

Metric Implications in the Kinematics of Surfaces

André M. Sonnet¹ and Epifanio G. Virga^{2*†}

¹*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Strathclyde,
26 Richmond Street, Glasgow, G1 1XH, U.K.

²*Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Pavia, Via Ferrata 5, Pavia,
27100, Italy.

*Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): eg.virga@unipv.it;

Contributing authors: andre.sonnet@strath.ac.uk;

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

In the direct approach to continua in reduced space dimensions, a thin shell is described as a mathematical surface in three-dimensional space. An exploratory kinematic study of such surfaces could be very valuable, especially if conducted with no use of coordinates. Three energy contents have been identified in a thin shell, which refer to three independent deformation modes: stretching, drilling, and bending. We analyze the consequences for the three energy contents produced by metric restrictions imposed on the admissible deformations. Would the latter stem from physical constraints, the elastic response of a shell could be hindered in ways that might not be readily expected.

Keywords: Kinematics of surfaces, Soft shells, Thin shells, Deformation modes, Soft elasticity, Eversions.

MSC Classification: 74A05 74B20 74K25

1 Introduction

It has appropriately been remarked that the kinematics of material surfaces cannot be reduced to the standard treatment of surfaces made in classical differential geometry (see, for example, [1]). As pointed out in [2] (see, in particular, the excerpt reproduced in [1], and also [3]), this does not merely amount to renouncing the use of coordinates

(which are at the heart of most analyses, as shown in [4]). It is rather a matter of prioritising physical essence over mathematical commodity.

This paper follows this line of thought. Motivated by a direct theory for soft thin shells proposed in [5], we explore the consequences of certain kinematic restrictions, mainly of a metric nature, on the energy contents, which we classify in three independent modes: stretching, drilling, and bending. Our development is intrinsic (coordinate-free) and generically tensorial; it employs the method of moving frames, phrased in the language of *connectors*, surface tangential vector fields that play here the role played by differential forms in Cartan’s method [6].¹

In an attempt to make this paper self-contained and attract readers not yet conversant with the method of moving frames, we recall some general preliminaries in Sect. 2 and give a special account on connectors in Sect. 3. Section 4 is devoted to the general kinematics of material surfaces, with special emphasis on an *invariant* rotation gradient, a third-rank tensor with a special status in the energetics of softy shells. In Sects. 5 and 6, we consider two classes of metric restrictions on the deformation of a surface, presented in order of increasing severity. In particular, in Sect. 6, we analyze the implications for the independent energy contents of the requirement that the deformation be isometric. Finally, in Sect. 7, we collect the main conclusions of our study. The paper is closed by four appendices with ancillary results and computational details.

2 Preliminaries on surface calculus

With the primary interest to make our development self-contained, we collect here a few mathematical properties of surfaces, phrased mainly in the language adopted in the method of *moving frames*, although our method differs formally from the latter in that it uses vector fields instead of differential forms.²

Our approach to surface calculus will be *absolute*, that is, it will avoid, insofar as possible, explicit resort to coordinates, patches, and atlases of local maps.

Let \mathcal{S} be a (locally) smooth (say, of class C^3), orientable surface imbedded in three-dimensional space \mathcal{E} .³ We denote by $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ the unit normal on \mathcal{S} in our chosen orientation.

A major role is played below by the notion of *surface gradient* ∇_s , which we introduce with the aid of smooth curves $\boldsymbol{x}(t)$ on \mathcal{S} . A scalar field $\varphi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is differentiable on \mathcal{S} whenever we can write

$$\frac{d}{dt}\varphi(\boldsymbol{x}(t)) = \nabla_s\varphi \cdot \dot{\boldsymbol{x}}, \quad (1)$$

¹ The method of moving frames has an interesting history, which predates Cartan’s work. It can be traced back to Darboux (see pp. 47-57 of [7] and also [8]), who extended to surfaces the classical Frenet-Serret formulas for curves. A first generalization of Darboux’s method is due to Cotton [9]; apparently, [10] is the first paper by Cartan on this topic (see also [11]).

² Our method is inspired by the work of Weatherburn [12, 13], whose essential features are also succinctly outlined in [14]. His work was indeed preceded by the introduction of a general vector method in differential geometry by the Italian school that originated from Levi-Civita (see [15–18] for the relevant contributions, which Weatherburn seems to have been unaware of.)

³ In local coordinates (u, v) ranging in a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, \mathcal{S} can be split into *patches*, defined as applications of Ω into \mathcal{E} that have the requested degree of regularity, are one-to-one, and have continuous inverse [see, for example, 19, p. 130].

where the vector $\nabla_s \varphi$, which is perpendicular to the normal $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, is the surface gradient of φ , a superimposed dot $\dot{}$ denotes differentiation with respect to the parameter t , and $\dot{\mathbf{x}}$ is a vector along the tangent to $\mathbf{x}(t)$. Similarly, for a vector field $\mathbf{v} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{V}$, where \mathcal{V} is the translation space associated with \mathcal{E} ,⁴

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}(t)) = (\nabla_s \mathbf{v}) \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (2)$$

where the second-rank tensor $\nabla_s \mathbf{v}$, which annihilates the normal $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, is the surface gradient of \mathbf{v} . In particular, $\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is the *curvature tensor* of \mathcal{S} , assumed to be at least continuous over \mathcal{S} : it is a symmetric tensor field, whose eigenvalues are the *principal curvatures* of \mathcal{S} .⁵

The surface curl of \mathbf{v} , $\text{curl}_s \mathbf{v}$, is defined by the identity

$$2 \text{skw}(\nabla_s \mathbf{v}) \mathbf{u} = [\nabla_s \mathbf{v} - (\nabla_s \mathbf{v})^T] \mathbf{u} =: \text{curl}_s \mathbf{v} \times \mathbf{u} \quad \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{V}, \quad (3)$$

where skw denotes the skew-symmetric part of a second-rank tensor, a superscript T the transposition of a tensor, and \times the vector product in \mathcal{V} . Equation (3) simply says that $\text{curl}_s \mathbf{v}$ is the axial vector associated with $2 \text{skw}(\nabla_s \mathbf{v})$. Likewise, the surface divergence of \mathbf{v} is defined as

$$\text{div}_s \mathbf{v} := \text{tr}(\nabla_s \mathbf{v}), \quad (4)$$

where tr denotes the trace of a second-rank tensor.

As also recalled in [14], if \mathbf{f} is a *tangential* vector field, that is, such that $\mathbf{f} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} \equiv 0$, there exists a scalar field φ on \mathcal{S} such that $\mathbf{f} = \nabla_s \varphi$, if and only if

$$\text{skw}(\nabla_s \mathbf{f}) = \text{skw}((\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}) \mathbf{f} \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}). \quad (5)$$

Similarly, letting a second-rank tensor field \mathbf{F} be defined on \mathcal{S} so that $\mathbf{F} \boldsymbol{\nu} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, there exists a vector field \mathbf{v} on \mathcal{S} such that $\mathbf{F} = \nabla_s \mathbf{v}$, if and only if

$$\text{skw}(\nabla_s \mathbf{F}) = \text{skw}(\mathbf{F}(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}) \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad (6)$$

where $\nabla_s \mathbf{F}$ is a third-rank tensor and skw acts as follows on its generic *triadic* component $\mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 \otimes \mathbf{a}_3$,

$$2 \text{skw}(\mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 \otimes \mathbf{a}_3) := \mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 \otimes \mathbf{a}_3 - \mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_3 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2. \quad (7)$$

It is sometimes convenient to represent a surface \mathcal{S} by use of coordinates (u, v) as the image of a mapping $\mathbf{r} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, where Ω is a domain in \mathbb{R}^2 . For a smooth surface

⁴Our notation for \mathcal{E} and \mathcal{V} is the same as in [20, p. 324], where these geometric structures are further illuminated, especially in connection with their role in formulating modern continuum mechanics.

⁵Often the curvature tensor is replaced by its opposite, the *shape tensor* $\mathbf{S} = -\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}$, which clearly encodes the same information. Our choice of sign, which differs from the one customary in differential geometry, is justified by the desire (shared by others [21, 22]) of designating as $1/R$ the principal curvatures of a sphere of radius R . Two other mathematical constructs with essentially the same meaning appear in the literature; these are the *second fundamental form* and the *Weingarten map*, none of which will be used here (see also [23, p. 150] for a similar neglect).

(at least of class C^2), coordinates (u, v) can be chosen so as to be, at least locally, *isothermal*, that is, such that

$$\mathbf{r}_u \cdot \mathbf{r}_v = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{r}_u| = |\mathbf{r}_v|, \quad (8)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_u := \partial_u \mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{r}_v := \partial_v \mathbf{r}$. When only the first equation in (8) is satisfied, but not the second, the coordinates are said to be *orthogonal*.⁶ Letting

$$\mathbf{e}_u := \frac{\mathbf{r}_u}{|\mathbf{r}_u|} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{e}_v := \frac{\mathbf{r}_v}{|\mathbf{r}_v|}, \quad (9)$$

we orient \mathcal{S} so that $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{e}_u \times \mathbf{e}_v$.

3 Connectors

We shall employ the method of *moving frames*.⁷ An orthonormal frame $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, where $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{e}_1 \times \mathbf{e}_2$,⁸ glides over \mathcal{S} according to the laws

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_s \mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_1, \\ \nabla_s \mathbf{e}_2 = -\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_2, \\ \nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu} = -\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{d}_2, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

where the vector fields $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)$ are everywhere tangent to \mathcal{S} ; these are the *connectors* of the moving frame. More precisely, \mathbf{c} is the *spin* connector and $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2$, which need not be orthogonal to one another, are the *curvature* connectors.⁹ Since the curvature tensor $\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is symmetric, the curvature connectors must obey the identity

$$\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}_2 = \mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_1. \quad (11)$$

In particular, the third equation in (10) implies that

$$2H := \text{tr}(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}) = -(\mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_2), \quad (12a)$$

$$K := \det(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}) = \mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad (12b)$$

where H and K are the *mean* and *Gaussian* curvatures of \mathcal{S} , respectively.¹⁰ Below, we shall apply (10) to a variety of different moving frames, each entailing its own set of connectors.

⁶A classical representation of the Gaussian curvature K in general orthogonal coordinates will be proved in Appendix A in the vector formalism adopted in this paper.

⁷This method is systematically presented by Cartan in [6] and is extensively used in the book by O'Neill [19] to illustrate the differential geometry of spaces, surfaces, and curves. A more recent, rather comprehensive account, far more formal than needed here, is given in [24]; a more elementary presentation can be found in [25] (see also footnote 1 for earlier precursors).

⁸We shall only consider *positively* oriented, orthonormal frames with one unit vector coincident with $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.

⁹We call them connectors because they connect the frame at one point to the frame in a nearby point.

¹⁰By $\text{tr}(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu})$ and $\det(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu})$, we mean the sum and the product of the principal curvatures of \mathcal{S} , respectively.

