.** Let  $S_R \subset S$  be simple and with sufficiently smooth, positively oriented boundary  $\partial S_R$  with parameterisation  $\underline{\gamma} : [0, L] \rightarrow \partial S_R$ , such that  $\frac{d\phi}{ds}$  is integrable in  $(0, L)$ , then the index of  $\mathbf{u}$  in  $S_R$  is defined to be

$$\text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, S_R) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^L \frac{d\phi}{ds} ds,$$

where  $\phi$  is the angle from  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  to  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}^1$ .

The choice in the parameterisation  $\underline{\gamma}$  implies that  $\partial S_R$  is such that  $|\partial S_R \cap J_{\mathbf{u}}| = \{0, 1\}$ , where the set  $J_{\mathbf{u}}$  is given in equation (4), thus we can only have one boundary defect in  $R$ . However, a reader might wonder "what if  $|\partial R \cap J_{\mathbf{u}}| \geq 2$ ?" or "what if I want to know the index of a vector field on a non-simple domain?". The answer to both of those can be answered by the homotopy properties of the index. Considering an exact cover of simple domains  $S_R^1, S_R^2, \dots, S_R^N \subset S$ , which satisfy the boundary assumptions. The index of  $\bigcup_{i=1}^N S_R^i$  is given by [13]

$$\text{Index} \left( \mathbf{u}, \bigcup_{i=1}^N S_R^i \right) := \sum_{i=1}^N \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, S_R^i).$$

This notion of a partition of a domain into regular components will be essential in the proof of the main result. However, the use of Algebraic values is rather cumbersome to use as a definition of the index, thus we wish to express the index as an integral of the components  $(u_1, u_2)$  of  $\mathbf{u}$ .

**Lemma 2.** Let  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$  have the decomposition given by equation (5) then we have that

$$\text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, S_R) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{\partial S_R} u_1 du_2 - u_2 du_1.$$

*Proof.* The definition of the Algebraic value from equation (6) and the decomposition of  $\mathbf{u}$  from equation (5) implies that

$$\left[ \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right] = \frac{d\hat{\mathbf{u}}}{dt} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{N}} \times \hat{\mathbf{u}}) = \hat{u}_1 \left( \frac{d\hat{u}_2}{dt} + \hat{u}_1 \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right) - \hat{u}_2 \left( \frac{d\hat{u}_1}{dt} - \hat{u}_2 \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}} \right)$$

As the components satisfy  $u_1^2 + u_2^2 = 1$  we have that

$$\left[ \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right] = \hat{u}_1 \frac{d\hat{u}_2}{dt} - \hat{u}_2 \frac{d\hat{u}_1}{dt} + \underline{\beta}' \cdot \hat{\mathbf{F}}$$

Comparing with equation (8) we immediately deduce that  $\frac{d\phi}{dt} = \hat{u}_1 \frac{d\hat{u}_2}{dt} - \hat{u}_2 \frac{d\hat{u}_1}{dt}$ , which when substituted into the definition of Index, from equation (4) yields our result.  $\square$

## 3 Topological charge conservation law for a simple domain

**Lemma 3.** For  $S_R \subset S$  simple with sufficiently smooth, positively oriented boundary  $\partial S_R$  with sufficiently smooth parameterisation  $\underline{\gamma} : [0, L] \rightarrow \partial S_R$ , and  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$ , we have that

$$\int_0^L \left( \frac{d\phi}{dt} - \left[ \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right] \right) dt = \iint_{S_R} K d\sigma, \quad (10)$$

where  $\phi$  is the angle between  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}^1$ .

*Proof.* Consider the integral of equation (8) over the interval  $(0, L)$

$$\int_0^L \left( \frac{d\phi}{dt} - \left[ \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right] \right) dt = - \int_0^L \underline{\beta}' \cdot (\mathbf{F} \circ \underline{\beta}) dt.$$

Recall the assumption that the transformation  $\mathbf{x}$  is bijective and smooth, this implies that there exists a simple  $R \subset \Omega$  with boundary parametrised by  $\underline{\beta}$  such that  $\mathbf{x}(R) = S_R$ . As the domain  $R$  is simple we can apply Green's theorem to the right hand side to deduce that

$$\int_0^L \left( \frac{d\phi}{dt} - \left[ \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right] \right) dt = - \iint_R \left( \frac{\partial F_2}{\partial \omega_1} - \frac{\partial F_1}{\partial \omega_2} \right) d\omega.$$

We now applying the definition of Gaussian curvature for orthogonal parametrisation, equation (9), we deduce that

$$\int_0^L \left( \frac{d\phi}{dt} - \left[ \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right] \right) dt = \iint_R K |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega.$$

Finally applying the definition of integration with respect to curvilinear co-ordinates we have that  $|\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega = d\sigma$ , giving our result.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** *For a surface  $S$ , satisfying the assumptions from sections (2.1)-(2.2), the Gauss-Bonnet theorem states that*

$$2\pi\chi(S) = \oint_{\partial S} kg \, ds + \iint_S K \, d\sigma + \sum_{i=1}^{V_{\partial S}} \tau_i. \quad (11)$$

Utilising these two lemmas, the Gauss-Bonnet theorem and the definition of boundary index, we can derive a conservation law for the interior defects on simple surfaces.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $S_R \subset S$  be a simple domain with sufficiently smooth boundary  $\partial S_R$  which is parametrised by a  $\underline{\gamma} : [0, L] \rightarrow \partial S_R$  (which is parametrised by its arclength  $L > 0$ ), additionally we denote the exterior angles of  $\partial S_R$  by  $\tau_i \in (-\pi, \pi)$  for  $i = 1, \dots, V_{\partial S_R}$ . For a  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$  we have that*

$$2\pi = \sum_{i=1}^{V_{\partial S_R}} \tau_i + \oint_{\partial S_R} \frac{d\theta}{dt} dt + 2\pi \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, S_R), \quad (12)$$

where  $\theta$  is the angle between  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  and the unit tangent to the boundary  $\underline{\gamma}'$ .

