

Poncelet polygons and monotonicity of rotation numbers: iso-periodic confocal pencils of conics, hidden traps, and marvels

Vladimir Dragović^{1,3} and Milena Radnović^{2,3}

¹THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT DALLAS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES

²THE UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS

³MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE SANU, BELGRADE

vladimir.dragovic@utdallas.edu, milena.radnovic@sydney.edu.au

Abstract

We study Poncelet polygons inscribed in a given boundary conic and tangent to conics from a confocal pencil, when the boundary does not belong to the pencil. This question naturally arose in the study of the numerical range and Blaschke products. We compare and contrast the obtained results with the case when the boundary belongs to the confocal pencil of caustics, which was studied before, in particular in the study of elliptical billiards. We examine the monotonicity of rotation numbers argument and observe deficiencies in typical ways such arguments were used. We derive and use Cayley-type conditions to fill the gaps in the existing proofs and derive more general statements. We discover confocal families of conics with the property that each conic from the family is a caustic for k -Poncelet polygons inscribed in the circle, with the same k . For $k = 4$ we characterize all such families. Then, we relate them to solutions to Painlevé VI equations. We prove that such families do not exist for $k \neq 4$.

Keywords: k -Poncelet polygons; elliptic curves; Cayley-type conditions; rotation numbers; iso-periodic confocal pencils; Painlevé VI equations; Okamoto transformations.

AMS subclass: 14H70, 37J70, 34M55, 37A10

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Cayley-type conditions. Cases $k = 3, 4, 5$	4
3	Iso-periodic confocal pencils: $k = 4$.	6
4	k-Poncelet conics vs. Blaschke ellipses for $k = 3, 4$ revisited	10
4.1	Review of the basic properties of the Blaschke transformations	10
4.2	3-Poncelet conics vs. Blaschke ellipses revisited	11
4.3	4-Poncelet caustics and Blaschke ellipses	12
5	Iso-periodic confocal pencils and Painlevé VI equations	13
5.1	Painlevé VI equations, Picard solutions, and Okamoto transformation	13
5.2	From iso-periodic confocal pencils to explicit solutions to Painlevé VI equations	14
6	Are there iso-periodic confocal pencils for $k \neq 4$?	16
7	Behaviour of the rotation numbers within a pencil of confocal conics	17

1 Introduction

Although Poncelet polygons occupy attention of major mathematicians for more than a bicentennial, from Poncelet, Jacobi, Cayley, via Darboux and Lebesgue, to Griffiths, Harris, Berger, Kozlov, Narasimhan, and Hitchin, to mention a few, we have discovered an unexpected phenomenon: there exist confocal families of conics which are all caustics of k -Poncelet polygons inscribed in a given circle, with a fixed k . This significantly changes the understanding and intuition related to injectivity and monotonicity of induced rotational numbers. To complete the surprise, we prove that such a phenomenon appears only for $k = 4$.

The main object of our study are Poncelet polygons inscribed in a given boundary conic and tangent to conics from a confocal pencil, when the boundary does not belong to the pencil. This question naturally arose in the study of the numerical range and Blaschke products, see [DGSV2018] and [MFSS2019] and references therein. We compare and contrast the obtained results with the case when the boundary belongs to the confocal pencil of caustics, which was studied before, in particular in the study of elliptical billiards and the Great Poncelet Theorem, see for example [Ber1987], [Dar1914], [KT1991], [Leb1942], [Fla2009], [DR2011], [DR2014a], and [DR2019b] and references therein.

Recently, two different approaches were developed to relate Poncelet polygons and distinguished classes of polynomials. In [DR2019a] the relationship between periodic trajectories of billiards within ellipsoids in d -dimensional space and the Chebyshev-type extremal polynomials over d intervals was established for any $d \geq 2$. In [MFSS2019] the case of Poncelet polygons in the plane ($d = 2$) was related to paraorthogonal polynomials. A specialization of the results of [DR2019a] for $d = 2$ is given in [DR2019b].

Integrability of a billiard system within an ellipse in the plane can be geometrically observed through the existence of a caustic: for every trajectory there exists a conic, *confocal* with the boundary ellipse, which is tangent to all lines containing segments of the given trajectory. Such a conic is called *the caustic* of a given trajectory. Keeping the boundary ellipse fixed and varying the trajectories, the caustics also vary within the same confocal pencil and this pencil contains the boundary ellipse.

Both Poncelet polygons and billiards within an ellipse have the same dynamical background. It was explained in [Kin1994]. Given two ellipses in the plane, the outer (the boundary) F and the inner (the caustic) E inside F . For any point $f_1 \in F$ one can define “the right” tangent to E which touches it at e_1 and intersects F in another point f_2 . This process can continue from f_2 using the right tangent to E and generates e_2 on E and $f_3 \in F$ and so on. If this process is periodic with period k starting from f_1 , then according to the Poncelet theorem (see for example [Kin1994], [DR2011], [DGSV2018]) it will be periodic with the same period starting from any other point f from F . We will refer to $f_1 f_2 \dots f_k$ as a Poncelet polygon inscribed in F and circumscribed about E or a k -Poncelet polygonal line. In the case of a billiard, we have periodic billiard trajectories of period k . We will also say that E is a k -Poncelet caustic with respect to F .

We can also say that the above process generates dynamics $R : F \rightarrow F$ and $\hat{R} : E \rightarrow E$ with $R(f_i) = f_{i+1}$ and $\hat{R}(e_i) = e_{i+1}$. Both of these dynamics are conjugate to a rigid rotation of a circle for a fixed angle θ (see [Kin1994]). Moreover, [Kin1994] there exist measures μ_F on F and μ_E on E such that

$$\mu_F(f_j, f_{j+1}) = \mu_F(f_i, f_{i+1}), \quad \mu_E(e_j, e_{j+1}) = \mu_E(e_i, e_{i+1}),$$

for any i, j and

$$\frac{\mu_F(f_j, f_{j+1})}{\mu_F(F)} = \frac{\mu_E(e_j, e_{j+1})}{\mu_E(E)} = \rho. \quad (1.1)$$

The quantity ρ is called *the rotation number* of the Poncelet process generated by conics E and F . The process is periodic if and only if $\rho \in \mathbb{Q}$. If the period is k then $\rho = p/k$, where p is the winding number describing the number of loops the trajectory makes around F for one period. In the case when the boundary conic belongs to the same confocal pencil as caustics, a measure which is invariant with respect to the reflections off the conics of the confocal pencil was constructed in [DR2014b] as a pullback of the Lebesgue measure, see also [DR2019a]. This means that one measure on a fixed caustic serves all the reflections off various boundaries from the confocal pencil.

(Another definition of rotation numbers in a more general context will be given in Section 7.)