We now elaborate further upon the integrability condition (6) by applying it to the tensor fields $\nabla_s \mathbf{e}_1$ and $\nabla_s \mathbf{e}_2$. We first let $\mathbf{F} = \nabla_s \mathbf{e}_1$. Repeated use of (10) easily shows that

$$\nabla_s^2 \mathbf{e}_1 = -\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{c} \otimes \mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{c} \otimes \mathbf{d}_2 + \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \nabla_s \mathbf{c} - \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \nabla_s \mathbf{d}_1 \quad (13)$$

and

$$(\nabla_s \mathbf{e}_1)(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}) \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} = -c_1 \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} - c_2 \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{d}_2 \boldsymbol{\nu} - d_{11} \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} - d_{12} \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}. \quad (14)$$

Here and below, we set

$$\mathbf{c} = c_1 \mathbf{e}_1 + c_2 \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \mathbf{d}_1 = d_{11} \mathbf{e}_1 + d_{12} \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \mathbf{d}_2 = d_{21} \mathbf{e}_1 + d_{22} \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \text{with} \quad d_{12} = d_{21}. \quad (15)$$

By applying (6) to the pair of equations (13), (14) and their analogs for $\mathbf{F} = \nabla_s \mathbf{e}_2$, we obtain formulas that can be written in the following general form,

$$\text{skw } \nabla_s \mathbf{F} - \text{skw}(\mathbf{F}(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}) \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}) = \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{W}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{W}_2 + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{W}_3, \quad (16)$$

where \mathbf{W}_1 , \mathbf{W}_2 , and \mathbf{W}_3 are skew second-rank tensors that must all vanish for (6) to hold, since $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ is a frame. Once written for the axial vectors associated with these skew-symmetric tensors, the corresponding identities become¹¹

$$\begin{cases} \text{curl}_s \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{d}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_2 = c_1 \mathbf{d}_1 \times \boldsymbol{\nu} + c_2 \mathbf{d}_2 \times \boldsymbol{\nu}, \\ \text{curl}_s \mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{d}_2 = d_{11} \mathbf{d}_1 \times \boldsymbol{\nu} + d_{12} \mathbf{d}_2 \times \boldsymbol{\nu}, \\ \text{curl}_s \mathbf{d}_2 + \mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{d}_1 = d_{21} \mathbf{d}_1 \times \boldsymbol{\nu} + d_{22} \mathbf{d}_2 \times \boldsymbol{\nu}, \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

which link all connectors together. A telling consequence of these equations follows from projecting along $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ both their sides: also by use of (12b), we arrive at

$$\text{curl}_s \mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = -K, \quad (18a)$$

$$\text{curl}_s \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad (18b)$$

$$\text{curl}_s \mathbf{d}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = -\mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}. \quad (18c)$$

Equations (18) are fundamental in the differential geometry of surfaces in three-dimensional space. They correspond to the equations that in Cartan's language of differential forms are derived in [19] (see claims (3) and (4) of Theorem 1.7, p. 267) or [23, p. 448]. Both [19] and [23] call (18a) the Gauss equation; [19] calls (18b) and (18c) the Codazzi equations, whereas [23], in an attempt to establish proper priority, calls them the Peterson-Mainardi-Codazzi equations.¹²

¹¹No further information could be obtained by requiring the integrability of $\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}$, as this would follow from (18) and the fact that $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{e}_1 \times \mathbf{e}_2$.

¹²The order of names would reflect the chronology of the discovery. Peterson apparently obtained these equations in his 1853 Thesis (originally written in Latvian), which was translated to Russian and published in 1952 [26]. In 1856, Mainardi found the same equations, which were then rediscovered independently by Codazzi in 1860 [see also 23, p. 448].

Equation (18a), a further classical consequence of which is illustrated in Appendix A, establishes a relation between the spin connector \mathbf{c} of any moving frame and the Gaussian curvature K of \mathcal{S} , a quantity pertaining to the *intrinsic* geometry of the surface.¹³ Equations (18b) and (18c) relate the curvature connectors of a moving frame to the spin connector of the same frame.

Connectors transform in a simple way under a change of moving frame. Consider a frame $(\mathbf{e}'_1, \mathbf{e}'_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ related to $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ through the equations

$$\mathbf{e}'_1 = \cos \alpha \mathbf{e}_1 + \sin \alpha \mathbf{e}_2 \quad \mathbf{e}'_2 = -\sin \alpha \mathbf{e}_1 + \cos \alpha \mathbf{e}_2, \quad (19)$$

where α is a scalar function of class C^2 on \mathcal{S} . The frame $(\mathbf{e}'_1, \mathbf{e}'_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ obeys the same gliding laws (10), but with primed connectors $(\mathbf{c}', \mathbf{d}'_1, \mathbf{d}'_2)$. To relate these to $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)$, we differentiate both sides of (19) and make use of the resulting equations in the primed version of (10). By identification of terms, we conclude that \mathbf{c} is shifted into

$$\mathbf{c}' = \mathbf{c} + \nabla_s \alpha,$$

while \mathbf{d}_1 and \mathbf{d}_2 transform like \mathbf{e}_1 and \mathbf{e}_2 in (19),

$$\mathbf{d}'_1 = \cos \alpha \mathbf{d}_1 + \sin \alpha \mathbf{d}_2, \quad \mathbf{d}'_2 = -\sin \alpha \mathbf{d}_1 + \cos \alpha \mathbf{d}_2. \quad (20)$$

Since, by (5), $\text{curl}_s(\nabla_s \alpha) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} \equiv 0$, we immediately see that \mathbf{c}' satisfies (18a) like \mathbf{c} . It is also easy to show from (20) that \mathbf{d}'_1 and \mathbf{d}'_2 obey the symmetry relation (11) whenever \mathbf{d}_1 and \mathbf{d}_2 do, irrespective of the choice of the rotation angle α . Moreover, $|\mathbf{d}'_1|^2 + |\mathbf{d}'_2|^2 = |\mathbf{d}_1|^2 + |\mathbf{d}_2|^2$, as it should, since $\text{tr}(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu})^2$ is the same for both frames.

A special choice of moving frame gives (18b) and (18c) another, possibly more transparent form. Let $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ be chosen as the eigenframe of the curvature tensor $\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}$, so that

$$\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu} = \kappa_1 \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1 + \kappa_2 \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2, \quad (21)$$

where κ_1 and κ_2 are the principal curvatures of \mathcal{S} . By comparing (21) and (10), we see that in this frame

$$\mathbf{d}_1 = -\kappa_1 \mathbf{e}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d}_2 = -\kappa_2 \mathbf{e}_2. \quad (22)$$

It follows by direct computation from the first equation in (22) that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{curl}_s \mathbf{d}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} &= -\kappa_1 \text{curl}_s \mathbf{e}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \nabla_s \kappa_1 \\ &= -\kappa_1 \mathbf{e}_1 \cdot \mathbf{c} + \mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \nabla_s \kappa_1, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

¹³As effectively recalled in [23, p. 11], “[I]ntrinsic geometry of a surface [is] a fundamentally new view of geometry, introduced by Gauss [27]. It means the geometry that is knowable to tiny, ant-like, intelligent (but 2-dimensional) creatures living *within* the surface.”

where use has also been made of the first equation in (10).¹⁴ By inserting in (18b) the second equation in (22) we arrive at

$$\mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \nabla_s \kappa_1 = (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)(\mathbf{e}_1 \cdot \mathbf{c}). \quad (24a)$$

Similarly, we give (18c) the form¹⁵

$$\mathbf{e}_1 \cdot \nabla_s \kappa_2 = (\kappa_1 - \kappa_2)(\mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \mathbf{c}). \quad (24b)$$

4 Kinematics of surfaces

In an attempt to build a direct theory for the elasticity of *soft* shells,¹⁶ we have introduced *drilling* and *bending contents* in the kinematics of material surfaces [14]. Here, we recall these definitions along with the corresponding invariant measures (of drilling and bending) that were attributed in [5] to separate deformation modes.

To this end, we first collect a number of general results about the kinematics of surfaces. Consider a deformation $\mathbf{y} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ of a smooth surface \mathcal{S} , which maps \mathcal{S} into $\mathcal{S}^* = \mathbf{y}(\mathcal{S})$. Let \mathbf{y} be twice continuously differentiable. By the polar decomposition theorem for the deformations of surfaces [28], we can write

$$\nabla_s \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{V}\mathbf{R}, \quad (25)$$

where, for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{S}$, $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})$ is a rotation of the special orthogonal group $\text{SO}(3)$ in three-dimensional translation space \mathcal{V} , $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{x})$ is a symmetric second-rank tensor on the tangent plane $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}$ to \mathcal{S} at \mathbf{x} , whereas $\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}))$ is a symmetric second-rank tensor on the tangent plane $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x})}^*$ to \mathcal{S}^* at $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x})$.

We shall also refer to \mathbf{R} as the polar rotation of $\nabla_s \mathbf{y}$; its determinant is +1 because the deformation \mathbf{y} is required to preserve the *orientation* of \mathcal{S} . The tensors \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{V} are the *stretching* tensors; they are both positive definite and can be represented as

$$\mathbf{U} = \lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{u}_1 + \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{u}_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{V} = \lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{v}_1 + \lambda_2 \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{v}_2, \quad (26)$$

where $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ are the *principal stretches* and the pairs $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2)$ and $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$ the corresponding *principal directions* of stretching on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x})}^*$, respectively. It readily follows from (25) that

$$\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{U}\mathbf{R}^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}_i = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}_i \quad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2. \quad (27)$$

¹⁴A general identity for the mixed product, $\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} \cdot \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{b} \times \mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{c} \times \mathbf{a} \cdot \mathbf{b}$, valid for any triple of vectors $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c})$, is tacitly implied in (23) and elsewhere below.

¹⁵See also [23, §38.6, especially p.450] for a proof of (24) phrased in the (equivalent) language of differential forms.

¹⁶These are the ones expected to be more prone than others to in-plane twisting, possibly relevant in biophysical applications.

A useful representation of \mathbf{R} is thus given by

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{u}_1 + \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{u}_2 + \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad (28)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu}^*$ is the unit normal to \mathcal{S}^* oriented coherently with $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.¹⁷

The *right* and *left* Cauchy-Green tensors embodying the metric properties of \mathcal{S}^* compared with \mathcal{S} (and of \mathcal{S} compared with \mathcal{S}^*), acting on $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x})}^*$, respectively, are defined as

$$\mathbf{C} := (\nabla_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{y})^\top (\nabla_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{y}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} := (\nabla_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{y}) (\nabla_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{y})^\top. \quad (29)$$

Both \mathbf{C} and \mathbf{B} are symmetric, positive definite tensors.

