

**MATH 560 FINAL EXAM**

CLAY SHONKWILER

1

Consider the surface

$$\mathbf{X}(u, v) = \left( u + uv^2 - \frac{u^3}{3}, v + u^2v - \frac{v^3}{3}, u^2 - v^2 \right).$$

**(a):** Calculate the first and second fundamental forms of this surface and show that its mean curvature is zero.

**Answer:** We know that  $E = \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_u \rangle$ ,  $F = \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle$  and  $G = \langle \mathbf{X}_v, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle$ , so we need to calculate  $\mathbf{X}_u$  and  $\mathbf{X}_v$ . Now,

$$\mathbf{X}_u = (1 - u^2 + v^2, 2uv, 2u)$$

and

$$\mathbf{X}_v = (2uv, 1 - v^2 + u^2, -2v).$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} E = \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_u \rangle &= (1 - u^2 + v^2)^2 + 4u^2v^2 + 4u^2 \\ &= 1 + 2u^2 + 2v^2 + u^4 + v^4 + 2u^2v^2 \\ &= (1 + u^2 + v^2)^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} F = \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle &= 2uv(1 - u^2 + v^2) + 2uv(1 - v^2 + u^2) - 4uv \\ &= 2uv - 2u^3v + 2uv^3 + 2uv - 2uv^3 + 2u^3v - 4uv \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G = \langle \mathbf{X}_v, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle &= 4u^2v^2 + (1 - v^2 + u^2)^2 + 4v^2 \\ &= 1 + 2u^2 + 2v^2 + u^4 + v^4 + 2u^2v^2 \\ &= (1 + u^2 + v^2)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{N} &= \frac{\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v}{\|\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v\|} = \frac{\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v}{\sqrt{EG - F^2}} \\ &= \frac{(-2uv^2 - 2u - 2u^3, 2u^2v + 2v + 2v^3, 1 - 2u^2v^2 - u^4 - v^4)}{\sqrt{(1 + u^2 + v^2)^4}} \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
L &= \langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{uu} \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} \langle (-2uv^2 - 2u - 2u^3, 2u^2v + 2v + 2v^3, 1 - 2u^2v^2 - u^4 - v^4), \\
&\quad (-2u, 2v, 2) \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} 2(1 + 2u^2 + 2v^2 + u^4 + v^4 + 2u^2v^2) \\
&= 2 \frac{(1+u^2+v^2)^2}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} \\
&= 2.
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
M &= \langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{uv} \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} \langle (-2uv^2 - 2u - 2u^3, 2u^2v + 2v + 2v^3, \\
&\quad 1 - 2u^2v^2 - u^4 - v^4), (2v, 2u, 0) \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} 2(-2uv^3 - 2uv + 2u^3v - 2u^3v + 2uv + 2uv^3) \\
&= \frac{1}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} (0) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
N &= \langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{vv} \rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} \langle (-2uv^2 - 2u - 2u^3, 2u^2v + 2v + 2v^3, \\
&\quad 1 - 2u^2v^2 - u^4 - v^4), (2u, -2v, -2) \rangle \\
&= -\frac{1}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} \langle (-2uv^2 - 2u - 2u^3, 2u^2v + 2v + 2v^3, \\
&\quad 1 - 2u^2v^2 - u^4 - v^4), (2u, -2v, -2) \rangle \\
&= -L \\
&= -2.
\end{aligned}$$

That is to say,

$$L = 2, \quad N = -2, \quad M = 0.$$

To compute the mean curvature, we calculate the principal curvatures:

$$k_1 = -a_{11} = \frac{-MF + LG}{EG - F^2}, \quad k_2 = -a_{22} = \frac{-MF + NE}{EG - F^2}.$$

Since  $M = F = 0$ ,

$$k_1 = \frac{LG}{EG} = \frac{L}{E}, \quad k_2 = \frac{NE}{EG} = \frac{N}{G}.$$

Hence,

$$k_1 = \frac{2}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2}, \quad k_2 = \frac{-2}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2}.$$

Therefore,

$$H = k_1 + k_2 = \frac{2}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} - \frac{2}{(1+u^2+v^2)^2} = 0.$$



(b): Find the parametric equations of the conjugate minimal surface of  $\mathbf{X}(u, v)$ .