*Proof.* The definition of a simple domain implies that it is homeomorphic to a disk, consequently it has Euler characteristic  $\chi = 1$ . Applying the Gauss-Bonnet theorem for  $R$  we deduce that

$$2\pi = \sum_{i=1}^{V_{\partial S_R}} \tau_i + \oint_{\partial S_R} kg \, dt + \iint_{S_R} K \, d\sigma.$$

The boundary of  $S_R$  being parametrised by its arclength implies that,  $|\underline{\gamma}'| = 1$  we can substituting in equation (10) to deduce that

$$2\pi = \sum_{i=1}^{V_{\partial S_R}} \tau_i + \int_0^L \left( kg - \left[ \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{dt} \right] \right) dt + \int_0^L \frac{d\phi}{dt} dt,$$

where  $\phi$  is the angle between  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}^1$ . Firstly we apply the definition of index from equation (4) to express  $\int_0^L \frac{d\phi}{dt} dt$  in terms of the Index. Secondly, we recall that the Geodesic curvature,  $kg : (0, L) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , is defined to be the algebraic value of  $\underline{\gamma}$ . Finally we use equation (7), to express that the integral of the derivative of the angle between two vectors is given by the difference of their algebraic values, which obtains our result.  $\square$

## 4 Topological charge conservation law for a non-simple domain

In the previous section we derived a conservation law for a tangential vector field on a simple domain, we shall use this to generalise to any sufficiently smooth surface. We shall do this by partitioning the surface into regular components, then apply the previous result on each component before using that to deduce our main result. However, we shall be considering a very specific partition known as a *triangulation*, readers who are familiar with numerical finite element methods would have a good visualisation.

Consider a triangulation, see definition (2),  $\mathcal{T} := \{T_i\}_{i=1}^F$  of the surface  $S$ , where  $F \in \mathbb{N}$  the number of triangles. For each triangle  $T_i$  let the edges be denoted  $\mathcal{E}_{T_i} = \{e_{ij}\}_{j=1}^3$ , the exterior angles  $\{\tau_{ij}\}_{i=1}^3$ , and the parametrisation of the boundary  $\underline{\gamma}_i \in C([0, L_i], \partial T_i)$  is parametrised by its arclength and is smooth on the edges. Additionally for a given  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$  it is assumed that  $|\partial T_i \cap J_{\mathbf{u}}| \leq 1$ , and if  $|\partial T_i \cap J_{\mathbf{u}}| = 1$  then  $\underline{\gamma}_i$  is such that  $\underline{\gamma}_i(0) = \partial T_i \cap J_{\mathbf{u}} = \underline{\gamma}_i(L_i)$ . As triangles are simple domains, we may apply equation (12) to the vector field on each triangle, hence

$$2\pi = \sum_{j=1}^3 \tau_{ij} + \sum_{j=1}^3 \int_{e_{ij}} \frac{d\theta_i}{dt} dt + 2\pi \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, T_i),$$

where  $\theta_i$  is the angle between  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\underline{\gamma}'_i$ . Taking a summation of the above equation over all triangles  $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^F$ , thus yielding

$$2\pi F = \sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \tau_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \int_{e_{ij}} \frac{d\theta_i}{dt} dt + 2\pi \sum_{i=1}^F \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, T_i). \quad (13)$$

We shall now simplify these terms, consider a pair of triangles  $T_i$  and  $T_k$  such that there exists  $n, m \in \{1, 2, 3\}$  such that  $e_{in} = e_{km}$ . As the boundary of each triangle is positively oriented we have that

$$\int_{e_{in}} \frac{d\theta_i}{dt} dt = - \int_{e_{km}} \frac{d\theta_k}{dt} dt. \Rightarrow \sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \int_{e_{ij}} \frac{d\theta_i}{dt} dt = \int_{\partial S} \frac{d\theta}{dt} dt, \quad (14)$$

where the function  $\theta$  is the angle between the vector field  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\underline{\gamma}'$ , where  $\underline{\gamma} : [0, L] \rightarrow \partial S$  is positively oriented and parametrises the boundary  $\partial S$ . We shall now simplify the sum of the exterior angles, using the following notation:

$E_{\partial S}$  = number of external edges of  $\mathcal{T}$

$E_S$  = number of internal edges of  $\mathcal{T}$  (ignoring repeated edges).

$V_{\partial \mathcal{T}}$  = number of external vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

$V_{\partial S}$  = number of vertices of  $\partial S$ .

$V_{\partial \mathcal{T}/S}$  = number of vertices of our triangulation which are not vertices of  $\partial S$ .

$V_{\mathcal{T}}$  = number of internal vertices of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

$\sigma_{i,j} := \pi - \tau_{ij}$ , the interior angles of the triangle  $T_i$

It is clear that  $V_{\partial \mathcal{T}/S} + V_{\partial S} = V_{\partial \mathcal{T}}$  and that

$$\sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \tau_{ij} = \sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 (\pi - \sigma_{i,j}) = 3\pi F - \sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \sigma_{i,j}.$$

It can be shown that because we are considering a triangulation we have that  $3F = 2E_S + E_{\partial S}$  and consequently

$$\sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \tau_{ij} = 2\pi E_S + \pi E_{\partial S} - \sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \sigma_{i,j}. \quad (15)$$