As discussed in [14], by applying Rodrigues' formula for representing rotations [29], \mathbf{R} can be uniquely decomposed into a *drilling* rotation \mathbf{R}_d and a *bending* rotation \mathbf{R}_b ,

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{R}_b \mathbf{R}_d \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{R}_d \in \text{SO}(\boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad \mathbf{R}_b \in \text{SO}(\mathbf{e}), \quad \mathbf{e} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = 0, \quad (30)$$

where $\text{SO}(\mathbf{e})$ is the subgroup of $\text{SO}(3)$ of all rotations about the axis designated by the unit vector \mathbf{e} .¹⁸ Thus, \mathbf{R}_d is a rotation about the normal $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ to \mathcal{S} , while \mathbf{R}_b is a rotation about an axis on the tangent plane (uniquely determined by \mathbf{R}). The vectors \mathbf{d} and \mathbf{b} that represent \mathbf{R}_d and \mathbf{R}_b via the Rodrigues formula, the former parallel to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and the latter orthogonal to it, are recorded for completeness in Appendix B.

We say that in a given frame a deformation is of *pure drilling* or of *pure bending* if $\mathbf{R}_b = \mathbf{I}$ or $\mathbf{R}_d = \mathbf{I}$, respectively. Alternatively, we call the former *bending-neutral* and the latter *drilling-neutral*, as they have the property of leaving the bending or drilling content unaltered when composed with a pre-existing deformation. Both bending-neutral and drilling-neutral deformations of *minimal surfaces*¹⁹ have been investigated in [30].

Here we are interested in seeing what implications some metric restrictions have on these classes of deformations.

In a general deformation \mathbf{y} of \mathcal{S} , we can identify three independent modes: they are *stretching*, *drilling*, and *bending*, to which there correspond three *pure* deformation measures, which we denote w_s , w_d , and w_b , respectively.²⁰ For w_s we take

$$w_s := |\mathbf{U} - \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu})|^2 = |\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}^*)|^2, \quad (31)$$

which measures the metric mismatch between \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^* .²¹ Both w_d and w_b were defined in [5] by taking invariant averages of the scalar contents d^2 and b^2 , respectively,

¹⁷That is, so that the frames $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ and $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}^*)$ are equally oriented, $\mathbf{u}_1 \times \mathbf{u}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{v}_1 \times \mathbf{v}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}^*$.

¹⁸Formally, $\text{SO}(\mathbf{e}) := \{\mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(3) : \mathbf{R}\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}\}$.

¹⁹These are surfaces with zero mean curvature H .

²⁰A pure measure of deformation is an invariant measure that is selectively activated when there is a frame where the polar rotation \mathbf{R} of $\nabla_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{y}$ is either \mathbf{I} , \mathbf{R}_d , or \mathbf{R}_b , see [5].

²¹The energy w_s as delivered by (31) is quadratic in the principal stretches; other forms have been proposed for w_s , such as Koiter's [31], which is *quartic* in the principal stretches. Here, w_s will play only a small role, as we are mainly interested in isomteric deformations of \mathcal{S} .

which delivered²²

$$w_d := |\mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \circ \mathbf{H}|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad w_b := \left(|\mathbf{H}|^2 - \frac{1}{2} |\mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \circ \mathbf{H}|^2 - 4\boldsymbol{\nu} \cdot \mathbf{H} \circ \nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu} \right)^2. \quad (32)$$

Here \mathbf{H} is the third-rank tensor defined as²³

$$\mathbf{H} := \mathbf{R}^\top \nabla_s \mathbf{R} \quad (33)$$

and two vector-valued products by a third- and a second-rank tensor have been introduced, both denoted by \circ and distinguished only by the order of multiplication, that in a given basis $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \mathbf{e}_3)$ are represented in component form as²⁴

$$\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{H} = A_{ij} H_{ijk} \mathbf{e}_k \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{H} \circ \mathbf{A} = H_{ijk} A_{jk} \mathbf{e}_i. \quad (34)$$

For \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{H} in the special diadic and triadic forms $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2$ and $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{b}_1 \otimes \mathbf{b}_2 \otimes \mathbf{b}_3$,²⁵

$$\mathbf{A} \circ \mathbf{H} = (\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{b}_1)(\mathbf{a}_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}_2) \mathbf{b}_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{H} \circ \mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{b}_2)(\mathbf{a}_2 \cdot \mathbf{b}_3) \mathbf{b}_1. \quad (35)$$

The symbol \circ will also be employed with yet a different meaning in the generation of a second-rank tensor as product of a third-rank tensor, say \mathbf{H} , by a vector \mathbf{a} ,

$$\mathbf{H} \circ \mathbf{a} := H_{ikj} a_k \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j. \quad (36)$$

No confusion should arise from our use of \circ in (36), as this involves a vector \mathbf{a} , whereas a second-rank tensor \mathbf{A} is involved in (34).

4.1 Invariant rotation gradient

The tensor \mathbf{H} will play a central role in our development. In component form, it reads explicitly as

$$\mathbf{H} = R_{hi} R_{hj;k} \mathbf{e}_i \otimes \mathbf{e}_j \otimes \mathbf{e}_k, \quad (37)$$

where a semicolon denotes surface differentiation.

We shall call \mathbf{H} the *invariant rotation gradient*, for the reason that we now explain. A change of frame is represented by a rotation $\mathbf{Q} \in \text{SO}(3)$, uniform in space and possibly depending on time [20, p. 325]. The polar rotation \mathbf{R} of a deformation gradient is transformed in $\mathbf{R}^* = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{R}$ by a change of frame, and so it is neither *frame-indifferent* nor *frame-invariant*.²⁶

²²It is perhaps worth noting that w_d is quadratic in \mathbf{H} , whereas w_b is quartic.

²³The tensor \mathbf{H} is somewhat reminiscent of the third-rank tensor $\mathbf{G} := \mathbf{F}^\top \nabla_s \mathbf{F}$, where $\mathbf{F} = \nabla_s \mathbf{y}$. The tensor \mathbf{G} was introduced by Murdoch [2] in his direct second-grade hyperelastic theory of shells and has recently received a full kinematic characterization in [32].

²⁴Here and in the following, the standard convention of summing over repeated indices is adopted.

²⁵Incidentally, for such an \mathbf{H} , $|\mathbf{H}|^2 = b_1^2 b_2^2 b_3^2$.

²⁶A frame-indifferent second-rank tensor \mathbf{G} would transform as $\mathbf{G}^* = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{Q}^\top$, while a frame-invariant one as $\mathbf{G}^* = \mathbf{G}$ (see [33, p. 150]).

Since $\mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(3)$, and so $\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}$, (37) readily entails that the invariant rotation gradient can be represented as follows,

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{u}_1) \otimes \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{u}_2) \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \otimes \mathbf{a}_3, \quad (38)$$

in terms of three *tangential* vectors \mathbf{a}_1 , \mathbf{a}_2 , and \mathbf{a}_3 , see also [5]. It should be noted that these vectors depend on the choice of the moving frame on \mathcal{S} ; equation (38) applies to the frame $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ of principal directions of stretching.

Below we collect a number of properties of \mathbf{H} , which shall be useful in the rest of the paper. The gliding laws in (10) can be written as follows for both frames $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ and $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}^*)$ on \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^* , respectively,

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_s \mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_1, \\ \nabla_s \mathbf{u}_2 = -\mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_2, \\ \nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu} = -\mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{d}_2, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \nabla_s^* \mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{c}^* + \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{d}_1^*, \\ \nabla_s^* \mathbf{v}_2 = -\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{c}^* + \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{d}_2^*, \\ \nabla_s^* \boldsymbol{\nu}^* = -\mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1^* - \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{d}_2^*, \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

where the connectors $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2)$ are associated with the frame $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, while $(\mathbf{c}^*, \mathbf{d}_1^*, \mathbf{d}_2^*)$ are associated with $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}^*)$, and ∇_s^* denotes the surface gradient on \mathcal{S}^* .

It was proved in [5] that with the aid of (39) the pure measures of drilling and bending in (32) can be given the form

$$w_d = 4|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{c}^* - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{c}|^2, \quad (40a)$$

$$w_b = 4[|\mathbf{V}(\nabla_s^* \boldsymbol{\nu}^*)|^2 - |\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}|^2]^2 = 4[\lambda_1^2(d_1^*)^2 + \lambda_2^2(d_2^*)^2 - d_1^2 - d_2^2]^2. \quad (40b)$$

By (27) and the chain rule,

$$\nabla_s \mathbf{v}_1 = \mathbf{R} \nabla_s \mathbf{u}_1 + \nabla_s \mathbf{R} \circ \mathbf{u}_1 = (\nabla_s^* \mathbf{v}_1) \nabla_s \mathbf{y}. \quad (41)$$

Making use of both (33) and the second set of equations in (39), we give (41) the following form,

$$\mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 + \mathbf{H} \circ \mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{U}\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{c}^* + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{U}\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{d}_1^*, \quad (42)$$

where (28) has also been employed. Since $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2)$ is a basis of $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}}$ and, as can easily be shown, $(\mathbf{H} \circ \mathbf{u}_1)^\top \mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{0}$, equation (42) is equivalent to the pair

$$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{c}^* - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{a}_3, \quad (43a)$$

$$\mathbf{V}\mathbf{d}_1^* - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{d}_1 = -\mathbf{R}\mathbf{a}_2, \quad (43b)$$

where the following identities, which are immediate consequences of (38), have also been used,

$$(\mathbf{H} \circ \mathbf{u}_1)^\top \mathbf{u}_2 = \mathbf{a}_3, \quad (\mathbf{H} \circ \mathbf{u}_1)^\top \boldsymbol{\nu} = -(\mathbf{H} \circ \boldsymbol{\nu})^\top \mathbf{u}_1 = -\mathbf{a}_2.$$

By reasoning similarly with the decomposition of $\nabla_s \mathbf{v}_2$ that parallels (41), we supplement (43a) and (43b) with²⁷

$$\mathbf{V} \mathbf{d}_2^* - \mathbf{R} \mathbf{d}_2 = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}_1. \quad (43c)$$

The three equations (43) give w_d and w_b a new form in terms of the three vectors \mathbf{a} ,

$$w_d = 4a_3^2, \quad w_b = 4(a_1^2 + a_2^2 + 2(\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{d}_2 - \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot \mathbf{d}_1))^2. \quad (44)$$

Two further properties of \mathbf{H} will be of some use; we close this section by illustrating them.

First, as shown in detail in Appendix C, the integrability condition (6) applied to $\mathbf{F} = \nabla_s \mathbf{y}$ reduces to the following system of scalar equations,

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1(\mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2) \cdot \mathbf{u}_2 = \lambda_2(\mathbf{d}_2 + \mathbf{a}_1) \cdot \mathbf{u}_1, & (45a) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_1(\mathbf{a}_3 \cdot \mathbf{u}_2) + (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{u}_2) - \nabla_s \lambda_2 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1 = 0, & (45b) \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} \lambda_2(\mathbf{a}_3 \cdot \mathbf{u}_1) + (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)(\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{u}_1) + \nabla_s \lambda_1 \cdot \mathbf{u}_2 = 0. & (45c) \end{cases}$$

Second, by expanding \mathbf{d}_1 and \mathbf{d}_2 in the frame $(\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ as done in (15) for the generic frame $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, from (43b) and (43c) we derive a similar expansion for \mathbf{d}_1^* and \mathbf{d}_2^* in the frame $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}^*)$,

$$\mathbf{d}_1^* = \frac{1}{\lambda_1}(d_{11} - a_{21})\mathbf{v}_1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_2}(d_{12} - a_{22})\mathbf{v}_2, \quad (46a)$$

$$\mathbf{d}_2^* = \frac{1}{\lambda_1}(d_{21} + a_{11})\mathbf{v}_1 + \frac{1}{\lambda_2}(d_{22} + a_{12})\mathbf{v}_2, \quad (46b)$$

where we have set $\mathbf{a}_1 = a_{11}\mathbf{u}_1 + a_{12}\mathbf{u}_2$ and $\mathbf{a}_2 = a_{21}\mathbf{u}_1 + a_{22}\mathbf{u}_2$. Use of (45a) in (46) makes sure that the connectors $(\mathbf{d}_1^*, \mathbf{d}_2^*)$ obey the symmetry condition (11).