The question of monotonicity of rotation numbers when caustics run through a confocal pencil even in the case when the pencil contains the boundary conic is quite delicate, and especially for hyperbolas as caustics, see [Dui2010] and also [DR2019a]. For billiards within ellipsoids in higher dimension d , this question is more complex. Each trajectory has $d - 1$ caustics, which are all quadrics confocal with the boundary ellipsoid. The analogue of the monotonicity of rotation numbers in the higher-dimensional situations is the injectivity of the frequency maps. It was studied in [DR2019a] using the relationship with the Chebyshev polynomials and properties of sets of alternance.

In studies of Blaschke products and the numerical ranges (see [DGSV2018] and [MFSS2019] for example and references therein) it is natural to study also polygons (or polygonal lines) inscribed in a unit circle and subscribed around a conic from a given confocal pencil. In these situations the boundary conic – the unit circle *does not belong* to the confocal family of caustics.

In these situations again a natural question of monotonicity of rotational numbers appears. We examine the monotonicity argument as it was usually used in the study of polygons inscribed in a given circle with caustics belonging to a confocal family of conics. Although quite intuitive, these arguments unfortunately do not seem to be complete. We use here Cayley-type conditions to fill the gaps in the existing proofs and derive more general statements. On that path, we discovered confocal families of conics with the property that each conic from the family is a

caustic for k -Poncelet polygons inscribed in the circle, with the same k . We refer to such confocal pencils of conics as *iso-periodic confocal pencils*, see Definition 3.7. For $k = 4$ we characterize all such iso-periodic pencils (see Figures 1 and 2) in Theorem 3.3. We relate them to solutions to Painlevé VI equations in Theorem 5.4. We prove that there are no iso-periodic families for $k \neq 4$ in Theorem 6.1.

In concluding Section 7 we study more closely monotonicity of rotation numbers as functions of pencil parameter and define iso-rotational confocal families in Definition 7.2 as natural generalizations of iso-periodic confocal families. In Theorem 7.4 we prove that there are no iso-rotational families which are not iso-periodic.

One significant difference between the situations when the boundary conic belongs to the same confocal pencil as caustics and those when the boundary conic does not belong to the confocal pencil of caustics can be explained as follows.

Suppose that the boundary is an ellipse which belongs to the same confocal pencil as ellipses caustics. Then for each caustic, there are three mutually excluding possibilities: (i) the caustic ellipse is completely inside the boundary ellipse; (ii) the caustic ellipse coincides with the boundary ellipse; (iii) the caustic ellipse completely contains the boundary ellipse.

In the case when the boundary conic does not belong to the confocal pencil of caustics the situation is more delicate. It may happen that the caustic touches the boundary in one or two points. It may also happen that the caustic is partially inside the boundary conic and partially outside the boundary conic. One can ask a question:

Is it possible to have a triangle inscribed in a circle, whose sides are tangent to an ellipse which is partially inside the circle, partially outside (see Figure 3) but with the condition that both foci *are inside the circle*?

These situations make study of monotonicity of rotation numbers more challenging even if the caustics are confocal ellipses. The answer to the above question is provided in Theorem 4.7. A similar question for quadrilaterals is answered in Theorem 4.13.

2 Cayley-type conditions. Cases $k = 3, 4, 5$

We consider polygonal lines inscribed in the unit circle:

$$\Gamma : (x - x_0)^2 + (y - y_0)^2 = 1$$

and circumscribed about an ellipse from the following confocal family:

$$\mathcal{C}(t) : \frac{x^2}{a-t} + \frac{y^2}{b-t} = 1, \quad a > b > 0.$$

We will use the same letters to denote the matrices corresponding to those two conics:

$$\Gamma = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & -x_0 \\ 0 & 1 & -y_0 \\ -x_0 & -y_0 & x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{a-t} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{b-t} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We denote:

$$D_t(\lambda) = \det(\mathcal{C}(t) + \lambda\Gamma).$$

We consider the family of cubic curves:

$$\mathcal{E}_t : \mu^2 = D_t(\lambda).$$

For t generic E_t is an elliptic curve. Calculation gives:

$$D_t(\lambda) = \frac{1}{(a-t)(b-t)} \cdot \left(- (a-t)(b-t)\lambda^3 + \lambda^2 \left(-(a-t)(b-t) + (a-t)(y_0^2 - 1) + (b-t)(x_0^2 - 1) \right) + \lambda \left(-(a-t) - (b-t) + x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1 \right) - 1 \right). \quad (2.1)$$

Denote the Taylor expansion about $\lambda = 0$ as follows:

$$\sqrt{-(a-t)(b-t)D(\lambda)} = C_0 + C_1\lambda + C_2\lambda^2 + C_3\lambda^3 + \dots$$

Remark 2.1 *The coefficients $C_j = C_j(t)$ are rational functions in t .*

Applying the ideas from [Cay1853], see also [GH1978], [DR2011] and [DR2019b] and references therein, we get:

Theorem 2.2 (Cayley's type condition) *There is a closed polygonal line with k vertices, inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ if and only if $kP_0 \sim kP_\infty$ on the cubic \mathcal{E}_t with P_0 being one of the points of the curve \mathcal{E}_t corresponding to $\lambda = 0$ and P_∞ corresponding to $\lambda = \infty$.*

Further, $kP_0 \sim kP_\infty$ is equivalent to:

$$C_2 = 0, \quad \begin{vmatrix} C_2 & C_3 \\ C_3 & C_4 \end{vmatrix} = 0, \quad \begin{vmatrix} C_2 & C_3 & C_4 \\ C_3 & C_4 & C_5 \\ C_4 & C_5 & C_6 \end{vmatrix} = 0, \dots \quad \text{for } k = 3, 5, 7, \dots$$

$$C_3 = 0, \quad \begin{vmatrix} C_3 & C_4 \\ C_4 & C_5 \end{vmatrix} = 0, \quad \begin{vmatrix} C_3 & C_4 & C_5 \\ C_4 & C_5 & C_6 \\ C_5 & C_6 & C_7 \end{vmatrix} = 0, \dots \quad \text{for } k = 4, 6, 8, \dots$$

Proof. It follows from the classical Cayley condition, see [DR2019b] and [DR2011] and references therein. In the current situation, for any fixed value of the parameter t , we generate a pencil from Γ and $\mathcal{C}(t)$ as a pair of conics. The question reduces to the following: find t for which the point (any of the two) above $\lambda = 0$ is a point of order k on the elliptic curve E_t . \square

Now, we are going to analyse the above Cayley-type conditions for small k .