If a vertex is internal, then the sum of internal angles at that vertex is  $2\pi$ , and if a vertex is external but not a vertex of  $\partial S$ , then the sum of internal angles is  $\pi$ . Recall that  $\{\tau_k\}_{k=1}^{V_{\partial S}}$  is the set of exterior angles of  $\partial S$ , we have that

$$\sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \sigma_{i,j} = 2\pi V_{\mathcal{T}} + \pi V_{\partial \mathcal{T}/S} + \sum_{k=1}^{V_{\partial S}} (\pi - \tau_k).$$

As the boundary curves are closed it is clear that  $E_{\partial S} = V_{\partial \mathcal{T}}$ , therefore we have  $E_{\partial S} = 2E_{\partial S} - V_{\partial \mathcal{T}}$  and hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^F \sum_{j=1}^3 \tau_{ij} = 2\pi(E_S + E_{\partial S}) - 2\pi(V_{\mathcal{T}} + V_{\partial \mathcal{T}}) + \sum_{k=1}^{V_{\partial S}} \tau_k. \quad (16)$$

Reusing the same notation from definition (2) it is clear that  $E = E_S + E_{\partial S}$  and  $V = V_{\mathcal{T}} + V_{\partial \mathcal{T}}$ . Consequently substituting equations (14) and (16) into (13) we obtain

$$\chi = \sum_{k=1}^{V_{\partial S}} \frac{\tau_k}{2\pi} + \frac{1}{2\pi} \oint_{\partial S} \frac{d\theta}{ds} ds + \sum_{i=1}^F \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, T_i) \quad (17)$$

where  $\chi$  is the Euler Characteristic of the surface  $S$ , given in definition (2).

## 5 Oseen-Frank energy rate minimisation

In the previous section we derived a conservation law for vector fields on a surface. We would normally wish to consider the Dirichlet integral of this vector field to find the minimising configurations, however we shall show that if there exists a point with non-zero index then the energy is infinite. Thus we either need to consider systems without defects, or we change our question.

Rather than minimising the Dirichlet integral of the vector field, we can instead minimise the rate at which the Dirichlet integral diverges; since the "minimising" configurations would be the ones which are the slowest to diverge. To derive such a rate we shall require a few additional assumptions on the geometry of our surface.

### 5.1 Geometry assumptions

We assume that our parameterisation  $\mathbf{x}$  is such that the vector field  $\mathbf{F}$  is such that  $|\mathbf{F}|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| \in L^1(\Omega)$ , this is equivalent to saying that  $\mathbf{F}$  is in the class  $L^2$  with respect to curvilinear co-ordinates. This assumption shall play a minor role in the construction of a lower bound. Similarly we recall the definition of the first fundamental forms  $L_{ij}$  and assume that

$$|\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| \sum_{i,j=1}^2 \frac{L_{ij}}{|\mathbf{x}^i|} \frac{L_{ij}}{|\mathbf{x}^j|} \in L^1(\Omega).$$

Additionally, for each point  $\underline{\omega} \in \bar{\Omega}$  we assume there exists a  $\rho(\underline{\omega}) > 0$ ,  $\alpha(\underline{\omega}) \in [0, \infty)$  and  $h^-(\underline{\omega}) \leq h^+(\underline{\omega})$  such that

$$0 < |\mathbf{x}^i|(\underline{\omega}) + h^-|\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}|^\alpha \leq |\mathbf{x}^i|(\underline{\omega}) \leq |\mathbf{x}^i|(\underline{\omega}) + h^+|\underline{\omega} - \underline{\omega}|^\alpha, \quad \underline{\omega} \in \bar{\Omega} \cap B_\rho(\underline{\omega}) \setminus \{\underline{\omega}\}, \quad (18)$$

for  $i = 1, 2$ . This local Hölder approximation is very important in the derivation of the divergence rate, especially in the case when  $|\mathbf{x}^1|(\underline{\omega}) = |\mathbf{x}^2|(\underline{\omega}) = 0$ .

### 5.2 Vector field assumptions

Similar to the previous section we require some additional assumptions on the vector field  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{A}_{tan}$ . A point  $\underline{s}$  is in  $J_{\mathbf{u}} \setminus \partial S$  if and only if  $\mathbf{x}^{-1}(\underline{s}) \notin \partial\Omega$ , we formally understand this as "an internal defect of  $S$  is an internal defect of  $\Omega$ ". For a given with discontinuity set  $J_{\mathbf{u}} \subset S$ , which we shall define the constant  $R > 0$  to be

$$2R := \left\{ \inf_{\underline{\omega} \in \mathbf{x}^{-1}(J_{\mathbf{u}})} (\text{dist}(\underline{\omega}, \mathbf{x}^{-1}(J_{\mathbf{u}}) \setminus \{\underline{\omega}\})), \inf_{\underline{\omega} \in \mathbf{x}^{-1}(J_{\mathbf{u}} \setminus \partial S)} (\text{dist}(\underline{\omega}, \partial\Omega)), \min_{\underline{\omega} \in \mathbf{x}^{-1}(J_{\mathbf{u}})} \rho(\underline{\omega}) \right\}$$

Thus the constant  $R > 0$  is such that for  $\underline{\omega}^1, \underline{\omega}^2 \in \mathbf{x}^{-1}(J_{\mathbf{u}})$  distinct, the simple manifolds  $\mathbf{x}(B_R(\underline{\omega}^1) \cap \Omega)$  and  $\mathbf{x}(B_R(\underline{\omega}^2) \cap \Omega)$  do not intersect. For  $\epsilon < R$  we define the following domain

$$\Omega_\epsilon := \Omega \setminus \bigcup_{\underline{\omega} \in J_{\mathbf{u}}} \bar{B}_\epsilon(\underline{\omega}).$$