Combining (46) and (12b), we readily arrive at the following formula for the Gaussian curvature K^* of \mathcal{S}^* , where the \mathbf{a} vectors also feature explicitly,

$$K^* = \frac{1}{\det \mathbf{U}} [K - (\mathbf{a}_1 \times \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{a}_1 \times \mathbf{d}_1 - \mathbf{a}_2 \times \mathbf{d}_2) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}], \quad (47)$$

where K is the Gaussian curvature of \mathcal{S} .

In the next sections, our development will build on the preliminary material collected in this section and the preceding one; to make our results easier to retrace, they will be presented in a formal, more structured way.

²⁷Equations (43b) and (43c) can also be obtained by decomposing $\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}^*$ in a fashion similar to (41).

5 Conformal deformations

Here we see how the properties of the invariant rotation gradient outlined above relate to those special deformations of \mathcal{S} that preserve *angles*. Such deformations are called *conformal* and are formally defined as follows.

Definition 1 A deformation \mathbf{y} is *conformal* if

$$\frac{\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{u}||\mathbf{v}|} = \frac{(\nabla_s \mathbf{y})\mathbf{u} \cdot (\nabla_s \mathbf{y})\mathbf{v}}{|(\nabla_s \mathbf{y})\mathbf{u}||(\nabla_s \mathbf{y})\mathbf{v}|}, \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}. \quad (48)$$

Remark 1 It readily follows from (29) that (48) can equivalently be rewritten as

$$\frac{\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{u}||\mathbf{v}|} = \frac{\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{C}\mathbf{v}}{(\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{C}\mathbf{u})^{1/2}(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{C}\mathbf{v})^{1/2}} \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}. \quad (49)$$

Proposition 1 A deformation \mathbf{y} is conformal if and only if

$$\mathbf{C} = \lambda^2 \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad (50)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a scalar field on \mathcal{S} .

Proof One implication is trivial as, for \mathbf{C} as in (50), (49) becomes an identity. To prove that (49) implies (50), we first remark that (49) specializes into

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{C}\mathbf{v} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0. \quad (51)$$

Then we resort to (26) and write

$$\mathbf{C} = \lambda_1^2 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{u}_1 + \lambda_2^2 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{u}_2. \quad (52)$$

By use of (52) in (51) with $\mathbf{u} = \cos \vartheta \mathbf{u}_1 + \sin \vartheta \mathbf{u}_2$ and $\mathbf{v} = -\sin \vartheta \mathbf{u}_1 + \cos \vartheta \mathbf{u}_2$, we readily arrive at

$$\mathbf{u} \cdot \mathbf{C}\mathbf{v} = (\lambda_2^2 - \lambda_1^2) \sin \vartheta \cos \vartheta = 0 \quad \forall \vartheta, \quad (53)$$

which requires $\lambda_1^2 = \lambda_2^2 = \lambda^2$, and so implies (50). \square

Remark 2 An alternative proof of Proposition 1 was also obtained in [1] by a different reasoning.

Remark 3 As a consequence of (52) and (26), for a conformal deformation the stretching tensors read as follows,

$$\mathbf{U} = \lambda \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{V} = \lambda \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}^*). \quad (54)$$

We now determine the \mathbf{a} vectors that represent the invariant rotation gradient \mathbf{H} for a conformal deformation.

Remark 4 Since for a conformal deformation the principal stretches are equal, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda > 0$, under the assumption that λ be differentiable, it follows from (45b) and (45c) that

$$\mathbf{a}_3 = \boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda. \quad (55a)$$

Similarly, by use of (54) in (43b) and (43c) we easily arrive at

$$\mathbf{a}_2 = -\lambda \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{d}_1^* + \mathbf{d}_1, \quad (55b)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_1 = \lambda \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{d}_2^* - \mathbf{d}_2. \quad (55c)$$

Remark 5 By combining (55a) and (43a), we also write the spin connector \mathbf{c}^* associated on \mathcal{S}^* with the frame $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}^*)$ as

$$\mathbf{c}^* = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{h} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{h} := \frac{1}{\lambda} (\mathbf{c} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda). \quad (56)$$

Remark 6 For a conformal deformation, the integrability condition (45a) combined with the symmetry property (11) delivers

$$\mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_2 = 0, \quad (57)$$

valid in any frame $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ on \mathcal{S} with the corresponding choice of the \mathbf{a} vectors.

Remark 7 It follows from (12a), (22), and (55b), (55c) that a conformal deformation transforms the mean curvature H of \mathcal{S} into the mean curvature H^* of \mathcal{S}^* according to the law,

$$2H^* = \frac{1}{\lambda} (2H + \mathbf{a}_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{a}_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}_2). \quad (58)$$

We are now in a position to relate the Gaussian curvature K^* of \mathcal{S}^* to the Gaussian curvature K of \mathcal{S} whenever the deformation \mathbf{y} is conformal.

Proposition 2 *For a conformal deformation \mathbf{y} of \mathcal{S} into \mathcal{S}^* ,*

$$K^* = \frac{1}{\lambda^2} (K - \Delta_s \ln \lambda), \quad (59)$$

where $\Delta_s := \operatorname{div}_s \nabla_s$ denotes the surface Laplacian.

Proof By (18a) applied to \mathcal{S}^* , $K^* = -\operatorname{curl}_s \mathbf{c}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}^*$, and so we need first compute $\nabla_s^* \mathbf{c}^*$. To this end, we remark that, by the chain rule,

$$\nabla_s \mathbf{c}^* = (\nabla_s^* \mathbf{c}^*) \nabla_s \mathbf{y} = \lambda (\nabla_s^* \mathbf{c}^*) \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}^*) \mathbf{R}, \quad (60)$$

which, also by (56), yields

$$\nabla_s^* \mathbf{c}^* = \frac{1}{\lambda} \nabla_s (\mathbf{R} \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{R}^\top = \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\mathbf{R} (\nabla_s \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{R}^\top + (\nabla_s \mathbf{R} \circ \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{R}^\top \right). \quad (61)$$

To compute $\nabla_s \mathbf{R}$ for \mathbf{R} expressed as in (28), we need the following formulae,

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_s \mathbf{v}_1 = \lambda \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{h} + \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{d}_1^*, \\ \nabla_s \mathbf{v}_2 = -\lambda \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{h} + \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{d}_2^*, \\ \nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}^* = -\lambda \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{d}_1^* - \lambda \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{d}_2^*, \end{cases} \quad (62)$$

which are obtained by applying the chain rule and (56) to the second set of equations in (39). By use of (62), the explicit form of \mathbf{h} in (56), and both (55b) and (55c), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_s \mathbf{R} &= \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes (\boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 - \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda) - \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes (\boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes (\mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{a}_1 - \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2).\end{aligned}\quad (63)$$

It is then a simple matter to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned}(\nabla_s \mathbf{R} \circ \mathbf{h}) \mathbf{R}^\top &= (\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{u}_1) [\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda) \mathbf{R}^\top - \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}_2] \\ &\quad - (\mathbf{h} \cdot \mathbf{u}_2) [\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda) \mathbf{R}^\top - \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}_1].\end{aligned}\quad (64)$$

Since both $\mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}_1$ and $\mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}_2$ are vectors orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{\nu}^*$, so also are the axial vectors associated with the skew-symmetric parts of both $\boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes \mathbf{R} \mathbf{a}_2$. Thus, combining (61) and (64), we find that

$$\text{curl}_s^* \mathbf{c}^* \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}^* = \frac{1}{\lambda} (\text{curl}_s \mathbf{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} + \boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda \cdot \mathbf{h}). \quad (65)$$

To conclude the proof, we must compute²⁸

$$\text{curl}_s \mathbf{h} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \text{curl}_s \mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} + \nabla_s \frac{1}{\lambda} \times \mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} + \nabla_s \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_s \ln \lambda + \frac{1}{\lambda} \Delta_s \ln \lambda \quad (66a)$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} \times \nabla_s \ln \lambda \cdot \mathbf{h} = \frac{1}{\lambda} (\nabla_s \ln \lambda \times \mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} + |\nabla_s \ln \lambda|^2). \quad (66b)$$

The desired result follows from inserting (66) in (65), as

$$\nabla_s \frac{1}{\lambda} \cdot \nabla_s \ln \lambda = -\frac{1}{\lambda} |\nabla_s \ln \lambda|^2 = -\frac{1}{\lambda^3} |\nabla_s \lambda|^2$$

and $K = -\text{curl}_s \mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}$. □

Remark 8 Equation (59) clearly shows how the Gaussian curvature of a conformally deformed surface is uniquely determined by the Gaussian curvature of the undeformed surface and the metric tensor \mathbf{C} in (50), thus confirming the intrinsic nature of K . Contrasting (58) to (59) shows instead how H fails to be intrinsic, as in a conformal deformation it is also affected by the invariant rotation gradient \mathbf{H} .

Remark 9 Setting $\lambda = e^\phi$ in (59), we rewrite the latter in the equivalent form,

$$\Delta_s \phi + K^* e^{2\phi} - K = 0, \quad (67)$$

which is more amenable to serve analytic purposes.

Remark 10 If \mathcal{S} is given (and so is K) and $K^*(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}))$ is prescribed on \mathcal{S} as the Gaussian curvature of a target (unknown) surface \mathcal{S}^* related to \mathcal{S} by a conformal deformation \mathbf{y} , yet to be determined, equation (67) becomes a necessary condition for the existence of such a deformation. For the unit sphere \mathbb{S}^2 in three-dimensional space, (67) reads as

$$\Delta_s \phi + K^* e^{2\phi} - 1 = 0, \quad (68)$$

²⁸Here use is made of the identity

$$\text{curl}_s(\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}) = (\nabla_s \mathbf{a}) \mathbf{b} - (\nabla_s \mathbf{b}) \mathbf{a} + (\text{div}_s \mathbf{b}) \mathbf{a} - (\text{div}_s \mathbf{a}) \mathbf{b},$$

valid for generic vector fields \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} on \mathcal{S} .

which is an equation with an interesting history. Based on geometric intuition, one may be led to conjecture that (68) has always a solution provided that K^* only takes on positive values. This is however false, as shown in [34], where positive Gaussian curvatures K^* unrealizable by conformal deformation of a sphere were explicitly constructed. A partial positive answer to the existence of conformally realizable curvatures was given in [35], where for K^* enjoying the *antipodal* symmetry, that is, such that $K^*(\mathbf{y}(-\mathbf{x})) = K^*(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}))$, it was proved that (68) admits a solution with the same symmetry, provided that $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{S}^2} K^*(\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x})) > 0$.²⁹

In the following section, we shall consider an even smaller class of deformations \mathbf{y} , for which the metric tensor \mathbf{C} is simpler than in (50) and, as we shall see, the metric implications are more stringent.