Corollary 2.3 *The condition for the existence of a triangle inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is $C_2(t) = 0$:*

$$4t + 1 - 2(a+b) + (a-b)^2 - 2x_0^2(1+a-b) - 2y_0^2(1-a+b) + (x_0^2 + y_0^2)^2 = 0.$$

That equation has the unique solution in t , which we will denote as t_3 :

$$t_3 = -\frac{1}{4} \left(1 - 2(a+b) + (a-b)^2 - 2x_0^2(1+a-b) - 2y_0^2(1-a+b) + (x_0^2 + y_0^2)^2 \right). \quad (2.2)$$

Corollary 2.4 *The condition for the existence of a quadrangle inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is $C_3(t) = 0$, i.e.:*

$$\alpha_4 + \beta_4 t = 0,$$

where:

$$\alpha_4 = 8ab + 4(x_0^2 + y_0^2 - a - b - 1)t_3,$$

$$\beta_4 = 8t_3 + 4(1 - a - b - x_0^2 - y_0^2).$$

Corollary 2.5 *The condition for the existence of a pentagon inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is:*

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} C_2(t) & C_3(t) \\ C_3(t) & C_4(t) \end{pmatrix} = 0,$$

which is equivalent to:

$$\alpha_5 + \beta_5 t + \gamma_5 t^2 + \delta_5 t^3 = 0,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_5 &= -64t_3^3 + 128ab(a + b + 1 - x_0^2 + y_0^2)t_3 - 256a^2b^2, \\ \beta_5 &= 192t_3^2 - 128t_3(a^2 + 4ab - ax_0^2 - ay_0^2 + a + b^2 - bx_0^2 - by_0^2 + b) \\ &\quad + 128ab(3a + 3b + x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1), \\ \gamma_5 &= 64(6a + 6b - 2x_0^2 - 2y_0^2 - 1)t_3 - 128(a^2 + 4ab + ax_0^2 + ay_0^2 - a + b^2 + bx_0^2 + by_0^2 - b), \\ \delta_5 &= -256t_3 + 64(2a + 2b + 2x_0^2 + 2y_0^2 - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.6 *Although there is an obvious similarity between Cayley-type conditions derived in Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 3 from [DR2019b], the analysis of the cases for small k shows that there is a striking difference between the Cayley-type conditions studied above for $k = 3, 4, 5$ and corresponding Cayley conditions for the cases studied in [DR2019b] when the boundary belongs to the confocal pencil of caustics. Namely, for $k = 3$ in [DR2019b] the Cayley condition led to a quadratic equation, which had two real solutions and one of them corresponded to a real motion. In Corollary 2.3 we got a linear equation. In the case $k = 4$ in [DR2019b] the equation was of degree 3 and it has three real solutions. Depending on parameters of the confocal pencil, they generated one or two possible cases of real motion. In Corollary 2.4 the obtained equation is linear. In [DR2019b] for $k = 5$ the obtained equation was of degree 6 and there were two corresponding cases of real motion, depending on the winding numbers. In Corollary 2.5 the equation is of degree 3.*

3 Iso-periodic confocal pencils: $k = 4$.

Let us start with a symmetric case: $x_0 = 0$. This is the case when the centre of Γ is on the y -axis.

We have:

$$D_t(\lambda) = -\frac{((a-t)\lambda + 1)((b-t)\lambda^2 + \lambda((b-t) - y_0^2 + 1) + 1)}{(a-t)(b-t)}.$$

The condition for triangles, according to Corollary 2.3, is:

$$t = \frac{1}{4}(-a^2 + 2ab - 2ay_0^2 + 2a - b^2 + 2by_0^2 + 2b - y_0^4 + 2y_0^2 - 1).$$

The condition for quadrangles, $C_3 = 0$, according to Corollary 2.4, becomes:

$$\frac{1}{16}(a - b + y_0^2 - 1)(a^2 - 2at - b^2 + 2b(t + y_0^2 + 1) - 2ty_0^2 - 2t - y_0^4 + 2y_0^2 - 1) = 0,$$

with the following solution in t :

$$t = \frac{a^2 - b^2 + 2by_0^2 + 2b - y_0^4 + 2y_0^2 - 1}{2(a - b + y_0^2 + 1)}.$$




Figure 1: Each conic with the foci on a circle is inscribed in quadrangles whose vertices belong to the circle.

We note that in the case when $a - b + y_0^2 = 1$, any ellipse $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is inscribed in quadrangles with vertices on Γ . This case corresponds to the foci of the family $\mathcal{C}(t)$ lying on the circle Γ , see Figure 1.

Remark 3.1 Notice that the Corollary 2.3 implies that there is a unique value of t such that triangles are inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$. In the case when the foci of $\mathcal{C}(t)$ lie on Γ , this is seemingly in contradiction with the conclusion that there are quadrangles inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ for any t .

When we calculate t using the formula from Corollary 2.3, with the condition $a - b + y_0^2 = 1$, we get $t = b$, which corresponds to the singular conic $C(b)$ from the confocal pencil $\mathcal{C}(t)$.

Consider now the other symmetric case: $y_0 = 0$. The condition for quadrangles, $C_3 = 0$, is:

$$\frac{1}{16} (a - b - x_0^2 + 1) (a^2 - 2a(t + x_0^2 + 1) - b^2 + 2bt + 2tx_0^2 + 2t + x_0^4 - 2x_0^2 + 1) = 0,$$

so we see that this condition is satisfied for each t whenever $x_0^2 = a - b + 1$. In order to see the geometric meaning of that condition, we calculate the cross ratio of the foci with the endpoints of the diameter of Γ which lies on the x -axis:

$$\frac{\sqrt{a-b} - (x_0 - 1)}{\sqrt{a-b} - (x_0 + 1)} \cdot \frac{-\sqrt{a-b} - (x_0 + 1)}{-\sqrt{a-b} - (x_0 - 1)} = -1.$$

Thus, in this case, the foci are symmetric to each other with respect to Γ , see Figure 2.

Remark 3.2 Similarly as in Remark 3.1, we need to check the case when both Cayley's conditions, for triangles and quadrangles, are satisfied: $C_2 = C_3 = 0$. The value of t from Corollary 2.3 is $t = a$ when the foci are symmetric with respect to the circle Γ . That is a degenerate conic coinciding with the y -axis, which is disjoint with Γ when the foci are symmetric with respect to that circle.




Figure 2: Each conic from the confocal family is inscribed in quadrangles whose vertices belong to the circle. The foci are symmetric with respect to the circle.

Theorem 3.3 *A confocal family of conics $\mathcal{C}(t)$ has a property that for each t , there is a 4-Poncelet polygonal line inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ if and only if the focal points belong to Γ or they are symmetric with respect to Γ . In other words, each conic from the confocal family $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is a 4-Poncelet caustic with respect to Γ .*

Proof. The focal points belong to Γ or they are symmetric with respect to Γ if and only if $x_0 = 0$ and $a - b + y_0^2 = 1$ or, respectively, $y_0 = 0$ and $a - b - x_0^2 + 1 = 0$. In both of those cases, we get that $\alpha_4 = \beta_4 = 0$ (see Corollary 2.4), thus the corresponding Cayley condition $C_3 = 0$ is satisfied for each t , which implies that there is a quadrangle inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ for any t .