**Answer:** Denote Enneper's surface as parametrized in (a) by

$$\mathbf{X}(u, v) = (\mathbf{x}(u, v), \mathbf{y}(u, v), \mathbf{z}(u, v)).$$

Then the conjugate minimal surface to Enneper's surface is

$$\mathbf{\Xi}(u, v) = (\xi(u, v), \eta(u, v), \zeta(u, v))$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_v &= \frac{1}{w} (G\mathbf{x}_u - F\mathbf{x}_v) \\ \xi_u &= \frac{1}{w} (-F\mathbf{x}_u - E\mathbf{x}_v) \\ \eta_v &= \frac{1}{w} (G\mathbf{y}_u - F\mathbf{y}_v) \\ \eta_u &= \frac{1}{w} (-F\mathbf{y}_u - E\mathbf{y}_v) \\ \zeta_v &= \frac{1}{w} (G\mathbf{z}_u - F\mathbf{z}_v) \\ \zeta_u &= \frac{1}{w} (-F\mathbf{z}_u - E\mathbf{z}_v)\end{aligned}$$

where  $E, F, G$  are as in (a) and  $w = \sqrt{EG - F^2}$ . Now, since we saw in (a) that  $E = G = (1 + u^2 + v^2)^2$  and  $F = 0$ ,  $w = E = G$  and the above reduce to

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_v &= \mathbf{x}_u = 1 + v^2 - u^2 \\ \xi_u &= -\mathbf{x}_v = -2uv \\ \eta_v &= \mathbf{y}_u = 2uv \\ \eta_u &= -\mathbf{y}_v = -1 - u^2 + v^2 \\ \zeta_v &= \mathbf{z}_u = 2u \\ \zeta_u &= -\mathbf{z}_v = 2v,\end{aligned}$$

so it's easy to see that

$$\mathbf{\Xi}(u, v) = \left( v - u^2v + \frac{v^3}{3}, -u + uv^2 - \frac{u^3}{3}, 2uv \right).$$

A simple computation (which I won't reproduce here) confirms that this surface has the same first fundamental form as Enneper's surface and mean curvature zero, so it really is a minimal surface.



(c): Prove Enneper's surface  $\{\mathbf{X}(u, v); -\infty < u < \infty, -\infty < v < \infty\}$  is complete.

**Answer:** I honestly have no idea how to prove this, despite having spent rather a long time trying to figure it out.

2

(a): Prove that developable surfaces  $\{\mathbf{X}(u, v) = \mathbf{x}(u) + v\mathbf{V}(u)\}$  are characterized by the condition (added to the regularity assumptions)  $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) = 0$ , identically.

*Proof.* In order to show this, we show that each characterization of developability implies the other.

Suppose  $S$  is a developable surface with parametrization  $\mathbf{X}(u, v) = \mathbf{x}(u) + v\mathbf{V}(u)$ . Let  $\mathbf{X}(u_0, v_0)$  be a point of  $S$ . Then, since  $S$  is developable, the tangent plane  $T_{\mathbf{X}(u_0, v_0)}S$  is tangent to  $D$  all along the line  $v \mapsto \mathbf{X}(u_0, v_0) + v\mathbf{V}(u_0)$ . Hence, the normal  $\mathbf{N}$  to  $S$  is constant along this line; since this is true for all choices of  $u_0$  and  $v_0$ , we see that  $\mathbf{N}_v \equiv 0$  on all of  $S$ . In particular, this implies that

$$M = \langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{uv} \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{N}_v, \mathbf{X}_u \rangle = 0.$$

In order to use this information, we need to compute  $\mathbf{N}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{uv}$  explicitly. To that end, note that  $\mathbf{X}_u = \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)$  and  $\mathbf{X}_v = \mathbf{V}(u)$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v &= (\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) \times \mathbf{V}(u) \\ &= \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{N} = \frac{\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)}{\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)\|},$$

which is well-defined since  $\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v \neq 0$  (by the regularity condition). Note that this calculation depended only on the fact that  $S$  is a ruled surface.