6 Isometric deformations

To restrict the range of conformal deformations of a surface, we first consider the class of all deformations that preserve area.

Definition 2 A deformation \mathbf{y} of \mathcal{S} is said to be *isoareal* if

$$A(\mathbf{y}(\mathcal{A})) = A(\mathcal{A}) \quad \forall \mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}, \quad (69)$$

where A is the area measure.

Remark 11 Since the element area ratio for a deformation \mathbf{y} of \mathcal{S} into \mathcal{S}^* can be written as

$$\frac{dA^*}{dA} = \frac{|(\nabla_s \mathbf{y})\mathbf{u} \times (\nabla_s \mathbf{y})\mathbf{v}|}{|\mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{v}|} \quad \forall \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{x}} \text{ with } \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{v} \neq \mathbf{0}, \quad (70)$$

it readily follows from (25) that (69) can be equivalently written in the form (see also [1])

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}} (\det \mathbf{U} - 1) dA = 0, \quad (71)$$

and so (69) reduces to the local requirement

$$\det \mathbf{U} = \det \mathbf{V} = 1. \quad (72)$$

Definition 3 A deformation \mathbf{y} that preserves both angles and area is said to be an *isometry*.³⁰

Remark 12 It follows from Proposition 1 and (72) that an isometry of \mathcal{S} is characterized by having

$$\nabla_s \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{P}(\nu) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(3), \quad (73a)$$

²⁹A similar result had also been proved in [36], but for K^* close to a constant, so that \mathcal{S}^* is indeed an *ovaloid*. The search for such a surface conformally obtained from a sphere was apparently a problem initially posed by Niremborg. The result proved in [35] removes the smallness condition enforced in [36], thus providing a general solution to Niremborg's problem.

³⁰Here, *isometry* and *isometric deformation* are used as synonyms, although in differential geometry the former usually refers to a larger class of mappings than the latter (see Remark 15 below for a simple example of this difference.)

for which

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{V} = \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}^*), \quad (73b)$$

amounting to letting $\lambda \equiv 1$ in (50).

We now prove a number of properties enjoyed by isometries.

Proposition 3 *For an isometric deformation \mathbf{y} , the following equations are valid in general,*

$$\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad K^* = K. \quad (74)$$

Proof Since an isometry is a special conformal deformation, the two claims in (74) are obtained by setting $\lambda \equiv 1$ in (55a) and (59), respectively. \square

Remark 13 It follows from Proposition 3 and (44) that $w_d = 0$, and so no drilling elastic energy can be associated with an isometric deformation.

Remark 14 The second claim in (74) states that an isometry leaves the Gaussian curvature unchanged, which is one form of the classical *theorema egregium* of Gauss (see, for example, [23, p. 140]).

6.1 Pure rotation

A rigid rotation of \mathcal{S} in three-dimensional space represented as $\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{x}$, where \mathbf{R} is any given (constant) element of $\text{SO}(3)$, is clearly an isometry of \mathcal{S} , as it satisfies (73a). It is well-known that isometric deformations are far more general than uniform rotations. However, there are instances where an isometry is necessarily a uniform rotation. Two such cases are examined below.

If both \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}^* are the same sphere, say \mathbb{S}^2 , for simplicity, then the only isometric deformations of \mathcal{S} onto \mathcal{S}^* are rigid motions in the ambient three-dimensional space. This is more formally stated as follows.

Proposition 4 *If \mathbf{y} is an isometric deformation of \mathbb{S}^2 onto \mathbb{S}^2 , then its polar rotation \mathbf{R} is uniform, that is, $\nabla_s \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{0}$.*

Proof Since \mathbf{R} is invertible, by (33), the claim of the proposition is equivalent to say that \mathbf{H} must vanish.

A deformation $\mathbf{y} : \mathbb{S}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{S}^2$ can be represented as

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x})\mathbf{x}, \quad (75)$$

where $\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{x}) \in \text{SO}(3)$. By differentiating both sides of (75), we arrive at

$$\nabla_s \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{R}(\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) + \mathbf{H} \circ \boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad (76)$$

where we have used the identity $\nu(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ that holds on \mathbb{S}^2 . By (76) and (38), \mathbf{y} is an isometry if and only if

$$\mathbf{H} \circ \nu = -\mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{0}. \quad (77)$$

Since \mathbf{u}_1 and \mathbf{u}_2 are linearly independent, (77) is equivalent to requiring that $\mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{0}$, that is, again by (38), that

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{W}(\nu) \otimes \mathbf{a}_3, \quad (78)$$

and so \mathbf{H} vanishes by (74). \square

Remark 15 Taking for \mathbf{R} a reflection³¹ across a great circle of \mathbb{S}^2 would provide via (75) an isometric map \mathbf{y} of \mathbb{S}^2 onto itself, but such a map would reverse the orientation of the surface, which (according to our definition) a deformation is not allowed to do.

Remark 16 As is clear from the proof of Proposition 4, the uniformity of \mathbf{R} is a local property, which also applies if the deformation \mathbf{y} just maps isometrically a part of \mathbb{S}^2 into another. Thus, this is a weaker form of the general result applied in [30] to identify a special class of Möbius transformations as uniform rotations of the whole Riemann sphere.

If an isometric deformation of a generic surface \mathcal{S} is further restricted, it may be reduced to a uniform rotation. One such restriction is the request of frame-indifference for the curvature tensor.

Proposition 5 *Let $\mathbf{y} : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$ be an isometric deformation such that*

$$\nabla_s^* \nu^* = \mathbf{R}(\nabla_s \nu) \mathbf{R}^T, \quad (79)$$

*where \mathbf{R} is the polar rotation of \mathbf{y} . Then $\nabla_s \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{0}$.*³²

Proof To prove our claim, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{H} \equiv \mathbf{0}$, that is, that $\mathbf{a}_1 = \mathbf{a}_2 = \mathbf{0}$, since $\mathbf{a}_3 = \mathbf{0}$ for all isometries by Proposition 3. Now, combining (39) and (79), we obtain from (28) that

$$\mathbf{d}_i^* = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{d}_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \quad (80)$$

The desired conclusion then follows from setting $\lambda = 1$ in (55b) and (55c). \square

Remark 17 While (80) requires (79) to hold, its analog for the spin connector \mathbf{c} ,

$$\mathbf{c}^* = \mathbf{R} \mathbf{c}, \quad (81)$$

which follows from setting $\lambda = 1$ in (56), is valid for all isometries.

³¹So that $-\mathbf{R}$ is in $\text{SO}(3)$ instead of \mathbf{R} .

³²A different, perhaps longer proof of this result can be found in [19, p. 316], see also [37] for a similar result about convex surfaces.

6.2 Pure drilling

We have already observed (see Remark 13) that an isometric deformation of a surface comes with no drilling energy. It is then interesting to classify all non-trivial isometries (different from a uniform rotation) that only entail drilling.³³ These would carry no elastic energy of any other sort: no stretching energy, because w_s in (31) vanishes on isometries, and no bending energy either because w_b vanishes on a pure drilling mode (by construction). Were there a *continuum* of energy-free deformations generating non-congruent shapes all in the same elastic ground state, they would represent instances of *soft elasticity* within the theory of shells proposed in [5]. Such instances have already been proved to exist for minimal surfaces in [30]; here we show that these are indeed the only possible ones.

Proposition 6 *An isometric deformation \mathbf{y} of \mathcal{S} can be a pure drilling only if \mathcal{S} is a minimal surface, for which \mathbf{y} reduces to a classical Bonnet transformation.³⁴*

Proof We choose on \mathcal{S} the moving frame $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, where $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ are the principal directions of curvature, so that (10) can be written with the curvature connectors \mathbf{d}_1 and \mathbf{d}_2 as in (22),

$$\begin{cases} \nabla_s \mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{c} - \kappa_1 \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \\ \nabla_s \mathbf{e}_2 = -\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{c} - \kappa_2 \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{e}_2, \\ \nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu} = \kappa_1 \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1 + \kappa_2 \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2. \end{cases} \quad (82)$$

An isometric deformation \mathbf{y} of \mathcal{S} must obey (73a), where $\mathbf{R} \in \text{SO}(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ is a rotation about $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, represented as

$$\mathbf{R} = \cos \alpha (\mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1 + \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2) + \sin \alpha (\mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1 - \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2) + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad (83)$$

with α a field to be determined to grant integrability to (73a).³⁵ A tedious, but simple calculation elaborating on (83) and (82) gives the following formula for the invariant rotation gradient associated with \mathbf{R} ,

$$\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{e}_1) \otimes \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{W}(\mathbf{e}_2) \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \otimes \mathbf{a}_3, \quad (84)$$

where

$$\mathbf{a}_1 = \kappa_1 \sin \alpha \mathbf{e}_1 + \kappa_2 (1 - \cos \alpha) \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \mathbf{a}_2 = \kappa_1 (\cos \alpha - 1) \mathbf{e}_1 + \kappa_2 \sin \alpha \mathbf{e}_2, \quad \mathbf{a}_3 = \nabla_s \alpha. \quad (85)$$

Thus, it follows from (74), (57), and (12a) that α must be constant on \mathcal{S} and

$$\sin \alpha (\kappa_1 + \kappa_2) = 2H \sin \alpha = 0, \quad (86)$$

so that, unless $\alpha = 0$ (in which case \mathbf{y} reduces to the identity), \mathcal{S} must necessarily be a minimal surface.

The proof is completed by the analysis of isometries of minimal surfaces conducted in [30] (see also [39, p. 159]). \square

³³That is, for which there is a frame where $\mathbf{R}_b = \mathbf{I}$.

³⁴In the theory of minimal surfaces, the Bonnet transformation is responsible, in particular, for changing a catenoid into a helicoid (see, for example, pp. 102 and 149 of [38].)

³⁵As made clear by (83), in general $(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}_2)$ are *not* principal directions of curvature of \mathcal{S} , although $(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ is a legitimate moving frame.

Remark 18 By use of the first two equations in (85) in (58) with $\lambda = 1$, we readily obtain that

$$H^* = H \cos \alpha = 0, \quad (87)$$

in accord with the fact that the Bonnet transformation changes a minimal surface into another.

Remark 19 It only takes a simple computation based on (85) and (22) to check that w_b in (44) vanishes identically for a pure drilling isometry. Thus, a whole family of non-trivial isometric deformations of \mathcal{S} is generated by varying the constant α . For them all energy modes in (31) and (32) vanish; they indeed constitute an example of soft elasticity.