We consider the one constant approximation to the Oseen-Frank energy, denoted  $E_\epsilon : \mathcal{A}_{tan} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ , on a manifold which is the simplest strain energy [17],

$$E_\epsilon[\mathbf{u}] := \int_{\mathbf{x}(\Omega_\epsilon)} |\text{grad}(\mathbf{u})|^2 d\sigma = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon} \left( \left| \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{\partial\omega_1} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{\partial\omega_2} \right|^2 + |\mathcal{B}[\mathbf{u}]|^2 \right) |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\underline{\omega},$$

where the co-variant derivative  $\frac{D}{\partial\omega_i}$  and shape operator  $\mathcal{B}$  are defined by

$$\frac{D\mathbf{u}}{\partial\omega_i} := \frac{\partial(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{x})}{\partial\omega_i} - \left( \frac{\partial(\mathbf{u} \circ \mathbf{x})}{\partial\omega_i} \cdot \mathbf{N} \right) \mathbf{N}, \quad \mathcal{B}_j[\mathbf{u}] := \sum_{i=1}^2 (u_i \circ \mathbf{x}) \frac{L_{ij}}{|\mathbf{x}^i|}.$$

We shall omit the " $\circ \mathbf{x}$ " for tractability as we shall be considering functions of  $\Omega$  only. We have excluded a small region about each of the defects and wish to estimate the local rate of divergence about each discontinuity, thus we seek a lower bound on the energy functional. Our assumption about the regularity of  $L_{ij}$  means that

$$E_\epsilon[\mathbf{u}] \geq \int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus \bar{\Omega}_R} \left( \left| \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{\partial\omega_1} \right|^2 + \left| \frac{D\mathbf{u}}{\partial\omega_2} \right|^2 \right) |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\underline{\omega} = \int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus \bar{\Omega}_R} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1 + \mathbf{F}|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\underline{\omega},$$



where  $\nabla$  is the gradient operator in  $\Omega$ . For a given  $q_1 \in (0, 1)$ , we can bound the integrand further by the following inequality

$$|u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1 + \mathbf{F}|^2 \geq q_1 |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 - q_2, \quad q_2 \geq \frac{q_1}{1 - q_1} |\mathbf{F}|^2.$$

In the formulation we assumed that  $|\mathbf{F}|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2|$  is integrable, thus the  $q_2$  term is negligible for this analysis. We need to estimate

$$\int_{\Omega_\epsilon \setminus \bar{\Omega}_R} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega = \sum_{\hat{\omega} \in J_{\mathbf{u}} A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega$$

where  $A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega}) := (B_R(\hat{\omega}) \setminus \bar{B}_\epsilon(\hat{\omega})) \cap \Omega$ . We shall a lower bound on the local Dirichlet integral of an internal defect and then use that to motivate a similar analysis of a boundary defect. The definition of  $R$  is such that  $\text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, \Omega \cap B_r(\hat{\omega}))$  is constant for all  $r \leq R$ , we denote the index by  $n(\hat{\omega}) := \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, \Omega \cap B_r(\hat{\omega}))$ , we shall omit  $\hat{\omega}$  during the derivation of the lower bound. Additionally we define the functions  $m^+, m^- : J_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  by

$$m^+(\hat{\omega}) := \max\{|\mathbf{x}^1|(\hat{\omega}), |\mathbf{x}^2|(\hat{\omega})\}, \quad m^-(\hat{\omega}) := \min\{|\mathbf{x}^1|(\hat{\omega}), |\mathbf{x}^2|(\hat{\omega})\},$$

similarly we shall omit the  $\hat{\omega}$ , it is clear by definition that  $0 \leq m^- \leq m^+$ . We consider two cases, when  $m^+ \neq 0$  and  $m^+ = 0$ , in this second case we also have that  $m^- = 0$ .

**Lemma 5.** • In the case  $m^+ \neq 0$  we have that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega$  diverges to

$$\text{infinity with rate } 2\pi n^2 \left(\frac{m^-}{m^+}\right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}.$$

• In the case  $m^+ = 0$  we have that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega$  diverges to infinity with

$$\text{rate } 2\pi n^2 \left(\frac{h^-}{h^+}\right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \text{ where } h^+, h^- \text{ are the bounds from equation (18).}$$

*Proof.* As we are considering an annulus the most appropriate basis would be polar co-ordinates  $(r, \vartheta)$  which motivates

$$\mathbf{x}^1 = \mathbf{x}^r \cos \vartheta - \frac{1}{r} \mathbf{x}^\vartheta \sin \vartheta, \quad \mathbf{x}^2 = \mathbf{x}^r \sin \vartheta + \frac{1}{r} \mathbf{x}^\vartheta \cos \vartheta.$$

Considering the cross and dot product of  $\mathbf{x}^1$  and  $\mathbf{x}^2$  we deduce that

$$\mathbf{x}^1 \times \mathbf{x}^2 = \frac{1}{r} \mathbf{x}^r \times \mathbf{x}^\vartheta, \quad \mathbf{x}^r \cdot \mathbf{x}^\vartheta = 0, \quad |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega = |\mathbf{x}^r| |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta dr.$$

Thus we have that

$$\int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega \geq \int_{\epsilon}^R \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right)^2 |\mathbf{x}^r| |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta \frac{dr}{r^2} \quad (19)$$

Our goal will be to substitute the defect strength to eliminate the  $\vartheta$  integral, if we consider the curve  $C^r := \{\mathbf{x}(\hat{\omega} + r\mathbb{S}^1)\}$  parametrised by  $\underline{\gamma}_r(\vartheta) := \mathbf{x}(\hat{\omega} + r(\cos \vartheta, \sin \vartheta))$  for  $\vartheta \in [-\pi, \pi]$  we note that  $\mathbf{x}^\vartheta = \underline{\gamma}'_r$ . It is clear from the definition of index and the assumption of isolated zeros that

$$2\pi n = \oint_{C^r} u_1 du_2 - u_2 du_1 = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right) |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta, \quad \forall r \in (0, R).$$