Now,

$$\mathbf{X}_{uv} = \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= M \langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{uv} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)\|} \langle \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u), \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)\|} (\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it must be the case that  $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) = 0$ .

On the other hand, suppose  $S$  is a ruled surface parametrized by  $\mathbf{X}(u, v) = \mathbf{x}(u) + v\mathbf{V}(u)$ , satisfies the given regularity conditions and is such that  $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) = 0$ . Then, as in (1),

$$\mathbf{N} = \frac{\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)}{\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)\|}$$

so

$$\langle \mathbf{N}_v, \mathbf{X}_u \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{uv} \rangle = -\frac{1}{\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)\|} (\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) = 0$$

and

$$\langle \mathbf{N}_v, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{vv} \rangle = -\langle \mathbf{N}, 0 \rangle = 0.$$

Hence, since  $\mathbf{X}_u$  and  $\mathbf{X}_v$  are linearly independent, we conclude that  $\mathbf{N}_v \equiv 0$  identically, which means that  $\mathbf{N}$  is constant along the lines  $v \mapsto \mathbf{X}(u_0, v_0) + v\mathbf{V}(u_0)$ , which in turn implies that  $T_{\mathbf{X}(u_0, v_0)}S$  is tangent to  $S$  all along this line for any  $u_0, v_0$ . Therefore, we see that  $S$  is a developable surface.

Thus, having shown implications both ways, we conclude that the two conditions for being developable given are equivalent.  $\square$

**(b):** We now consider ruled surfaces that are *strictly not developable*, meaning that, for each  $u$ ,  $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) \neq 0$ . Show that a strictly non-developable ruled surface  $S$  has no local singularities and that its Gaussian curvature is everywhere strictly negative.

*Proof.* Note that our computations for  $\mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_v$  and  $M$  in part (a) are valid for any ruled surface, so we can import them directly to this problem. Now,  $\mathbf{X}_{vv} = (\mathbf{X}_v)_v = (\mathbf{V}(u))_v = 0$ , so  $N = 0$ . Hence,

$$K = \frac{LN - M^2}{EG - F^2} = \frac{-M^2}{EG - F^2},$$

so we don't even need to bother computing  $L$ . Using the value for  $M$  computed in (a), we have that

$$K = \frac{-M^2}{EG - F^2} = -\frac{1}{\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)\|} \frac{(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u))^2}{EG - F^2}.$$

Since  $\|\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v\| = \|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) \times \mathbf{V}(u)\|$  and  $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u))^2$  are both strictly positive, if we can show that  $EG - F^2 > 0$ , then that will suffice to show that  $K < 0$ . However,

$$EG - F^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_u\|^2 \|\mathbf{X}_v\|^2 - \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v\|^2 > 0.$$

Therefore, we conclude that, indeed,  $K < 0$ .  $\square$

**(c):** We shall assume now that the parameter  $u$  of the generating curve  $\Gamma_0 = \{\mathbf{x}(u)\}$  of  $S$  describes its oriented arc length ( $\dot{\mathbf{x}} \cdot \dot{\mathbf{x}} = 1$ ) and that the direction  $\mathbf{V}(u)$  of the rulings is everywhere normal to  $\Gamma_0$ , *i.e.*  $\mathbf{V}(u) = \mathbf{n}(u) \cos \theta(u) + \mathbf{b} \sin \theta(u)$ , where  $\mathbf{n}$  denotes the principal normal and  $\mathbf{b}$  the binormal of  $\Gamma_0$ . Prove that  $S$  is strictly non-developable if and only if