Remark 20 It follows from equations (55), (57), and (58) that both (86) and the conclusions reached in Remarks 18 and 19 remain valid for *uniformly* conformal deformations (that is, with constant λ , albeit different from unity). However, they are not a source of soft elasticity because $w_s \neq 0$.

Remark 21 Pure drilling isometries are special non-trivial isometries that preserve the mean curvature of \mathcal{S} . The surfaces for which such isometries exist are called the *Bonnet surfaces*, as Bonnet first studied them (see [40, pp. 72-92]).³⁶ He proved that analytic surfaces with no umbilics³⁷ and *constant* mean curvature are Bonnet surfaces. Further studies [11, 41, 42] have been devoted to the characterization of these surfaces using the method of moving frames. In particular, new classes of Bonnet surfaces have been identified under the assumption that they contain no umbilics and are at least of class C^5 [42]. Moreover, it was proved in [43] that *helicoidal* surfaces³⁸ are Bonnet surfaces.

6.3 Pure bending

Another, complementary way to restrict an isometric deformation of a material surface \mathcal{S} is by requiring it to be a pure bending (in some frame). This is achieved, in particular, by replacing \mathbf{R} in (83) with

$$\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1 + \cos \alpha (\mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 + \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}) + \sin \alpha (\boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 - \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad (88)$$

which describes a rotation by angle α about \mathbf{e}_1 .

We shall identify pure bending isometries in a special class of deformations, which are defined as follows.

Definition 4 We say that an isometric deformation \mathbf{y} of \mathcal{S} is an *eversion* if

$$\nabla_s^* \boldsymbol{\nu}^*(\mathbf{y}(x)) = -\mathbf{R}(x) \nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}(x) \mathbf{R}(x)^T \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{S}, \quad (89)$$

where \mathbf{R} is the polar rotation of \mathbf{y} .

³⁶Since all isometries preserve the Gaussian curvature, the Bonnet surfaces can equivalently be defined as the surfaces that admit isometries preserving both principal curvatures.

³⁷These are points with equal principal curvatures.

³⁸One such surface is produced by a helicoidal motion in three-dimensional space of an appropriate curve.

Proposition 7 *A pure bending isometry of \mathcal{S} with polar rotation as in (88), where \mathbf{e}_1 is a principal direction of curvature, is an eversion if and only if the following conditions hold,*

$$\nabla_s \kappa_1 \cdot \mathbf{e}_2 = \kappa_1(\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) \frac{\sin \alpha}{1 - \cos \alpha}, \quad (90a)$$

$$\nabla_s \kappa_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 = 0, \quad (90b)$$

$$\nabla_s \alpha = 2\kappa_2 \mathbf{e}_2, \quad (90c)$$

where κ_1 and κ_2 are the principal curvatures of \mathcal{S} .

Proof A direct computation resorting to (82) delivers \mathbf{H} in the form (84), where now

$$\mathbf{a}_1 = \nabla_s \alpha, \quad (91a)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_2 = \sin \alpha \mathbf{c} + \kappa_1(\cos \alpha - 1)\mathbf{e}_1, \quad (91b)$$

$$\mathbf{a}_3 = (\cos \alpha - 1)\mathbf{c} - \kappa_1 \sin \alpha \mathbf{e}_1. \quad (91c)$$

Since \mathbf{a}_3 must vanish for an isometry, we derive from (91c) that

$$\mathbf{c} = -\frac{\kappa_1 \sin \alpha}{1 - \cos \alpha} \mathbf{e}_1. \quad (92)$$

It then follows from (92) and (91b) that

$$\mathbf{a}_2 = -2\kappa_1 \mathbf{e}_1, \quad (93)$$

which combined with (91a) shows that the integrability condition (57) reduces to

$$\nabla_s \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_1 = 0. \quad (94)$$

Equations (90a) and (90b) follow from inserting (92) into equations (24).

We now use equations (55b) and (55c) combined with (91a) and (93) to obtain

$$\mathbf{d}_1^* = \kappa_1 \mathbf{R} \mathbf{e}_1 = \kappa_1 \mathbf{e}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{d}_2^* = ((\nabla_s \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_2) - \kappa_2) \mathbf{R} \mathbf{e}_2, \quad (95)$$

which lead us to the following expressions for the principal curvatures of \mathcal{S}^* ,

$$\kappa_1^* = -\kappa_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_2^* = \kappa_2 - \nabla_s \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_2. \quad (96)$$

Thus, (89) is obeyed if and only if (90c) is. \square

At first sight conditions (90) may appear to be too many to be compatible; we shall now see that this is not the case.

Proposition 8 *All surfaces of revolution admit a pure bending eversion.*

Proof In the frame $(\mathbf{e}_r, \mathbf{e}_\vartheta, \mathbf{e}_z)$ of ordinary cylindrical coordinates (r, ϑ, z) , we represent a surface of revolution about \mathbf{e}_z as

$$\mathbf{x}(\vartheta, z) = \rho(z) \mathbf{e}_r + z \mathbf{e}_z, \quad \vartheta \in [0, 2\pi), \quad z \geq 0, \quad (97)$$

where ρ is a smooth positive function, with $\rho(z)$ representing the radius of the circular section of \mathcal{S} at height z . The parallels of \mathcal{S} are oriented along $\mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{e}_\vartheta$ and its meridians along

$$\mathbf{e}_2 = \frac{\rho' \mathbf{e}_r + \mathbf{e}_z}{\sqrt{1 + \rho'^2}},$$




Figure 1: Two views of the eversion of half a catenoid based on a unit circle and extending for $0 \leq z \leq 2$. The surface is everted inside out as suggested by the different colours of the exposed side.

while the unit normal $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\nu} = \mathbf{e}_1 \times \mathbf{e}_2 = \frac{\mathbf{e}_r - \rho' \mathbf{e}_z}{\sqrt{1 + \rho'^2}}. \quad (98)$$

The principal curvatures associated with the principal directions $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2)$ are

$$\kappa_1 = \frac{1}{\rho \sqrt{1 + \rho'^2}} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_2 = -\frac{\rho''}{(1 + \rho'^2)^{3/2}}. \quad (99)$$

Equation (90b) is thus automatically satisfied. To satisfy (90c), we take $\alpha = \alpha(z)$ and compute

$$\nabla_s \alpha = \frac{\alpha'}{\sqrt{1 + \rho'^2}} \mathbf{e}_2. \quad (100)$$

Similarly, we obtain $\nabla_s \kappa_2 \cdot \mathbf{e}_2$, so that equations (90a) and (90c) become

$$\begin{cases} \rho' = \frac{\sin \alpha}{1 - \cos \alpha}, \\ \alpha' = -\frac{2\rho''}{1 + \rho'^2}. \end{cases} \quad (101)$$

It is straightforward to check that for any function ρ this system is solved by³⁹

$$\alpha = \arctan(2\rho', \rho'^2 - 1). \quad (102)$$

In Appendix D, we exhibit the deformation \mathbf{y} corresponding to (102) together with other computational details. \square

Figure 1 shows the eversion of half a catenoid represented by (97) with $\rho(z) = \cosh z$ for $0 \leq z \leq 2$.

³⁹The two-argument function $\arctan(y, x)$, ranging in the interval $[-\pi, \pi]$, extends the standard function $\arctan(y/x)$ ranging in $[-\pi/2, \pi/2]$; it attributes to the correct quadrant of the Cartesian plane the angle subtended by the positive x -axis and the radial line through the origin and the point (x, y) .

Remark 22 It is instructive to contrast Proposition 5 with Proposition 7: what is a pure rotation in the former becomes an eversion in the latter, while only a sign makes (79) differ from (89).

Remark 23 Since for an isometry $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{P}(\nu^*)$, it follows from (40b) and (89) that $w_b = 0$ for a pure bending eversion. However, despite the fact that both w_s and w_d also vanish, an eversion is *not* an instance of soft elasticity (see Remark 19), as the everted shape cannot be attained through a family of energy-free deformations; quite on the contrary, it is *energetically isolated*: a surface must in general go through a great deal of stretching (and possibly drilling too) to get everted.

Remark 24 Elastic eversion was perhaps first studied (both theoretically and “experimentally”) by Truesdell (see, in particular pp. 510-519 of [44]). In more recent times, the eversion of shells has again become quite a popular topic (see, for example, [45–49]) also involving some exotic applications that exploit the bistability of everted shapes [50].

7 Conclusions

In deforming a material surface in three-dimensional space, angles and areas will generally be altered. When they are not, the deformation is an isometry and this metric restriction, which is geometrically intrinsic in nature, has notable implications, the most known of which is perhaps Gauss’ *theorema egregium*, which states that the Gaussian curvature of the surface remains unchanged under the deformation. We have attempted to explore other, possibly more exotic implications of metric restrictions imposed on a deformation of a material surface.

As our mathematical language betrays, we have been interested in kinematics, seen as the geometric vestments of mechanics: in this view, a material surface cannot be identified with its fundamental forms; it is rather a coherent collection of individual body-points that move in space and cannot interpenetrate. Such a conception of material surfaces poses a number of restrictions to its geometric manifestations. We have *not* used the classical method of coordinates, although these are unavoidable to accomplish certain computational tasks.⁴⁰ We have embraced the method of moving frames, but in a vectorial variant, which avoids resorting to differential forms, and is thus possibly more germane to the taste and skills of the engineering community.

Although some preliminaries on surface calculus were needed to make the reader acquainted with our approach, our endeavour was not only limited to reobtaining in a different way results that have already been known for quite some time. A method is best tested by new applications. We found these in a theory for soft thin shells that we have recently proposed. This is a theory based on the energetic separation of three independent deformation modes: stretching, drilling, and bending. We explored the consequences that some metric restrictions of the deformation have on the three independent energetic contents.

Here is a list of our main conclusions:

⁴⁰In this respect, our style is reminiscent of that first fashioned in [51, 52], of which [1] represents perhaps the most recent emanation.

- (1) An isometric deformation, which has no stretching content, has no drilling content either.
- (2) An isometric deformation of any part of a sphere onto another is a uniform rotation in the ambient space.
- (3) An isometric deformation of a surface \mathcal{S} has no bending elastic energy (besides having no drilling elastic energy) only if \mathcal{S} is a minimal surface and the deformation is a Bonnet transformation.
- (4) All surfaces of revolution admit a pure bending eversion with no elastic energy.

We have given more general conditions for the existence of pure bending eversions; they might be worth exploring further for classes of shell shapes also lacking any particular symmetry. It is our hope that such a study could be conducted in the future; it might shed some new light on the snapping of soft shells between bistable configurations.

Appendix A Metric curvature formula

In this appendix, we derive from the Gauss equation (18a) an elegant formula for the Gaussian curvature K , which is called *metric* as it expresses K solely in terms of the metric elements $|\mathbf{r}_u|$ and $|\mathbf{r}_v|$ defined in Sect. 2 for a generic system of coordinates. Here, we shall assume that (u, v) coordinates are merely orthogonal, and $|\mathbf{r}_u|$ and $|\mathbf{r}_v|$ may differ.