Comparing the above to equation (19) it is clear that we must bound  $|\mathbf{x}^r|$  from below by a function of  $r$  only. Reverting back to  $\mathbf{x}^1$  and  $\mathbf{x}^2$  we have that

$$|\mathbf{x}^r| = r \sqrt{|\mathbf{x}^1|^2 \cos^2 \vartheta + |\mathbf{x}^2|^2 \sin^2 \vartheta} \geq r \min_{i=1,2} |\mathbf{x}^i|, \quad \forall r \in [0, R], \vartheta \in [-\pi, \pi] \quad (20)$$

Recall we assumed that  $\mathbf{x}^1$  and  $\mathbf{x}^2$  satisfy equation (18) this allows us construct the following bounds

$$0 < h^- r^\alpha + m^- \leq |\mathbf{x}^i| \leq h^+ r^\alpha + m^+, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \quad (21)$$

Substituting the lower bound from equation (21) into equation (20) and then applying that bound to  $|\mathbf{x}^r|$  in equation (19) yields

$$\int_{A_\epsilon^R(\underline{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega \geq \int_{\epsilon}^R \oint_{C^r} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right)^2 d\lambda (m^- + h^- r^\alpha) \frac{dr}{r}. \quad (22)$$

where  $d\lambda := |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta$ . Using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we deduce that

$$4\pi^2 n^2 = \left( \oint_{C^r} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right) d\lambda \right)^2 \leq \oint_{C^r} 1^2 d\lambda \oint_{C^r} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right)^2 d\lambda, \quad (23)$$

We wish to bound  $\oint_{C^r} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right)^2 d\lambda$  from below in terms of the index of the vector field  $n$  and the parameter  $r$ , thus we must construct an upper bound on the arclength of  $C^r$ ,

$$(m^- + h^- r^\alpha) |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| \leq \frac{1}{r} |\mathbf{x}^r| |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| = |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| \leq (m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha)^2, \quad \oint_{C^r} 1^2 d\lambda = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta \leq 2\pi \frac{(m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha)^2}{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}. \quad (24)$$

Thus substituting the lower bound from equation (24) into the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality from equation (23) we obtain

$$2\pi n^2 \frac{(m^- + h^- r^\alpha)}{(m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha)^2} \leq \oint_{C^r} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right)^2 d\lambda$$

This lower bound is finite for  $r \in [0, R]$  by the assumption from equation (18), substituting the above equation into the bound from equation (22) eliminates the dependence on  $\vartheta$  yielding

$$\int_{A_\epsilon^R(\underline{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega \geq 2\pi n^2 \int_{\epsilon}^R \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 \frac{dr}{r}. \quad (25)$$

We now consider two cases when  $m^+ > 0$  and when  $m^+ = 0$ , in the latter case by our assumption we have that  $0 < h^- \leq h^+$  as otherwise  $|\mathbf{x}^1|, |\mathbf{x}^2| = 0$  which implies that  $\mathbf{x}$  parametrises a point, not a surface. Additionally if  $\alpha = 0$  then that implies that  $|\mathbf{x}^i|$  is constant in  $B_R(\underline{\omega})$  and thus  $h^+ = h^- = 0$  and  $0 < m^- \leq m^+$ . Consider first case, when  $m^+ > 0$  and  $\alpha > 0$  then the integral from equation (25) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\underline{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega &\geq 2\pi n^2 \left( \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + 2\pi n^2 \left( \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \log R \\ &\quad + \frac{2\pi n^2}{\alpha} \left( \left( \frac{h^-}{h^+} \right)^2 - \left( \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \right) \log \frac{h^+ R^\alpha + m^+}{h^+ \epsilon^\alpha + m^+} \\ &\quad + \frac{2\pi n^2 m^+}{\alpha} \left( \frac{h^-}{h^+} - \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \left( \frac{1}{h^+ R^\alpha + m^+} - \frac{1}{h^+ \epsilon^\alpha + m^+} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  the Dirichlet integral diverges with rate  $2\pi n^2 \left( \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$  as the lower order terms are constant. Consider the second case, when  $m^+ > 0$  and  $\alpha = 0$ , the lower bound integral becomes

$$\int_{A_\epsilon^R(\underline{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega \geq 2\pi n^2 \left( \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + 2\pi n^2 \left( \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \log R,$$

which matches the case when  $\alpha > 0$ . Finally, we consider the case when  $m^+ = 0$  then we have that equation (22) becomes

$$\int_{A_\epsilon^R(\underline{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega \geq 2\pi n^2 \left( \frac{h^-}{h^+} \right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon} + 2\pi n^2 \left( \frac{h^-}{h^+} \right)^2 \log R.$$

□

### 5.3 Rate for a boundary defect

Similar to the previous lemma, we shall construct a lower bound on the energy near a defect, however with the inclusion of the boundary changing the geometry and consequently the bound. Similar to the additional assumptions from section 5.1 we require a higher degree of regularity of the boundary. For a given  $\hat{\omega} \in \mathbf{x}^{-1}(J_{\mathbf{u}} \cap \partial S)$  we shall assume that there exist  $\vartheta_1, \vartheta_2 \in C^1([0, R], \mathbb{R})$  such that  $\vartheta_2(t) > \vartheta_1(t)$  for all  $t \in [0, R]$  and

$$\mathbf{x}(B_r(\hat{\omega})) \cap \partial S = C_1^r \cup C_2^r, \text{ where } C_i^r := \left\{ \mathbf{x} \left( \hat{\omega} + \begin{pmatrix} t \cos \vartheta_i(t) \\ t \sin \vartheta_i(t) \end{pmatrix} \right) \mid t \in [0, r] \right\}.$$