Now, suppose that there are quadrangles inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ for each t . Thus the Cayley condition $C_3 = 0$ is satisfied for all t . By Corollary 2.4, $C_3 = \alpha_4 + \beta_4 t$ is a linear expression in t , so $\alpha_4 = \beta_4 = 0$. From there:

$$\alpha_4 + (a + b - x_0^2 - y_0^2 + 3)\beta_4 = 0,$$

which gives:

$$1 - (a - b)^2 + (a - b - 1)x_0^2 + (b - a - 1)y_0^2 = 0.$$

From there, we get:

$$y_0^2 = \frac{(a - b - 1)(a - b - x_0^2 + 1)}{-a + b - 1},$$

which we substitute to $\beta_4 = 0$:

$$\frac{x_0^2(a - b)^2(a - b - x_0^2 + 1)}{(a - b + 1)^2} = 0.$$

The first possibility, $x_0 = 0$, will imply $y_0^2 = 1 + b - a$, which means that the foci belong to Γ . The second case, $a - b - x_0^2 - 1 = 0$, implies $y_0 = 0$ and that the foci are symmetric with respect to Γ . Finally, the case $a - b = 0$ implies that $x_0^2 + y_0^2 = 1$, i.e. the origin is on Γ and it is also the centre of the concentric family of circles $\mathcal{C}(t)$. \square

Remark 3.4 Alternative geometric proof of Theorem 3.3. *First we consider the case when the center O of the circle Γ and the foci F_1, F_2 are collinear. Denote the line that contains these three points by ℓ and let points M, N form the intersection of ℓ and circle Γ . We assume that points F_1, M, O, N are anharmonic, i.e. the cross-ratio is -1 :*

$$[F_1, M, F_2, N] = -1.$$

We want to show that for any conic E with the foci F_1, F_2 there exists a quadrilateral inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about E . Denote the intersection points of E and Γ by P, Q . Consider the line NP . We want to show that it is tangent to E (at P). From $[F_1, M, F_2, N] = -1$, we get

$$[PF_1, PM, PF_2, PN] = -1.$$

From the fact that the lines PF_1, PM, PF_2, PN are anharmonic, it follows that F_1PF_2 is a billiard reflection off E and off PN . Thus, the line PN is tangent to E at P .

Similarly the line NQ is tangent to E at Q . Thus, $NPNQ$ is a 4-Poncelet polygon inscribed in the circle Γ and circumscribed about an arbitrary selected conic E with the foci F_1, F_2 . This concludes one part of the geometric proof of Theorem 3.3.

Now let us consider the case when both foci F_1, F_2 belong to the circle Γ . Let M, N denote the mid-points of two arcs of Γ having M, N as the end-points.

We want to show that for any conic E with the foci F_1, F_2 there exists a quadrilateral inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about E . Denote the intersection points of E and Γ by P, Q . Consider the line NP . We want to show that it is tangent to E (at P).

Indeed, the line PM is the bisector of the angle F_1PF_2 . This line is also orthogonal to PN , since MN is a diameter of Γ and P belongs to Γ . Taking into account the focal property of conics, we get that the line NP is tangent to the conic E at P .

Similarly, the line NQ is tangent to E at Q . Thus, $NPNQ$ is a 4-Poncelet polygon inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about E .

Corollary 3.5 *Given a circle Γ and any point F on it. Any circle C with the center at F is a caustic of a 4-Poncelet polygon inscribed in Γ .*

Proof. Let P, Q be the intersection points of the circles C and Γ and let N be the second intersection point of the line FO with Γ .

Then NP is orthogonal to FP , since FN is a diameter of Γ and P belongs to Γ . Thus, NP is tangent to C at P . Similarly, NQ is tangent to C at Q . Thus, $NPNQ$ is a Poncelet quadrilateral inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about C . \square

Remark 3.6 Third proof of Theorem 3.3, based on the theory of invariants. *Denote by $I_j, j = 1, 2, 3, 4$, the coefficients of $D_t(\lambda)$ from (2.1) with λ^{4-j} . The condition that there exists a quadrilateral inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ can be expressed in terms of I_j :*

$$8I_1I_4^2 - 4I_2I_3I_4 + I_3^3 = 0. \quad (3.1)$$

(see for example [DR2011] Ex. 4.50 where a misprint in the term I_3^2 is corrected to get I_3^3).

As said above, (i) the focal points belong to Γ if and only if $x_0 = 0$ and $a - b + y_0^2 = 1$ and (ii) they are symmetric with respect to Γ if and only if $y_0 = 0$ and $a - b - x_0^2 + 1 = 0$.

In the case (i), the coefficients I_j take the form (up to a common factor):

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= -(a - t)(b - t); \\ I_2 &= (I_1 - t(b - a - 1) + (b - a)a - b); \\ I_3 &= 2(t - a); \\ I_4 &= -1. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

By plugging the relations (3.2) for I_j into (3.1) one gets the identity for all t . Case (ii) can be treated analogously. This completes the third proof of Theorem 3.3.

Definition 3.7 *If a confocal pencil of conics $\mathcal{C}(t)$ has a property that for each t , the conic $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is a k -Poncelet caustic with respect to Γ , then we say that the confocal family $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is iso-periodic, or k -iso-periodic.*

We have characterized 4-iso-periodic confocal pencils in Theorem 3.3. The natural question is:

Are there iso-periodic confocal pencils for $k \neq 4$?

The answer is going to be provided in Theorem 6.1.

4 k -Poncelet conics vs. Blaschke ellipses for $k = 3, 4$ revisited

4.1 Review of the basic properties of the Blaschke transformations

We are going to review properties of Blaschke transformations (see e.g. [DGSV2018] and references therein) in a way we will need it later. Let us denote

$$B_a(z) = \frac{a - z}{1 - z\bar{a}} \quad (4.1)$$

a Möbius transformation for a given $a \in \mathbb{C}$.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $z, w, v \in \mathbb{C}$, $z \neq \bar{w}$, $z\bar{v} \neq 1$, $v\bar{w} \neq 1$. Then*

$$\frac{1 - B_w(z)B_w^-(v)}{1 - z\bar{v}} = \frac{1 - |w|^2}{(1 - z\bar{w})(1 - \bar{v}w)}.$$

Proof. It follows by straightforward calculation:

$$1 - B_w(z)B_w^-(v) = \frac{(1 - z\bar{w})(1 - \bar{v}w) - (z - w)(\bar{v} - \bar{w})}{(1 - z\bar{w})(1 - \bar{v}w)} = \frac{(1 - z\bar{w})(1 - |\bar{w}|^2)}{(1 - z\bar{w})(1 - \bar{v}w)}.$$

□

Corollary 4.2 *For $v = z$ it holds:*

$$\frac{1 - |B_w(z)|^2}{1 - |z|^2} = \frac{1 - |w|^2}{|1 - z\bar{w}|^2}. \quad (4.2)$$

Corollary 4.3 *The Möbius transformations (4.1) have the following properties:*

- If $|z| < 1$ and $|w| < 1$ then $|B_w(z)| < 1$.
- If $|z| < 1$ and $|w| \geq 1$ then $|B_w(z)| \geq 1$.
- If $|z| > 1$ and $|w| < 1$ then $|B_w(z)| > 1$.
- If $|z| > 1$ and $|w| > 1$ then $|B_w(z)| < 1$.