$$\frac{d\theta(u)}{du} + \tau(u) \neq 0,$$

where  $\tau(u)$  denotes the torsion of  $\Gamma_0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $S$  is strictly non-developable. Then  $(\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) \neq 0$ . Now,

$$\mathbf{V}(u) = \mathbf{n}(u) \cos \theta(u) + \mathbf{b}(u) \sin \theta(u),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) &= \dot{\mathbf{n}}(u) \cos \theta(u) - \mathbf{n}(u) \dot{\theta}(u) \sin \theta(u) + \dot{\mathbf{b}}(u) \sin \theta(u) + \mathbf{b}(u) \dot{\theta}(u) \cos \theta(u) \\ &= (-\kappa \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + \tau \mathbf{b}(u)) \cos \theta(u) - \mathbf{n} \dot{\theta}(u) \sin \theta(u) - \tau \mathbf{n}(u) \sin \theta(u) + \mathbf{b}(u) \dot{\theta}(u) \cos \theta(u) \\ &= -\kappa \cos \theta(u) \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) - (\tau + \dot{\theta}(u)) \sin \theta(u) \mathbf{n}(u) + (\dot{\theta}(u) + \tau) \cos \theta(u) \mathbf{b}(u), \end{aligned}$$

by the Frenet equations. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{V}(u) \times \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u) = (\dot{\theta}(u) + \tau) \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) - \kappa \sin \theta(u) \cos \theta(u) \mathbf{n}(u) + \kappa \cos^2 \theta(u) \mathbf{b}(u),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\neq (\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{V}(u), \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) \\ &= \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \cdot (\mathbf{V}(u) \times \dot{\mathbf{V}}(u)) \\ &= (\dot{\theta}(u) + \tau) \|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u)\|^2 \\ &= \frac{d\theta(u)}{du} + \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Note that all of the equalities in the above expression hold regardless of any assumptions we made about  $S$ , so we see that, if  $S$  is a surface satisfying the given hypothesis and such that  $\frac{d\theta(u)}{du} + \tau(u) \neq 0$ , then  $S$  is strictly non-developable.  $\square$

**(d):** With the same assumptions as in (c), prove that, if  $\theta(u) = 0$  (identically) and  $\tau(u) \neq 0$ , then the mean curvature  $H(u, v)$  of  $S$  equals 0 all along  $\Gamma_0$ .

*Proof.* Suppose this is the case. Then  $\mathbf{V}(u) = \mathbf{n}(u)$ , so  $\mathbf{X}(u, v) = \mathbf{x}(u) + v\mathbf{n}(u)$ . Hence, along the curve  $\Gamma_0$  (*i.e.* where  $v = 0$ ),

$$\mathbf{X}_u = \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{n}}(u) = \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u)$$

and

$$\mathbf{X}_v = \mathbf{n}(u).$$

Now, note that  $F = \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle = \langle \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u), \mathbf{n}(u) \rangle = 0$ . Moreover,

$$\mathbf{X}_{uu} = \ddot{\mathbf{x}}(u)$$

$$\mathbf{X}_{uv} = \dot{\mathbf{n}}(u)$$

$$\mathbf{X}_{vv} = 0$$

and

$$\mathbf{N} = \frac{\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v}{\|\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v\|} = \frac{\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{n}(u)}{\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \times \mathbf{n}(u)\|} = \mathbf{b}(u).$$

Therefore,  $N = 0$  and

$$L = \langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{uu} \rangle = \langle \mathbf{b}(u), \ddot{\mathbf{x}}(u) \rangle = 0,$$

so

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \frac{LG - 2MF + NE}{EG - F^2} = 0$$

since  $L = F = N = 0$ .  $\square$

(e): (Challenge) Calculate  $H(u, v)$  under the same assumptions of questions (b), (c), (d). In particular, show that, if the curvature  $\kappa(u)$  of  $\Gamma_0$  is positive, then there is a positive valued function  $f(u)$  such that  $H(u, v) = 0$ , if and only if either  $v = 0$  or  $v = f(u)$ .