We shall assume that the reciprocal of the difference of the angle functions can be linearised, there exists a constant  $\vartheta^{\min} < \vartheta^{\max}$  such that

$$\vartheta^{\min} r \leq \frac{1}{\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1}(r) - \frac{1}{\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1}(0) \leq \vartheta^{\max} r, \text{ for all } r \in [0, R]. \quad (26)$$

We understand  $\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1(0)$  to be the interior angle of  $\Omega$  at the point  $\hat{\omega} \in \partial\Omega$ . We recall that  $\mathbf{u}$  is the normalisation of a real analytical vector field, this implies that there exists a constant  $u^* \geq 0$  such that

$$\left| \int_{C_2^r - C_1^r} u_1 du_2 - u_2 du_1 \right| \leq u^* r.$$

We understand this to be derivative angle between  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{e}^1$  is bounded, which implies that the boundary data is such that there are no essential discontinuities [16]. We shall now construct a lower bound on the energy divergence, the majority of the analysis will be similar to the previous lemma.

**Lemma 6.** • In the case  $m^+ \neq 0$  we have that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega$  diverges to

$$\text{infinity with rate } \frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{(\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)(0)} \left( \frac{m^-}{m^+} \right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}.$$

• In the case  $m^+ = 0$  we have that  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega$  diverges to infinity with

$$\text{rate } \frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{(\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)(0)} \left( \frac{h^-}{h^+} \right)^2 \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}, \text{ where } h^+, h^- \text{ are the bounds from equation (18).}$$

*Proof.* Let  $U_\epsilon(\hat{\omega}) := \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega$ , from the previous proof we can immediately obtain a similar bound to equation (22)

$$U_\epsilon(\hat{\omega}) \geq \int_{\epsilon}^R \left( \int_{\vartheta_1(r)}^{\vartheta_2(r)} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right)^2 |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta \right) (m^- + h^- r^\alpha) \frac{dr}{r}.$$

Applying Cauchy-Schwartz in a similarly to (23) we deduce that

$$U_\epsilon(\hat{\omega}) \geq \int_{\epsilon}^R \left( \int_{\vartheta_1(r)}^{\vartheta_2(r)} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right) |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta \right)^2 \frac{1}{(\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)(r)} \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 \frac{dr}{r}.$$

We recall the definition of the index of a vector field to deduce that

$$\left( \int_{\vartheta_1(r)}^{\vartheta_2(r)} \left( u_1 \frac{\partial u_2}{\partial \vartheta} - u_2 \frac{\partial u_1}{\partial \vartheta} \right) |\mathbf{x}^\vartheta| d\vartheta \right)^2 = \left( 2\pi m + \int_{C_1^r - C_2^r} u_1 du_2 - u_2 du_1 \right)^2 \geq 4\pi^2 n^2 - 4\pi |n| u^* r,$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_\epsilon^R(\hat{\omega})} |u_1 \nabla u_2 - u_2 \nabla u_1|^2 |\mathbf{x}^1| |\mathbf{x}^2| d\omega &\geq \int_{\epsilon}^R \frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{(\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)(r)} \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 \frac{dr}{r} \\ &\quad - \int_{\epsilon}^R \frac{4\pi u^* n}{(\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)(r)} \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 dr. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the assumption on  $\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1$  from equation (26) we deduce that

$$U_\epsilon(\underline{\omega}) \geq \frac{4\pi^2 n^2}{(\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)(0)} \int_\epsilon^R \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 \frac{dr}{r} + 4\pi^2 n^2 \vartheta^{\min} \int_\epsilon^R \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 dr \\ - \frac{4\pi u^* |n|}{(\vartheta_2 - \vartheta_1)(0)} \int_\epsilon^R \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 dr - 4\pi u^* |n| \vartheta^{\max} \int_\epsilon^R \left( \frac{m^- + h^- r^\alpha}{m^+ + h^+ r^\alpha} \right)^2 r dr.$$

We observe that the 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> terms are bounded as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  because  $m^- \leq m^+$  and therefore do not contribute towards the divergence, we may apply the same analysis to the 1<sup>st</sup> term as equation (22), thus obtaining our result.  $\square$

## 6 Prediction of defect strengths

Recall that the energy we wish to consider the limit of the energy

$$E_\epsilon = \int_{\mathbf{x}(\Omega_\epsilon)} |\text{grad}(\mathbf{u})|^2 d\sigma,$$

as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ . However, as we have just proven if there are any defects in the system then the energy diverges to infinity logarithmically. A reader might think that we need only consider systems that lack defects, but we recall the conservation law for defects given in equation (17), which might force the existence of defects depending on the boundary conditions. Minimising an energy which is infinite would have no meaning, however we can minimise the rate at which the energy diverges. We can predict the strengths of defects within a system using only the geometrical parameters. Note that in liquid crystal systems the strengths of defects can be half-integers [6, 13] and as such we extend our notion of defect strength to include such systems.

The edges of the surface may be designed such that they produce a force on the liquid crystal molecules, which influences the orientation of the molecules. There are two ways to model such an influence, the first is called *Weak Anchoring*, which imposes an energy penalty the further the common axis deviates from the preferred direction. If these forces are sufficiently strong, then we may assume that the vector  $\mathbf{u}$  has a fixed direction on the boundary [7]. One of the most common boundary conditions is conic boundary conditions where the angle between our vector field  $\mathbf{u}$  and the tangent to the boundary  $\underline{\gamma}'$  (from section 2.2) is constant, with the typical choice being equal to the normal to the edge  $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{N} \times \underline{\gamma}'$  or purely tangential  $\mathbf{u} = \underline{\gamma}'$  [12]. Regardless of the specific choice of constant we obtain two important simplifications:

- Boundary defects are given in terms of the exterior angle at that point [11], for a point  $\underline{s} \in \partial S$  with exterior angle  $\tau \in (-\pi, \pi)$  there exists an integer  $m \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $\text{str}(\mathbf{u}, \underline{s}) = m + \frac{\tau}{2\pi}$ . Consequently the presence of a vertex implies the existence of a boundary defect.
- The conservation law from section 2.2 is simplified to

$$\chi = \sum_{k=1}^{V_{\partial S}} \frac{\tau_k}{2\pi} + \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, S) \quad (27)$$

As previously established the energy  $E_\epsilon$  diverges logarithmically with rate

$$\sum_{\underline{\omega} \in J_{\mathbf{u}} \cap \Omega} q(\underline{\omega}) n^2(\underline{\omega}) + \sum_{\underline{\omega} \in J_{\mathbf{u}} \cap \partial \Omega} \frac{2\pi}{\pi - \phi(\underline{\omega})} q(\underline{\omega}) n^2(\underline{\omega}), \quad (28)$$

where the function  $q : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  is given by

$$q(\underline{\omega}) = \begin{cases} \frac{\min\{|\mathbf{x}^1|, |\mathbf{x}^2|\}}{\max\{|\mathbf{x}^1|, |\mathbf{x}^2|\}}(\underline{\omega}), & \max\{|\mathbf{x}^1|, |\mathbf{x}^2|\}(\underline{\omega}) \neq 0, \\ \frac{h^-}{h^+}, & \max\{|\mathbf{x}^1|, |\mathbf{x}^2|\}(\underline{\omega}) = 0, \end{cases}$$

for  $h^- < h^+$  are given in equation (18). The function  $n : \bar{\Omega} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined to be the pointwise limit of the index,

$$n(\underline{\omega}) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \text{Index}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{x}(B_r(\underline{\omega}) \cap \Omega)).$$




Figure 1: An illustration of the optimal defect configuration for a planar triangle.

The function  $\phi : \partial\Omega \rightarrow (-\pi, \pi)$  is the exterior angle of  $\partial\Omega$ , not to be confused with  $\tau$  which is the exterior angle of  $\partial S$ . Thus to minimise the rate at which the energy diverges to infinity one needs to minimise (28) with respect to (27). Recall that the boundary defects can be expressed as a constant plus an integer which implies that the domain of both our function and constraint are the half-integers.

We can consider a simplification of the above system when  $S$  is a planar domain and thus  $|\mathbf{x}^1| = |\mathbf{x}^2| = 1$  and the exterior angle of  $\partial S$  is equal to  $\partial\Omega$ , then our quadratic minimisation problem becomes the minimisation of  $Q : \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}^{|J_{\mathbf{u}}|} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$

$$Q = \sum_{i=1}^{|J_{\mathbf{u}} \cap \Omega|} n_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{V_{\partial S}} \frac{2\pi}{\pi - \tau_j} \left( m_j - \frac{\tau_j}{2\pi} \right)^2, \text{ subject to } \chi = \sum_{i=1}^{|J_{\mathbf{u}} \cap \Omega|} n_i + \sum_{j=1}^{V_{\partial S}} m_j.$$

A great example of how this principle can be applied is when we consider the square well with nematic liquid crystals [12], such a system has two steady states the rotational and diagonal state, with no interior defects and defects of  $\{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 0, 0\}$  at each of the vertices. The locations of the defects in the vertices determine what "state" the system is in, but the question of why there are no other families of solutions can be explained through the above minimisation principle.

Similarly we can predict the families of solutions for any other reasonably smooth system, for example consider an equilateral triangle, which implies that  $N = 3$ ,  $\chi = 1$  and  $\tau_i = \frac{2\pi}{3}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 3$ . Using a numerical minimiser we deduce that "minimising" configuration has three defects of strength  $+\frac{1}{6}$  located at the vertices and one internal defect of strength  $-\frac{1}{2}$ , which is illustrated in figure (1). This piece has been focused on the Oseen-Frank model on the surface of a manifold. However, similar work has been conducted on the Landau-de Gennes model in planar polygonal domains. We can compare the configuration of defects predicted by the derived algorithm against the results that these authors find.

In the case of a equilateral triangular well, the configuration of defects matches precisely the configurations found by Han, Majumdar and Zhang [8] for both the large and small  $\lambda$  parameter. In the context of two dimensional modelling the large  $\lambda$  limit of the Landau-de Gennes model corresponds to the Oseen-Frank one constant approximation.

In the case of an equilateral hexagonal well, the work of Han, Harris, Majumdar and Walton predict the existence of multiple branches of defect patterns.

- The three branches denoted *Ortho*, *Meta* and *Para*, correspond to permutations of the corner defect strengths: two of strength  $\frac{1}{3}$  and four of strength  $-\frac{1}{6}$  [10, 8], these branches are present in the limit  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ .
- The *M1*-states which correspond to a single internal defect of strength  $\frac{1}{2}$ , one corner defect of strength  $\frac{1}{3}$  and five corner defects of strength  $-\frac{1}{6}$  [9].
- The *BD*-state which corresponds to corresponds to six corner defects of strength  $-\frac{1}{6}$  and two internal defects of strength  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

These five branches are all predicted by the minimisation method we have described as they all possess the same energy divergence rate. However, these are not the only branches of defect patterns which are observed in the Landau-de Gennes model.

The *Ring* pattern, which is similar to the *BD*-state because of the six corner defects of strength  $-\frac{1}{6}$ , has a single internal defect of strength  $+1$ . This defect pattern is not predicted, as the minimisation principle considers the sum of the squares of the defect strengths, and the internal defect of  $+1$  has a larger rate of energy divergence than two defects of strength  $\frac{1}{2}$ .