Lemma 4.4 *For given a, b , $|a| < 1$, $|b| < 1$ there exists a unique c such that $B_c(a) = b$. For such a c , it is $|c| < 1$.*

Proof. For given a, b the condition $B_c(a) = b$ leads to a system of two linear equations on two real variables $c_1 = \Re c, c_2 = \Im c$. The determinant of that system is

$$\Delta = 1 - |a|^2|b|^2.$$

Thus, from $|a| < 1, |b| < 1$ it follows that $\Delta \neq 0$, and the system has a unique solution, c . From Corollary 4.3 it follows that $c < 1$. \square

Let us denote $\mathbb{T} = \{z \mid |z| = 1\}$ the unit circle and $\mathbb{D} = \{z \mid |z| < 1\}$ the open unit disk bounded by \mathbb{T} .

The transformations defined by (4.1) are called the Blaschke transformations. For $|a| < 1$, B_a is an automorphism of \mathbb{D} , see [DGSV2018]. Composition of n Blaschke transformations defines a Blaschke product B of degree n . Following [DGSV2018], one associates to B a Blaschke curve as the caustic of all polygons with vertices at the solutions of $B(z) = \lambda$, for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$. Let us recall two statements from [DGSV2018].

Proposition 4.5 (Theorem 2.9, [DGSV2018]) *Let B be a Blaschke product of degree 3 with zeros $0, a, b$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{T}$, let z_1, z_2, z_3 denote the three distinct solutions to $B(z) = \lambda$. Then the lines joining z_j and z_k , ($j \neq k$) are tangent to the ellipse given by*

$$|w - a| + |w - b| = |1 - \bar{a}b|.$$

Proposition 4.6 (Corollary 13.9, [DGSV2018]) *Let B be a Blaschke product of degree 4. Then the associated Blaschke curve is an ellipse if and only if B is decomposable.*

4.2 3-Poncelet conics vs. Blaschke ellipses revisited

Now, we are going to study triangles inscribed in the unit circle and having a conic from a given confocal family as the caustic. Unlike [DGSV2018] we, in principle, allow the possibility for the caustic to be a hyperbola.

Theorem 4.7 *Given two points $a, b \in \mathbb{D}$. Then there exists a unique conic E with the foci a, b , which is 3-Poncelet caustic with respect to \mathbb{T} . Moreover, E is an ellipse. That ellipse is the Blaschke ellipse with the major axis of length $|1 - \bar{a}b|$.*

Proof. We can construct the Blaschke 3-ellipse with the focal points a, b . This ellipse satisfies all the requirements of the Theorem. It is unique such a conic, because the Cayley-type condition derived above in Corollary 2.3 shows that there is at most one conic with the foci a, b which is a 3-Poncelet caustic with respect to \mathbb{T} . \square

Remark 4.8 *Previously existing proofs of the uniqueness, like one from [DGSV2018] (pp. 43–44), do not seem to be complete. They are all based on an intuitive, but informal argument that the rotational function is strictly monotonic within a confocal pencil. However, unfortunately, if conics are not completely situated within \mathbb{D} such an argument is invalid. Moreover, in principle, a triangle which is inscribed in \mathbb{T} and whose sides belong to tangents to an ellipse which is not completely contained in \mathbb{D} could exist, see Figure 3. Our nontrivial conclusion is that in such a situation, at least one focal point lies outside \mathbb{D} .*

Remark 4.9 *Not only that our proof is more complete than previously existing ones, but our statement is more complete as well. We prove that E is unique not only among the ellipses with focal points a, b but it is also unique among all conics with these focal points. In other words, we prove that there is no hyperbola with given properties.*




Figure 3: A triangle inscribed in the circle

Theorem 4.10 *Given a triangle ABS inscribed in \mathbb{T} with the property that lines AB , AC , BC touch an ellipse in the points C_1, B_1, A_1 respectively with the following orders of the points $B - A_1 - C$, $C_1 - B - A$, and $B_1 - C - A$. Then at least one focal point of E is outside \mathbb{D} .*

Remark 4.11 *Let us observe Figure 3 and see what happens with rotational numbers in such a situation. Let us denote by ρ_A, ρ_B, ρ_C the arcs of the ellipse E seen from the corresponding vertex of the triangle ABC . Then it is obviously*

$$\rho_A = \rho_B + \rho_C.$$

4.3 4-Poncelet caustics and Blaschke ellipses

Remark 4.12 *We want to observe first that not all 4-Poncelet ellipses are Blaschke ellipses.*

However, the following reformulation and generalization of a statement from [DGSV2018], p. 175, holds:

Theorem 4.13 *Given $a, b \in \mathbb{D}$. Among all conics with the foci a, b there is a unique one which is a 4-Poncelet caustic with respect to \mathbb{T} . It is an ellipse and it is the Blaschke ellipse.*

Proof. Using Lemma 4.4, we see that for given $a, b \in \mathbb{D}$, there is a unique c (this $c \in \mathbb{D}$), such that $B_c(a) = b$. Using now the construction from [DGSV2018] one gets the Blaschke product with zeros $0, c, a, b$. Since $B_c(a) = b, B_c(0) = c$, this product is decomposable and thus, generates a Blaschke ellipse. This Blaschke ellipse is a 4-Poncelet caustic. Using the Cayley-type condition derived above in Corollary 2.4 we see that there is at most one such 4-Poncelet caustic with the foci a, b . Thus, the Theorem follows. \square

The last Theorem has a highly counter-intuitive consequence.

Corollary 4.14 *A hyperbola with the foci in \mathbb{D} cannot be a 4-Poncelet caustic of a polygonal line (including nonconvex ones) inscribed in \mathbb{T} .*

5 Iso-periodic confocal pencils and Painlevé VI equations

5.1 Painlevé VI equations, Picard solutions, and Okamoto transformation

The Painlevé VI equations form one of six families of remarkable second order ordinary differential equations introduced by Paul Painlevé and his school at the beginning of the XX century. The Painlevé VI equations are the four-parameter family

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2y}{dx^2} = & \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{y} + \frac{1}{y-1} + \frac{1}{y-x} \right) \left(\frac{dy}{dx} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{x-1} + \frac{1}{y-x} \right) \frac{dy}{dx} \\ & + \frac{y(y-1)(y-x)}{x^2(x-1)^2} \left(\alpha + \beta \frac{x}{y^2} + \gamma \frac{x-1}{(y-1)^2} + \delta \frac{x(x-1)}{(y-x)^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

with parameters $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{C}$, see for example [Oka1987, IKS1991, Hit1995, DS2019] and references therein. We are here interested in two equation with parameter values

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{8}, \quad \beta = -\frac{1}{8}, \quad \gamma = \frac{1}{8}, \quad \delta = \frac{3}{8}. \quad (5.2)$$

and

$$\alpha = 0, \quad \beta = 0, \quad \gamma = 0, \quad \delta = \frac{1}{2}. \quad (5.3)$$

We will use the transformed Weierstrass \wp -function with periods $2w_1$ and $2w_2$ satisfying the equation

$$(\hat{\wp}'(z))^2 = \hat{\wp}(z)(\hat{\wp}(z) - 1)(\hat{\wp}(z) - x). \quad (5.4)$$

Apparently, more than a decade prior to Painlevé, Picard found the explicit solution of the above mentioned Painlevé VI equation with parameters (5.3) in [Pic1889]. Namely, the function

$$y_0(x) = \hat{\wp}(2c_1w_1(x) + 2c_2w_2(x)) \quad (5.5)$$

is the Picard solution [Pic1889] of the Painlevé VI equation (5.1) with constants $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0$, $\delta = 1/2$, see for example (3.6) in [Oka1987],.