We start by recalling how the surface gradient $\nabla_s f$ of a smooth, scalar-valued function f defined on \mathcal{S} is related to the partial derivatives $\partial_u f$ and $\partial_v f$ of f expressed in the (u, v) coordinates. For a generic curve $t \mapsto \mathbf{r}(t)$, parameterized as $t \mapsto (u(t), v(t))$,

$$\dot{f}(\mathbf{r}(t)) = \nabla_s f \cdot \dot{\mathbf{r}} = \nabla_s f \cdot (\dot{u}|\mathbf{r}_u|\mathbf{e}_u + \dot{v}|\mathbf{r}_v|\mathbf{e}_v), \quad (\text{A1})$$

where a superimposed dot denotes differentiation with respect to t and use has been made of (9). Since, for f expressed in (u, v) coordinates, we also have that $\dot{f} = (\partial_u f)\dot{u} + (\partial_v f)\dot{v}$, and the curve along which the differentiation is performed is arbitrary, we easily derive from (A1) that

$$\nabla_s f = \frac{\partial_u f}{|\mathbf{r}_u|}\mathbf{e}_u + \frac{\partial_v f}{|\mathbf{r}_v|}\mathbf{e}_v. \quad (\text{A2})$$

Letting $(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{d}_u, \mathbf{d}_v)$ denote the connectors of the moving frame $(\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_v, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ associated with orthogonal coordinates (u, v) , we wish now to represent \mathbf{c} in the basis $(\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_v)$. To this end, since by (10) $\mathbf{c} = (\nabla_s \mathbf{e}_u)^\top \mathbf{e}_v$, with the aid of (A2) we first compute

$$\nabla_s \mathbf{e}_u = -\frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u|}\mathbf{e}_u \otimes \nabla_s |\mathbf{r}_u| + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u|} \left(\frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u|} \partial_{uu} \mathbf{r}_u \otimes \mathbf{e}_u + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_v|} \partial_{vu} \mathbf{r}_u \otimes \mathbf{e}_v \right), \quad (\text{A3})$$

from which we obtain

$$\mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u|^2 |\mathbf{r}_v|} (\partial_{uu} \mathbf{r}_u \cdot \partial_v \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}_u + \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_v|^2 |\mathbf{r}_u|} (\partial_{vv} \mathbf{r} \cdot \partial_v \mathbf{r}) \mathbf{e}_v. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Since $\partial_u \mathbf{r} \cdot \partial_v \mathbf{r} = 0$ and $\partial_{uv} \mathbf{r} = \partial_{vu} \mathbf{r}$, again by use of (9), (A4) can be given a more symmetric form,

$$\mathbf{c} = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u| |\mathbf{r}_v|} (\mathbf{e}_v \otimes \mathbf{e}_v - \mathbf{e}_u \otimes \mathbf{e}_u) \partial_{uv} \mathbf{r}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

To express \mathbf{c} only in terms of derivatives of the metric elements, we remark that

$$\partial_{uv} \mathbf{r} = \partial_u (|\mathbf{r}_v| \mathbf{e}_v) = (\partial_u |\mathbf{r}_v|) \mathbf{e}_v + |\mathbf{r}_v| \partial_u \mathbf{e}_v \quad (\text{A6a})$$

$$= (\partial_v |\mathbf{r}_u|) \mathbf{e}_u + |\mathbf{r}_u| \partial_v \mathbf{e}_u. \quad (\text{A6b})$$

Equations (A5) and (A6) together with the identities $\mathbf{e}_u \cdot \partial_v \mathbf{e}_u = \mathbf{e}_v \cdot \partial_u \mathbf{e}_v = 0$, which follow from both \mathbf{e}_u and \mathbf{e}_v being unit vectors, allow us to decompose \mathbf{c} as $\mathbf{c} = c_u \mathbf{e}_u + c_v \mathbf{e}_v$, where

$$c_u = -\frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u| |\mathbf{r}_v|} \partial_v |\mathbf{r}_u|, \quad c_v = \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u| |\mathbf{r}_v|} \partial_u |\mathbf{r}_v|. \quad (\text{A7})$$

With this representation for \mathbf{c} at hand, we can now make use of (18a) to obtain the desired formula for K . From (10) written for the frame $(\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_v, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ we easily arrive at

$$\text{curl}_s \mathbf{e}_u \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = c_u \quad \text{and} \quad \text{curl}_s \mathbf{e}_v \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} = c_v, \quad (\text{A8})$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \text{curl}_s \mathbf{c} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} &= \text{curl}_s (c_u \mathbf{e}_u + c_v \mathbf{e}_v) \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ &= c_u^2 + c_v^2 + \mathbf{e}_u \cdot \nabla_s c_v - \mathbf{e}_v \cdot \nabla_s c_u. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A9})$$

By inserting (A7) in (A9), after some simplifications, we conclude that

$$K = -\frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_u| |\mathbf{r}_v|} \left[\partial_u \left(\frac{\partial_u |\mathbf{r}_v|}{|\mathbf{r}_u|} \right) + \partial_v \left(\frac{\partial_v |\mathbf{r}_u|}{|\mathbf{r}_v|} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A10})$$

This equation can be found in all elementary textbooks on differential geometry.⁴¹

We finally note that equation (A9), written here for the coordinate frame $(\mathbf{e}_u, \mathbf{e}_v, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, is indeed valid for a generic moving frame $(\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu})$, as it simply relies on the gliding laws (10) in the main text. Once applied to the moving frame identified by the principal directions of curvature, and combined with (18a), (A9) delivers the following alternative curvature formula,

$$K = \mathbf{e}_2 \cdot \nabla_s (\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{e}_1) - \mathbf{e}_1 \cdot \nabla_s (\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{e}_2) - (\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{e}_1)^2 - (\mathbf{c} \cdot \mathbf{e}_2)^2, \quad (\text{A11})$$

⁴¹See, for example, [19, p. 297] or [23, equation (38.35)], to cite just two whose development is closer in style to the one presented here.

see also (38.36) of [23].

Appendix B Drilling and bending contents

As shown in [5], the drilling and bending *contents* of \mathbf{y} are vector fields on \mathcal{S} given by

$$\mathbf{d} = a_\nu \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad \mathbf{b} = \frac{1}{1 + a_\nu^2} (\mathbf{I} + a_\nu \mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu})) \mathbf{a} \quad \text{with} \quad a_\nu := \mathbf{a} \cdot \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad (\text{B12})$$

where \mathbf{I} is the identity tensor (in three dimensions), $\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) := \mathbf{I} - \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is the projection onto the plane orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ (the tangent plane), $\mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ is the skew-symmetric tensor associated with $\boldsymbol{\nu}$,⁴² and \mathbf{a} is the vector representing \mathbf{R} , which can be extracted from

$$\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{\mathbf{R} - \mathbf{R}^\top}{1 + \text{tr} \mathbf{R}}. \quad (\text{B13})$$

Both \mathbf{d} and \mathbf{b} are frame-dependent, whereas, as established in [5], both w_d and w_b in (32) are frame-invariant measures of drilling and bending, respectively.

Appendix C Integrability condition

In this appendix, we complete the proof of equations (45). By (25), (33), and (38), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_s^2 \mathbf{y} &= \nabla_s(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{U}) = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{u}_1)\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{a}_1 + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{u}_2)\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{W}(\boldsymbol{\nu})\mathbf{U} \otimes \mathbf{a}_3 \\ &\quad + \mathbf{R}\nabla_s(\lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{u}_1 + \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{u}_2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C14})$$

where (26) has also been used. Equations (10) and (27) then allow us to expand (C14) in the lengthy, but useful form,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_s^2 \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes (-\lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 + \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \nabla_s \lambda_1 + \lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{c} + \lambda_1 \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 - \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{c}) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes (\lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_3 + \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \nabla_s \lambda_2 + \lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{c} + \lambda_2 \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{d}_2 - \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{c}) \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\nu}^* \otimes (\lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{a}_1 - \lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{a}_2 + \lambda_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 + \lambda_2 \mathbf{u}_2 \otimes \mathbf{d}_2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C15})$$

On the other hand,

$$(\nabla_s \mathbf{y})(\nabla_s \boldsymbol{\nu}) \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} = -\lambda_1 \mathbf{v}_1 \otimes \mathbf{d}_1 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu} - \lambda_2 \mathbf{v}_2 \otimes \mathbf{d}_2 \otimes \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad (\text{C16})$$

so that, since $(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2, \boldsymbol{\nu}^*)$ is a basis of \mathcal{V} , with little more labour, setting $\mathbf{F} = \nabla_s \mathbf{y}$ in (6) delivers (45).

⁴²For a generic vector \mathbf{u} , the skew-symmetric tensor $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{u})$ associated with \mathbf{u} is such that $\mathbf{W}(\mathbf{u})\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{u} \times \mathbf{v}$, for all vectors \mathbf{v} .

Appendix D Eversion of a surface of revolution

On a surface of revolution \mathcal{S} represented as in (97) of the main text, we consider a smooth curve parameterized by $(\vartheta(t), z(t))$. Differentiating this curve in the parameter t ,⁴³ we obtain from (97) that

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}} = \rho \dot{\vartheta} \mathbf{e}_1 + \sqrt{1 + \rho'^2} \dot{z} \mathbf{e}_2. \quad (\text{D17})$$

Thus, for a scalar field α depending only on z ,

$$\dot{\alpha} = \alpha' \dot{z} = \nabla_s \alpha \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}}, \quad (\text{D18})$$

which together with (D17) implies (100).

Let now \mathbf{y} be the deformation that maps $\mathbf{x}(\vartheta, z)$ into

$$\mathbf{y}(\mathbf{x}) = \rho(z) \mathbf{e}_r - z \mathbf{e}_z. \quad (\text{D19})$$

Its effect on half a catenoid is shown in Fig. 1. Along the same curve introduced above,

$$\dot{\mathbf{y}} = \rho \dot{\vartheta} \mathbf{e}_1 \dot{\vartheta} + \dot{z}(\rho' \mathbf{e}_r - \mathbf{e}_z), \quad (\text{D20})$$

which, as

$$\mathbf{e}_r = \frac{\rho' \mathbf{e}_2 + \boldsymbol{\nu}}{\sqrt{1 + \rho'^2}}, \quad \mathbf{e}_{\vartheta} = \mathbf{e}_1, \quad \mathbf{e}_z = \frac{\mathbf{e}_2 - \rho' \boldsymbol{\nu}}{\sqrt{1 + \rho'^2}}, \quad (\text{D21})$$

can also be written as

$$\dot{\mathbf{y}} = \rho \dot{\vartheta} \mathbf{e}_1 + \frac{\dot{z}}{\sqrt{1 + \rho'^2}} [(\rho'^2 - 1) \mathbf{e}_2 + 2\rho' \boldsymbol{\nu}]. \quad (\text{D22})$$

Comparing (D22) and (D17), we obtain that

$$\nabla_s \mathbf{y} = \frac{1}{1 + \rho'^2} [(\rho'^2 - 1) \mathbf{e}_2 + 2\rho' \boldsymbol{\nu}] + \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1, \quad (\text{D23})$$

which can be given the following form derived from (88),

$$\mathbf{RP}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \mathbf{e}_1 \otimes \mathbf{e}_1 + \cos \alpha \mathbf{e}_2 \otimes \mathbf{e}_2 + \sin \alpha \boldsymbol{\nu} \otimes \mathbf{e}_2, \quad (\text{D24})$$

only if

$$\sin \alpha = \frac{2\rho'}{1 + \rho'^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \cos \alpha = \frac{\rho'^2 - 1}{1 + \rho'^2}, \quad (\text{D25})$$

which is equivalent to (102).