**Partial Answer:** Suppose  $S$  is as in (b), (c) and (d); that is,  $S$  is a strictly non-developable ruled surface with  $\|\dot{\mathbf{x}}\| = 1$  and  $\mathbf{V}(u) = \mathbf{n}(u)$ . Note that, since  $S$  is strictly non-developable, (c) implies that  $\tau(u) \neq 0$  (since  $\theta(u) = 0$ ). Now, under these assumptions,  $\mathbf{X}(u, v) = \mathbf{x}(u) + v\mathbf{V}(u) = \mathbf{x}(u) + v\mathbf{n}(u)$ . Hence,

$$\mathbf{X}_u = \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v\dot{\mathbf{n}}(u) = \dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v(-\kappa(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + \tau(u)\mathbf{b}(u)) = (1 - v\kappa(u))\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v\tau(u)\mathbf{b}(u)$$

$$\mathbf{X}_v = \mathbf{n}(u).$$

Hence,

$$\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v = (1 - v\kappa(u))\mathbf{b}(u) - v\tau(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u),$$

so

$$\mathbf{N} = \frac{\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v}{\|\mathbf{X}_u \times \mathbf{X}_v\|} = \frac{1}{v^2\tau^2 + (1 - v\kappa)^2} [-v\tau(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + (1 - v\kappa(u))\mathbf{b}(u)].$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}_{uu} &= \ddot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v(-\dot{\kappa}(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) - \kappa(u)\ddot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + \dot{\tau}(u)\mathbf{b}(u) + \tau(u)\dot{\mathbf{b}}(u)) \\ &= -v\dot{\kappa}(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + (\kappa(u) - v\kappa^2(u) - \tau^2(u))\mathbf{n}(u) + v\dot{\tau}(u)\mathbf{b}(u), \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\mathbf{X}_{uv} = -\kappa(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + \tau(u)\mathbf{b}(u)$$

and

$$\mathbf{X}_{vv} = 0.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} L &= \langle \mathbf{N}, \mathbf{X}_{uu} \rangle \\ &= \frac{\langle -v\tau(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + (1 - v\kappa(u))\mathbf{b}(u), -v\dot{\kappa}(u)\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + (\kappa(u) - v\kappa^2(u) - \tau^2(u))\mathbf{n}(u) + v\dot{\tau}(u)\mathbf{b}(u) \rangle}{v^2\tau^2 + (1 - v\kappa)^2} \end{aligned}$$

(2)

$$= \frac{v^2\tau(u)\dot{\kappa}(u) + v\dot{\tau}(u) - v^2\dot{\tau}(u)\kappa(u)}{v^2\tau^2 + (1 - v\kappa)^2}.$$

Also, note that  $N = 0$ ,  $F = \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_v \rangle = 0$ ,  $G = 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} E &= \langle \mathbf{X}_u, \mathbf{X}_u \rangle \\ &= \langle (1 - v\kappa(u))\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v\tau(u)\mathbf{b}(u), (1 - v\kappa(u))\dot{\mathbf{x}}(u) + v\tau(u)\mathbf{b}(u) \rangle \\ &= (1 - v\kappa(u))^2 + v^2\tau^2(u). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \frac{LG - 2MF + NE}{EG - F^2} = \frac{LG}{2EG} = \frac{L}{2E},$$

which is zero if and only if either  $v = 0$  (which was part (d) above) or  $L = 0$ , which, given (2), means that

$$0 = v^2\tau(u)\dot{\kappa}(u) + v\dot{\tau}(u) - v^2\dot{\tau}(u)\kappa(u).$$

In turn, this equality holds if and only if

$$v = \frac{\dot{\tau}(u)}{\dot{\tau}(u)\kappa(u) - \tau(u)\dot{\kappa}(u)}.$$

I believe the righthand side of this equality is a positive function, but I can't prove it. Assuming it is, this would demonstrate that  $H = 0$  if and only if either  $v = 0$  or  $V = f(u)$  for some positive function  $f(u)$ .