The transformation

$$y(x) = y_0 + \frac{y_0(y_0 - 1)(y_0 - x)}{x(x-1)y_0' - y_0(y_0 - 1)}, \quad (5.6)$$

follows from [Oka1987] and was written in this form in [DS2019]. It relates the Picard solution $y_0(x)$ (5.5) and the general solution $y(x)$ of the Painlevé VI equation with constants (5.2).

In order to apply the Okamoto transformation, one needs an expression for y_0' . Such an expression is obtained in [DS2019] as follows. Consider the elliptic curve \mathcal{C} parameterized by $(u, v) = (\hat{\wp}, \hat{\wp}')$, that is the curve of the equation

$$v^2 = u(u-1)(u-x) \quad (5.7)$$

and its Abel map

$$\mathcal{A}(p) = \int_{p_\infty}^p \frac{du}{v}, \quad p \in \mathcal{L},$$

into the Jacobian $J(\mathcal{C}) = \mathbb{C}/\{n(2w_1) + m(2w_2) \mid n, m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where p_∞ is the point at infinity on the compactified curve \mathcal{C} . Let us now take an arbitrary point $2w_1c_1 + 2w_2c_2$ in the Jacobian, with some constants c_1 and c_2 and consider its Jacobi inversion, that is the point q_0 on the curve such that

$$\mathcal{A}(q_0) = \int_{p_\infty}^{q_0} \frac{du}{v} = 2w_1c_1 + 2w_2c_2.$$

From these data, denoting by q^* the elliptic involution of a point q of the curve, we build the following differential of the third kind:

$$\Omega_1 := \Omega_{q_0, q_0^*} - 4\pi ic_2\omega, \quad (5.8)$$

with Ω_{q_0, q_0^*} being the normalized differential of the third kind with poles at q_0 and q_0^* of residues 1 and -1 , respectively, and ω the normalized holomorphic differential $w = \frac{1}{2w_1} \frac{du}{v}$. Differential Ω_1 has two zeros paired by the elliptic involution, we denote by y their projection on the u -sphere. This projection, as a function of x , satisfies a Painlevé-VI equation, as stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.1 ([DS2019], **Theorem 1**) *If x varies, while c_1, c_2 stay fixed, then $y(x)$, the position of zero of Ω_1 , is the Okamoto transformation (5.6) of y_0 and satisfies Painlevé VI with constants (5.2)*

Moreover, the derivative of y'_0 needed to apply the Okamoto transformation (5.6) can also be expressed in terms of Ω_1 :

$$\frac{dy_0}{dx} = -\frac{1}{4}\Omega_1(p_x) \frac{\omega(p_x)}{\omega(q_0)}. \quad (5.9)$$

Note that the a -period of Ω_1 is $-4\pi ic_2$, while the b -period is $4\pi ic_1$. Thus, the periods are preserved under the deformation described in Theorem 5.1.

5.2 From iso-periodic confocal pencils to explicit solutions to Painlevé VI equations

To have nicer formulas we will consider the “super-symmetric” case, when both x_0 and y_0 are zero, meaning that the circle $\Gamma = \Gamma_0$ is concentric with the confocal conics $\mathcal{C}(t)$. Then, $a = b + 1$ and

$$\Gamma_0 : x^2 + y^2 = 1,$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}(t) : \frac{x^2}{a-t} + \frac{y^2}{a-t-1} = 1.$$

We consider the pencil of cubics

$$E_t : \mu^2 = D_t(\lambda) = -\frac{((a-t)\lambda + 1)((a-t-1)\lambda^2 + \lambda(a-t) + 1)}{(a-t)(a-t-1)}.$$

with a marked section of points $P_0(t)$ of order four on the elliptic curve E_t corresponding to $\lambda = 0$ each. Each of the cubics E_t has three finite ramification points:

$$\lambda_1(t) = \frac{1}{t-a}, \quad \lambda_2(t) = \frac{1}{t-a+1}, \quad \lambda_3(t) = -1.$$

Let us consider Möbius transformations on the basis

$$u = \phi_t(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda - \lambda_1}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1}.$$

Then $\phi_t(\infty) = \infty$, $\phi_t(\lambda_1) = 0$, $\phi_t(\lambda_2) = 0$ and denote $x := \phi_t(\lambda_3)$. The Möbius transformations ϕ_t induce morphisms from the elliptic curves E_t onto the elliptic curve (5.7). Since $P_0(t)$ corresponding to $\lambda = 0$ are points of a fixed, finite order (four), we get the following:

Proposition 5.2 *Let*

$$y_0(t) := \phi_t(0). \quad (5.10)$$

Then $y_0(t) = -(a - t - 1)$ is a Picard solution to the Painlevé VI $(0, 0, 0, 1/2)$ as a function of $x = (a - t - 1)^2$.

Proof. By a direct computation we get

$$x = \phi_t(\lambda_3) = (a - t - 1)^2, \quad y_0(t) = \phi_t(0) = -(a - t - 1). \quad (5.11)$$

Since the points $P_0(t)$ which correspond to $\lambda = 0$ have all order four, we see that for them c_1, c_2 do not depend on t , thus also do not depend on x , so, by (5.5), they provide the Picard solution to the Painlevé VI $(0, 0, 0, 1/2)$. \square

Before we apply the Okamoto transformation (5.6), let us verify one technical statement.

Lemma 5.3 *For y_0 from (5.10) the identity holds:*

$$\frac{(y_0 - 1)(y_0 - x)}{x(x - 1)y_0' - y_0(y_0 - 1)} = -2. \quad (5.12)$$

Proof. Observe that

$$\frac{dy_0}{dx} = \frac{1}{2y_0}. \quad (5.13)$$

The rest is a straightforward verification. \square

Theorem 5.4 *Let*

$$y(t) := -y_0(t). \quad (5.14)$$

Then $y(t) = a - t - 1$ is a solution to the Painlevé VI $(1/8, -1/8, 1/8, 3/8)$ as a function of $x = (a - t - 1)^2$.