⁴³Operation denoted by a superimposed dot.

References

- [1] Seguin, B., Fried, E.: Coordinate-free compatibility conditions for deformations of material surfaces. *Mech. Mater.* **166**, 104193 (2022) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mechmat.2021.104193>
- [2] Murdoch, A.I.: Direct notation for surfaces with application to the thermodynamics of elastic material surfaces of second grade. Research Report ES 78–134, University of Cincinnati, Department of Engineering Science (1978). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.1894.8962>
- [3] Murdoch, A.I.: A coordinate-free approach to surface kinematics. *Glasgow Math. J.* **32**(3), 299–307 (1990) <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017089500009381>
- [4] Ciarlet, P.G.: An introduction to differential geometry with applications to elasticity. *J. Elast.* **78–79**, 1–215 (2005)
- [5] Sonnet, A.M., Virga, E.G.: A variational theory for soft shells. *J. Mech. Phys. Solids* **200**, 106132 (2025) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2025.106132>
- [6] Cartan, E.: *La Méthode du Repère Mobile, La Théorie des Groupes Continus et Les Espaces Généralisés*. Actualités Scientifiques et Industrielles, vol. 194. Hermann, Paris (1935). Available from <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k38182z>
- [7] Darboux, G.: *Leçons sur la Théorie Générale des Surfaces. Première Partie*. Gauthier-Villars, Paris (1887). Available from <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bd6t5381755k/f11.item>
- [8] Ribaucour, A.: Mémoire sur la théorie générale des surfaces courbes. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **7**, 5–108 (1891). Available from http://www.numdam.org/item?id=JMPA_1891_4_7_5_0
- [9] Cotton, E.: Généralisation de la théorie du trièdre mobile. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **33**, 1–23 (1905). Available from http://www.numdam.org/item?id=BSMF_1905_33_42_0
- [10] Cartan, E.: La structure des groupes de transformations continus et la théorie du trièdre mobile. *Bull. Sc. Math.* **34**, 250–283 (1910). Available from <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k9633912b/f254.item>
- [11] Chern, S.-S.: Moving frames. In: *Élie Cartan et les mathématiques d’aujourd’hui - Lyon, 25-29 Juin 1984*. Astérisque, vol. S131, pp. 67–77 (1985). Available from https://www.numdam.org/item/AST_1985__S131_67_0/
- [12] Weatherburn, C.E.: *Differential Geometry of Three Dimensions vol. I*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2016)

- [13] Weatherburn, C.E.: Differential Geometry of Three Dimensions vol. II. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2016)
- [14] Sonnet, A.M., Virga, E.G.: Bending-neutral deformations of minimal surfaces. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **480**(2300), 20240394 (2024) <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2024.0394>
- [15] Burali-Forti, C.: Fondamenti per la geometria differenziale di una superficie col metodo vettoriale generale. *Rend. Circolo Mat. Palermo* **33**, 1–40 (1912) <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03015286>
- [16] Burgatti, P.: I teoremi del gradiente, della divergenza, della rotazione sopra una superficie e loro applicazione ai potenziali. *Rend. Acc. Sci. Ist. Bologna* **4** (VII), 3–12 (1917)
- [17] Burgatti, P.: Memorie Scelte, pp. 201–212. Zanichelli, Bologna (1951)
- [18] Burgatti, P., Boggio, T., Burali-Forti, C.: *Analisi Vettoriale Generale. Vol. II: Geometria Differenziale*. Zanichelli, Bologna (1930)
- [19] O'Neill, B.: *Elementary Differential Geometry*, 2nd edn. Academic Press, Burlington (2006)
- [20] Truesdell, C.A.: *A First Course in Rational Continuum Mechanics*, 2nd edn. Pure and Applied Mathematics, vol. 71. Academic Press, Boston (1991)
- [21] Sanders, J.L.: Nonlinear theories for thin shells. *Quart. Appl. Math.* **21**(1), 21–36 (1963) <https://doi.org/10.1090/qam/147023>
- [22] Budiansky, B.: Notes on nonlinear shell theory. *J. Appl. Mech.* **35**(2), 393–401 (1968) <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.3601208>
- [23] Needham, T.: *Visual Differential Geometry and Forms. A Mathematical Drama in Five Acts*. Princeton University Press, Princeton (2021)
- [24] Clelland, J.N.: *From Frenet to Cartan: The Method of Moving Frames*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 178. American Mathematical Society, Providence (2017)
- [25] Ivey, T.A., Landsberg, J.M.: *Cartan for Beginners. Differential Geometry Via Moving Frames and Exterior Differential Systems*, 2nd edn. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 175. American Mathematical Society, Providence (2016)
- [26] Phillips, E.R.: Karl M. Peterson: The earliest derivation of the Mainardi-Codazzi equations and the fundamental theorem of surface theory. *Hist. Math.* **6**(2), 137–163 (1979) [https://doi.org/10.1016/0315-0860\(79\)90075-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0315-0860(79)90075-2)

- [27] Gauss, C.F.: General Investigations of Curved Surfaces of 1827 and 1825. Translated with Notes and a Bibliography by J. C. Morehead and A. M. Hildebrandt. The Princeton Library, Princeton (1902). Available from <https://archive.org/details/cu31924001557226/mode/2up>
- [28] Man, C.-S., Cohen, H.: A coordinate-free approach to the kinematics of membranes. *J. Elast.* **16**, 97–104 (1986) <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00041068>
- [29] Rodrigues, O.: Des lois géométriques qui régissent les déplacements d’un système solide dans l’espace, et de la variation des coordonnées provenant de ces déplacements considérés indépendamment des causes qui peuvent les produire. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* **5**, 380–440 (1840). Available from http://www.numdam.org/item/JMPA_1840_1_5_380_0/
- [30] Sonnet, A.M., Virga, E.G.: Neutral Deformation Modes of Minimal Surfaces (2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2510.12987>
- [31] Koiter, W.T.: A consistent first approximation in the general theory of thin elastic shells. In: Koiter, W.T. (ed.) *Proc. IUTAM Symposium on the Theory of Thin Elastic Shells*, Delft, pp. 12–33. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1960)
- [32] Tiwari, S., Fried, E.: Characterization of an overlooked kinematical descriptor in the second-gradient hyperelastic theory for thin shells. *J. Elast.* **157**, 9 (2025) <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10659-024-10103-7>
- [33] Gurtin, M.E., Fried, E., Anand, L.: *The Mechanics and Thermodynamics of Continua*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2010)
- [34] Kazdan, J.L., Warner, F.W.: Integrability conditions for $\delta u = k|ke^{\alpha u}$ with applications to Riemannian geometry. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **77**, 819–823 (1971) <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9904-1971-12818-5>
- [35] Moser, J.: On a nonlinear problem in differential geometry. In: Peixoto, M.M. (ed.) *Dynamical Systems*, pp. 273–280 (1973). <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-550350-1.50026-6>
- [36] Koutroufiotis, D.: Gaussian curvature and conformal mapping. *J. Differential Geom.* **7**(3-4), 479–488 (1972) <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1214431167>
- [37] Grove, V.G.: On closed convex surfaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **8**(4), 777–786 (1957) <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9939-1957-0086337-1>
- [38] Dierkes, U., Hildebrandt, S., Sauvigny, F.: *Minimal Surfaces*, 2nd edn. A Series of Comprehensive Studies in Mathematics, vol. 339. Springer, Berlin (2010)
- [39] Lawson, H.B.: Some intrinsic characterizations of minimal surfaces. *J. Anal. Math.* **24**, 151–161 (1971) <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02790373>

- [40] Bonnet, O.: Mémoire sur la théorie des surfaces applicables sur une surface donnée. II. Détermination de toutes les surfaces applicables sur une surface donnée. J. École Pol. Paris **25**, 1–151 (1867). Available from <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k433698b/f5>
- [41] Cartan, E.: Sur les couples de surface applicables avec conservation des courbures principales. Bull. Sc. Math. **66**, 55–85 (1942). Available from <https://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k9632895z/f61>
- [42] Chern, S.-S.: Deformation of surfaces preserving principal curvatures. In: Chavel, I., Farkas, H.M. (eds.) Differential Geometry and Complex Analysis. A Volume Dedicated to the Memory of Harry Ernest Rauch, pp. 155–164. Springer, Berlin (1985)
- [43] Bracken, P.: Helicoidal surfaces and their relationship to Bonnet surfaces. Adv. Pure Math. **7**, 31–40 (2017) <https://doi.org/10.4236/apm.2017.71003>
- [44] Truesdell, C.: Some challenges offered to analysis by rational thermodynamics. In: de La Penha, G.M., Medeiros, L.A. (eds.) Contemporary Developments in Continuum Mechanics and Partial Differential Equations. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Continuum Mechanics and Partial Differential Equations, Rio de Janeiro, August 1977. Mathematics Studies, vol. 30, pp. 495–603. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1978)
- [45] Krieger, K.: Extreme mechanics: Buckling down. Nature **488**, 146–147 (2012) <https://doi.org/10.1038/488146a>
- [46] Reis, P.M.: A perspective on the revival of structural (in)stability with novel opportunities for function: From buckliphobia to buckliphilia. J. Appl. Mech. **82**(11), 111001 (2015) <https://doi.org/10.1115/1.4031456>
- [47] Taffetani, M., Jiang, X., Holmes, D.P., Vella, D.: Static bistability of spherical caps. Proc. R. Soc. London A **474**(2213), 20170910 (2018) <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.2017.0910>
- [48] Liu, M., Domino, L., Dupont de Dinechin, I., Taffetani, M., Vella, D.: Snap-induced morphing: From a single bistable shell to the origin of shape bifurcation in interacting shells. J. Mech. Phys. Solids **170**, 105116 (2023) <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmps.2022.105116>
- [49] Taffetani, M., Pezzulla, M.: Nonlinear morphoelastic energy based theory for stimuli responsive elastic shells (2025). <https://arxiv.org/abs/2511.10324>
- [50] Kwak, B., Hars, J., Floreano, D.: Edible jumpers powered by shell snapping. Adv. Mater. Technol. **10**(8), 2401230 (2025) <https://doi.org/10.1002/admt.202401230>

- [51] Gurtin, M.E., Murdoch, A.I.: A continuum theory of elastic material surfaces. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **57**, 291–323 (1975) <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00261375>
- [52] Gurtin, M.E., Murdoch, A.I.: Addenda to our paper A continuum theory of elastic material surfaces. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **59**, 389–390 (1975) <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00250426>