The transitional states which are denoted  $T$  and  $H$ , similarly are not observed as, the perspective of the defect configuration identical to the *BD*-state but with additional pairs of internal defects of strengths  $-\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$ . Each pair of defects, while possessing a net defect strength of 0, increase the rate of divergence by  $+\frac{1}{2}$ . Thus this minimisation principle prefers the *BD*-state to both the  $T$  and  $H$  states.

## 7 Conclusion and Discussion

We derived a conservation law for vector fields on the surface of a manifold using the notions of triangulation and an application of the Gauss-Bonnet theorem. We then considered the Oseen-Frank one constant approximation (the Dirichlet integral) on the surface of the manifold and investigated the rate at which the energy density diverges locally because of the defect. Finally, we combined the two results to create a discrete minimisation problem with a linear constraint, the solutions of which predict the strengths of defect branches. Finally, we compared the predictions that this theorem made with results from practical experiments and from numerical simulations.

In future work, the derivation of the generalisation of the Poincaré–Hopf theorem that we have presented could potentially be generalised further for surfaces which can be described by an atlas of charts, rather than a single one. The proof sketch would involve applying the previous theorem on each chart and then simplifying the sum of angles in a similar method to equation (15).

The prediction theorem we have presented is valid for the Oseen-Frank one constant approximation, which (for thermotropic liquid crystals) is the limit of the Landau-de Gennes model as the temperature decreases [3]. However, we have seen that this heuristic prediction theorem cannot capture certain states. At the present time it is unclear whether this is because the prediction theorem is lacking an important term or if the states are unstable in the low temperature limit.

In this piece we considered the leading order term of the lower bound of the localised Dirichlet integral about each defect, which allowed us to derive a heuristic prediction about the defect strengths. This method predicts the various branches of defects, however it does not give any information about which branch is "preferred". For example, in the shallow rectangular well the diagonal state may energetically preferable to the rotated state [12, 11] depending on the ratio between the lengths of the sides. A potential continuation would be to consider the lower order terms of this energy, this may allow us to heuristically predict the locations of the internal defects and understand which branches are energetically preferable.

Despite the issues we have discussed, the ability to predict potential defect configurations based solely on geometrical parameters could have extensive uses in numerical analysis to construct well posed initial conditions, which are essential in finite element methods. Additionally, the predictive method can be applied to unusual, non-regular, non-polygonal well shapes making it exceptionally versatile. Finally, the algorithm to predict the defect strengths is numerically easy to apply; as it is the discrete minimisation of a quadratic with respect to a linear constraint; where the coefficients are geometrical constants. Such an algorithm is so numerically cheap, the calculations may be done on a smartphone within a few seconds.

### 7.1 Acknowledgements

We are grateful for the financial support of the University of Bath's department of Mathematical Sciences. Additionally, we are thankful for the support and guidance of Kirill Cherednichenko, Apala Majumdar and Jey Sivaloganathan.

## References

- [1] Stan Alama, Lia Bronsard, and Dmitry Golovaty. "Thin Film Liquid Crystals with Oblique Anchoring and Boojums." In: *preprint arXiv 1907.04757* (2019).
- [2] James Bailey et al. "Switchable Liquid Crystal Contact Lenses for the Correction of Presbyopia." In: *Crystals* 8 (29 2018).
- [3] Fabrice Bethuel, Haim Brezis, and Frederic Helein. "Asymptotics for the minimization of a Ginzburg-Landau functional." In: *Calculus of Variations 1* (1993), pp. 123–148.

- [4] Manfredo P.do Carmo. *Differential Geometry of Curves and Surfaces*. Prentice-Hall Inc., 1976.
- [5] F.C.Frank. “I. Liquid crystals. On the theory of liquid crystals”. In: *Discussions of the Faraday Society* 25 (1958), pp. 19–25.
- [6] G. Di Fratta et al. “Half-integer point defects in the Q-tensor theory of nematic liquid crystals.” In: *Journal of Nonlinear Science* 26 (1 2016), pp. 121–140.
- [7] P.G. de Gennes. *The physics of Liquid Crystals*. The international series of monographs of Physics. Clarendon Press, 1974.
- [8] Yucen Han, Apala Majumdar, and Lei Zhang. “A Reduced Study for Nematic Equilibria on Two-Dimensional Polygons”. eng. In: *SIAM journal on applied mathematics* 80.4 (2020), pp. 1678–1703. ISSN: 0036-1399.
- [9] Yucen Han et al. “Solution landscape of a reduced Landau-de Gennes model on a hexagon”. eng. In: (2020).
- [10] Yucen Han et al. “Tailored Nematic and Magnetization Profiles on 2D Polygons”. eng. In: (2021).
- [11] Alexander Lewis. “Defects in Liquid Crystals: Mathematical and Experimental Studies”. PhD thesis. St Anne’s College University of Oxford, 2015.
- [12] Chong Luo, Apala Majumdar, and Radek Erban. “Multistability in planar liquid crystal wells”. In: *Physical review* 85 (2012).
- [13] N.D.Mermin. “The topological theory of defects in ordered media.” In: *Reviews of Modern Physics* 51.3 (June 1979), pp. 591–648.
- [14] Gaetano Napoli and Luigi Vergori. “Surface free energies for nematic shells.” In: *Physical Review* 85 (6 2012).
- [15] David R. Nelson. “Toward a Tetravalent Chemistry of Colloids.” In: *Nano-letter* 2.10 (2002), pp. 1125–1129.
- [16] S. Saks and A. Zygmund. *Analytic functions*. Elsevier, 1971.
- [17] Antonio Segatti, Micheal Snarski, and Marco Veneroni. “Analysis of a variational model for nematic shells.” In: *Mathematical models and methods in applied sciences* 26.10 (2014).
- [18] E.G. Virga. *Variational Theories for Liquid Crystals*. 1st. Vol. 8. Applied Mathematics and Mathematical Computation. Chapman and Hall, May 1995.