Proof. By applying the Okamoto transformation (5.6) and using Lemma 5.3 we get:

$$y = y_0 - 2y_0 = -y_0. \quad \square$$

Remark 5.5 *Both solutions $y = y(x)$ to Painlevé VI $(1/8, -1/8, 1/8, 3/8)$ and $y_0 = y_0(x)$ to Painlevé VI $(0, 0, 0, 1/2)$ can be seen as instances of the solution parametrized as $y(s) = s$, $x(s) = s^2$ where $s = a - t - 1$ in one case and $s = -(a - t - 1)$ in the other case. So, in some sense, here the Okamoto transformation maps the “same” solutions to each other, although the Okamoto transformation is not identity itself. It is an involution in this case. Let us also observe that the same solution was obtained by Hitchin in [Hit1995] in his consideration of points of order four on elliptic curves. Hitchin also observed in the same paper that $y(s) = s$, $x(s) = s^2$ provides solutions to all Painlevé VI with*

$$\alpha + \beta = 0, \quad \gamma + \delta = \frac{1}{2},$$

in (5.1). However, Hitchin did not consider the Okamoto transformation nor iso-periodic confocal pencils.

Remark 5.6 We did not need to use (5.9) here since our iso-rotational confocal family provided an explicit form of the one-parameter family of cubics $E_t = E_t(\mu, \lambda)$ with the section of marked points of order four lying above $\lambda = 0$. This section provides an explicit form of y_0 (see (5.11)), which can be differentiated directly, as in (5.13).

6 Are there iso-periodic confocal pencils for $k \neq 4$?

The answer to the intriguing question is contained in the following theorem.

Theorem 6.1 *If $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is k -iso-periodic with respect to Γ , then $k = 4$.*

Proof. Based on Corollary 2.3, there is unique value $t = t_3$ (see (2.2)), such that Cayley's condition for triangles inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is satisfied. Thus $k \neq 3$. Since $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is k iso-rotational, the conic $\mathcal{C}(t_3)$ must be degenerate, i.e. $t_3 \in \{a, b\}$.

Similarly, according to Corollary 2.4, there is a quadrangle inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ if and only if $\alpha_4 + \beta_4 t = 0$. In order to have $k \neq 4$, that equation should not have solutions in t or its unique solution $t = t_4$ belongs to the set $\{a, b\}$. We will consider them as two cases.

Case 1: The equation $\alpha_4 + \beta_4 t = 0$ doesn't have solutions.

That means $\beta_4 = 0 \neq \alpha_4$, thus:

$$t_3 = t_3 - \frac{1}{8}\beta_4 = \frac{1}{2}(a + b + x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1) \in \{a, b\},$$

yielding:

$$x_0^2 + y_0^2 \pm (a - b) = 1. \tag{6.1}$$

Expressing b from the last relation and substituting to β_4 , we get:

$$y_0^2(x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1) = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad x_0^2(x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1) = 0,$$

which is equivalent to:

$$x_0^2 + y_0^2 = 1 \quad \text{or} \quad x_0 = y_0 = 0.$$

The first possibility, $x_0^2 + y_0^2 = 1$, together with (6.1), gives $a = b$, so the confocal family degenerates to the family of concentric circles, with the centre on Γ . The second possibility, $x_0 = y_0 = 0$, together with (6.1), implies that the foci of the confocal family are on Γ . According to Theorem 3.3, we have $k = 4$ in both cases.

Case 2: Equation $\alpha_4 + \beta_4 t = 0$ has unique solution t_4 , which belongs to $\{a, b\}$.

We can suppose that $t_4 = a$, since $t_4 = b$ can be discussed analogously. The relation $\alpha_4 + \beta_4 a = 0$ is equivalent to:

$$(a - b + x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1)(a - t_3) = 0.$$

If $t_3 = b$, then we have $a - b + x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1 = 0$. Expressing b from there and substituting into the expression for t_3 , we get $x_0^2(x_0^2 + y_0^2 - 1) = 0$. If $x_0 = 0$, we have $a - b + y_0^2 = 1$, which implies that the foci are on Γ . If $x_0^2 + y_0^2 = 1$, we have $a = b$, so again $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is a family of concentric circles with the centre on Γ . In both cases, Theorem 3.3 implies that $k = 4$.

Suppose now that $t_3 = a$. Since the coefficients C_2 and C_3 both take values 0 for $t = a$, that will mean that $t = a$ will also be a solution of the cubic equation from Corollary 2.5:

$$\alpha_5 + \beta_5 a + \gamma_5 a^2 + \delta_5 a^3 = 0.$$

The calculation shows:

$$\alpha_5 + \beta_5 t + \gamma_5 t^2 + \delta_5 t^3 = -64(a-t)^2 \times ((t-b)(2a-2b-2x_0^2-2y_0^2+1) + a-b). \quad (6.2)$$

Thus $k = 5$ can produce an iso-periodic family only if:

$$2a - 2b - 2x_0^2 - 2y_0^2 + 1 = a - b = 0,$$

which implies $2x_0^2 + 2y_0^2 = 1$. Under those conditions, we calculate that $t_3 = a - \frac{1}{16}$, which is in contradiction with the assumption $t_3 = a$. We conclude that $k \neq 5$.

The equality (6.2) shows that the polynomial $\alpha_5 + \beta_5 t + \gamma_5 t^2 + \delta_5 t^3$ has a double root at $t = a$. Since $k \neq 5$, the third root of that polynomial belongs to $\{a, b\}$ or it does not have the third root. We will consider those possibilities as two subcases.

Case 2.1: The third root of $\alpha_5 + \beta_5 t + \gamma_5 t^2 + \delta_5 t^3$ belongs to $\{a, b\}$.

From (6.2), we see that then either $a = b$ or $2a - 2b - 2x_0^2 - 2y_0^2 + 1 = 0$.

Substituting $a = b$ into the equality $t_3 = a$, we get $x_0^2 + y_0^2 = 1$, which means that the centre of the concentric family of circles $\mathcal{C}(t)$ will lie on Γ , which is again a symmetric case satisfying the conditions of Theorem 3.3, so $k = 4$.

Suppose that $2a - 2b - 2x_0^2 - 2y_0^2 + 1 = 0$. Substituting that into $t_3 = a$, we get

$$-16x_0^2 y_0^2 - 16y_0^4 + 8y_0^2 - 1 = 0.$$

Substituting there again the assumption, we get:

$$-8(2a - 2b - 2y_0^2 + 1)y_0^2 - 16y_0^4 + 8y_0^2 - 1 = 0,$$

which is equivalent to:

$$-8(2a - 2b)y_0^2 - 1 = 0.$$

The last equality is not possible, since its left-hand side is always negative.

Case 2.2: The polynomial $\alpha_5 + \beta_5 t + \gamma_5 t^2 + \delta_5 t^3$ does not have the third root, i.e. $\delta_5 = 0$.

That means: $2a - 2b - 2x_0^2 - 2y_0^2 + 1 = 0$, which leads to a contradiction as in the previous case.

We can conclude that the reasoning about iso-periodic confocal pencils leads us either to the conditions of Theorem 3.3 and thus $k = 4$ or to a contradiction. \square

7 Behaviour of the rotation numbers within a pencil of confocal conics

In this section, we will study the monotonicity of rotation numbers as functions of the pencil parameter and introduce the notion of iso-rotational confocal families as natural generalizations of iso-periodic confocal families. To that end, let us start with a usual definition of the rotation number of a polygonal line inscribed in a curve Γ . Let $\sigma : [0, 1) \rightarrow \Gamma$ be the parametrisation of Γ . If $a = A_0 A_1 \dots$ is a polygonal line with vertices on Γ , then we introduce functions $\rho_k(a)$, for $k \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$ as follows:

$$\rho_0(a) = \sigma(A_0), \quad \rho_1(a) = \sigma(A_1) + N_1, \quad \dots, \quad \rho_n(a) = \sigma(A_n) + N_n, \quad \dots$$

Here N_k are inductively defined non-negative smallest possible integers, such that the sequence $(\rho_k(a))_k$ is strictly increasing. Now, we can introduce the rotation number as:

$$\rho(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\rho_n(a)}{n}. \quad (7.1)$$

In the case when Γ is a conic and a polygonal line a has a conic as a caustic, the rotation number $\rho(a)$ from (7.1) coincides with the rotation number ρ defined in (1.1) in Section 1 and does not depend on the choice of a polygonal line.

Theorem 7.1 *Suppose that the foci of the family $\mathcal{C}(t)$ lie within Γ and*

$$t_0 = \inf \{t \in (-\infty, b) \mid \mathcal{C}(t) \text{ is within } \Gamma\}.$$

Then the rotation number $\rho(t)$ of polygonal lines inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is continuous and monotonic on (t_0, b) , with

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^+} \rho(t) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow b^-} \rho(t) = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. Ellipse $\mathcal{C}(t_0)$ is within Γ and touching that circle at one or two points. The vertices of a polygonal line inscribed in Γ and circumscribed about $\mathcal{C}(t_0)$ approach a touching point, while the lengths of the sides approach 0. Thus $\rho(t_0) := \lim_{t \rightarrow t_0^+} \rho(t) = 0$. \square

Let us mention that billiards inside cusps were studied before, see for example [Kin1995]. Now we introduce a notion which generalizes the notion of iso-periodic confocal families, see Definition 3.7.

Definition 7.2 *If a confocal pencil of conics $\mathcal{C}(t)$ has the property that the rotation numbers $\rho(t)$ induced by a fixed circle Γ as function of the pencil parameter t are locally constant, then we say that the confocal pencil of conics $\mathcal{C}(t)$ is iso-rotational.*

Example 7.3 *The iso-periodic confocal pencils of conics are iso-rotational with $\rho(t) = 1/2$, for all t .*

The question is: *Are there any other iso-rotational confocal pencils?*

We conclude with the following answer:

Theorem 7.4 *There are no iso-rotational confocal pencils of conics apart from iso-periodic pencils of conics with $k = 4$.*

Proof. This can be shown along the same lines of the proof of Theorem 6.1. \square

Acknowledgment

The research was supported by the Australian Research Council, Discovery Project 190101838 *Billiards within quadrics and beyond* and the Serbian Ministry of Education, Technological Development and Science and the Science Fund of Serbia.

References

- [Ber1987] M. Berger, *Geometry. II*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [Cay1853] A. Cayley, *Note on the porism of the in-and-circumscribed polygon*, Philosophical magazine **6** (1853), 99–102.
- [Dar1914] G. Darboux, *Leçons sur la théorie générale des surfaces et les applications géométriques du calcul infinitesimal*, Vol. 2 and 3, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1914.

- [DGSV2018] U. Daepf, P. Gorkin, A. Shaffer, and K. Voss, *Finding ellipses*, Carus Mathematical Monographs, vol. 34, MAA Press, Providence, RI, 2018. What Blaschke products, Poncelet’s theorem, and the numerical range know about each other.
- [DR2011] V. Dragović and M. Radnović, *Poncelet porisms and beyond*, Frontiers in Mathematics, Birkhäuser/Springer Basel AG, Basel, 2011. Integrable billiards, hyperelliptic Jacobians and pencils of quadrics.
- [DR2014a] V. Dragović and M. Radnović, *Bicentennial of the great Poncelet theorem (1813–2013): current advances*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **51** (2014), no. 3, 373–445, DOI 10.1090/S0273-0979-2014-01437-5.
- [DR2014b] ———, *Pseudo-integrable billiards and arithmetic dynamics*, Journal of Modern Dynamics **8** (2014), no. 1, 109–132.
- [DR2019a] V. Dragović and M. Radnović, *Periodic ellipsoidal billiard trajectories and extremal polynomials*, Comm. Math. Phys. **372** (2019), no. 1, 183–211.
- [DR2019b] ———, *Caustics of Poncelet polygons and classical extremal polynomials*, Regul. Chaotic Dyn. **24** (2019), no. 1, 1–35.
- [DS2019] V. Dragović and V. Shramchenko, *Algebro-geometric approach to an Okamoto transformation, the Painlevé VI and Schlesinger equations*, Ann. Henri Poincaré **20** (2019), no. 4, 1121–1148.
- [Dui2010] J. J. Duistermaat, *Discrete integrable systems*, Springer Monographs in Mathematics, Springer, New York, 2010. QRT maps and elliptic surfaces.
- [Fla2009] L. Flatto, *Poncelet’s Theorem*, AMS, 2009.
- [GH1978] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, *On Cayley’s explicit solution to Poncelet’s porism*, Enseign. Math. **24** (1978), no. 1-2, 31–40.
- [Hit1995] N. J. Hitchin, *Poncelet polygons and the Painlevé equations*, Geometry and analysis (Bombay, 1992), Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Bombay, 1995, pp. 151–185.
- [IKSY1991] K. Iwasaki, H. Kimura, S. Shimomura, and M. Yoshida, *From Gauss to Painlevé*, Aspects of Mathematics, E16, Friedr. Vieweg & Sohn, Braunschweig, 1991. A modern theory of special functions.
- [Kin1994] J. L. King, *Three problems in search of a measure*, Amer. Math. Monthly **101** (1994), no. 7, 609–628.
- [Kin1995] ———, *Billiards inside a cusp*, Math. Intelligencer **17** (1995), no. 1, 8–16, DOI 10.1007/BF03024711.
- [KT1991] V. Kozlov and D. Treshchëv, *Billiards*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence RI, 1991.
- [Leb1942] H. Lebesgue, *Les coniques*, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1942.
- [MFSS2019] A. Martínez-Finkelshtein, B. Simanek, and B. Simon, *Poncelet’s theorem, paraorthogonal polynomials and the numerical range of compressed multiplication operators*, Adv. Math. **349** (2019), 992–1035.
- [Oka1987] K. Okamoto, *Studies on the Painlevé equations. I. Sixth Painlevé equation P_{VI}* , Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **146** (1987), 337–381.
- [Pic1889] E. Picard, *Mémoire sur la théorie des fonctions algébriques de deux variables*, Journal de Liouville **5** (1889), 135–319.