

# involve

a journal of mathematics

Cylindrical liquid bridges

Lamont Colter and Ray Treinen



# Cylindrical liquid bridges

Lamont Colter and Ray Treinen

(Communicated by Frank Morgan)

We consider a cylindrical liquid bridge under capillary effects, spanning two horizontal plates and further bounded by a pair of parallel vertical planes. We explicitly formulate the volume-constrained problem and describe a numerical procedure for approximating the solution. Finally, a problem of finding the minimum spanning volume is considered.

## 1. Introduction

We consider a fluid trapped between two horizontal plates  $P_0, P_h$ , and further bounded by two parallel vertical planes  $\Pi_0, \Pi_d$ . Define the distance between  $P_0$  and  $P_h$  to be  $h$ , and that between  $\Pi_0$  and  $\Pi_d$  to be  $d$ . We orient a coordinate system  $(x, y, z)$  so that  $P_0$  is given by  $z \equiv 0$  and  $P_h$  is given by  $z \equiv h$ , while  $\Pi_0$  is given by  $y \equiv 0$  and  $\Pi_d$  is given by  $y \equiv d$ . We assume that the fluid is connected and any wetted portions of the plates are simply connected. The fluid then has a free interface  $\Lambda$  bounding a volume in the  $x$ -direction, and we denote the enclosed volume by  $\mathcal{V}$ . For an example, see [Figure 1](#), where we have not drawn  $\Pi_0$  or  $\Pi_d$ .

We consider dominant energies due to surface tension, wetting energy and gravitational potential energy. This gives the energy functional

$$\mathcal{E}[\Lambda] = \sigma \mathcal{A}[\Lambda] - \sigma \beta \mathcal{W}[\Lambda] + \int_{\mathcal{V}} \rho g z \, dz, \quad (1)$$


where  $\sigma$  is the (constant) surface tension,  $\beta$  is the wetting coefficient, taken to be constant on each plate,  $\rho$  is the uniform fluid density, and  $g$  is the gravitational constant. Further,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the area functional for the free-surface, and  $\mathcal{W}$  is the area functional for the wetted portions of  $P_0, P_h, \Pi_0$  and  $\Pi_d$ .

It is well known that the first variation for this functional implies

$$2H = \kappa u - \lambda, \quad (2)$$

*MSC2010:* primary 35Q35; secondary 76A02.

*Keywords:* capillarity, liquid bridges, numerical ODE.




**Figure 1.** A cylindrical bridge.

where  $H$  is the mean curvature of  $\Lambda$ ,  $u$  is the height of the interface, the capillary constant is  $\kappa = \rho g / \sigma$ , and we have included a Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$ . It may also be derived that  $\beta = \cos \gamma$  for a contact angle  $\gamma$  measured within the fluid. The standard reference is a manuscript by Finn [1986]. In what follows we do not assume that the interface is a graph over a base domain, though we do restrict our attention to the physical case where the interface is embedded. See Theorem 2.1 for details on how we interpret (2).

We make the assumption that  $\beta = 0$  on  $\Pi_0$  and  $\Pi_d$ . This implies a contact angle of  $\pi/2$  along the intersection of  $\Lambda$  with those planes. As we shall see in Section 2, this also implies that the free-surface is generated by curves in the plane  $\Pi_0$  and is extended as a right cylinder. See Figure 2 for an example of the generating curves, where  $\delta/2$  denotes the value of the horizontal displacement of the fluid interface on  $P_0$ . On the plates  $P_0$  and  $P_h$ , we allow the constant  $\beta$  to differ at heights 0 and  $h$  and to be any number in  $[-1, 1]$ . This corresponds to contact angles along the intersection of  $\Lambda$  with those plates, which we will denote by  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_h$  respectively.

In Section 3, we derive a formula for the enclosed volume in terms of the solution to a version of the differential equation (2) when the fluid remains connected. Then we give an algorithm for computing the interface  $\Lambda$  with a volume constraint in



**Figure 2.** A liquid bridge.

**Section 4.** We use this algorithm to give a numerical approximation of  $\Lambda$  for different parameters  $h$ ,  $\gamma_0$ ,  $\gamma_h$ , and volume  $\mathcal{V}$ . Next, in **Section 5**, we present a collection of examples. Finally, we explore the minimum spanning volume for  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h) \in [0, \pi/2] \times [0, \pi/2]$  in **Section 6**.

As far as we have been able to determine, this is the first exploration of liquid bridges of this type. Three dimensional liquid bridge problems have been studied by Athanassenas [1992]; Concus, Finn and McCuan [Concus et al. 2001]; Finn and Vogel [1992]; and Vogel [1982; 1987; 1989; 2005; 2006; 2013]. In recent work there is a trend to study the lower dimensional versions of certain related fluid mechanics problems. We point to papers by Bhatnagar and Finn [2006], as well as by McCuan and Treinen [2013;  $\geq$  2015], and Wentz [2006] for examples of this approach. In particular, we mention a paper by McCuan [2013] as a model for the present approach.

## 2. Symmetries

There are two types of symmetries in the fluid configurations. The first is the cylindrical symmetry that allows us to restrict our attention to the generating curves in the  $\Pi_0$  plane. The second is a reflective symmetry about the plane  $x = 0$ .

An Alexandrov moving plane argument has been successful in establishing symmetry properties for similar fluid configurations. See Wentz [1980], Treinen [2012], and McCuan [2013]. The following is a direct consequence of first using those methods with a moving plane parallel to  $\Pi_0$ , then a second argument using those methods with a moving plane parallel to  $x = 0$  can be used to show symmetry about  $x = 0$ . The details are left to the interested reader.

**Theorem 2.1.** *The interface  $\Lambda$  is right-cylindrically symmetric with generating curves restricted to the plane  $\Pi_0$ . The generating curves satisfy*

$$\frac{dx}{ds} = \cos \psi, \quad (3)$$

$$\frac{du}{ds} = \sin \psi, \quad (4)$$

$$\frac{d\psi}{ds} = \kappa u - \lambda, \quad (5)$$

and it suffices to compute one generating curve where  $x \geq 0$ .

Note that then the distance  $d$  is not important to our consideration, and hence we can view our problem in this reduced dimensional setting, or as extending infinitely in a horizontal direction. With this perspective, we normalize so that  $d = 1$  so that we are considering volume per unit distance in the  $y$ -direction. The solution may be extended infinitely in both  $y$ -directions and be seen as an infinitely long liquid bridge between two horizontal plates generated by the curves in  $\Pi_0$ . The

solution may also interpreted as a lower dimensional problem, where the interfaces are reduced to curves in the plane  $\Pi_0$ , spanning a *volume* that is more properly seen as an area in  $\Pi_0$ . This last interpretation is the easiest way to visualize the results of our computations, and so is our default for figures, even while we continue to use the terminology of *volume* and *area*, and we use them in the sense of per unit distance  $d$ .

### 3. Computing the fluid volume

Consider solutions to (3)–(5) with the boundary conditions

$$\sin \psi(0) = \cos \gamma_0 \quad \text{at } s = 0, \text{ where } u(0) = 0, \tag{6}$$

$$\sin \psi(\ell) = \cos \gamma_h \quad \text{at } s = \ell, \text{ where } u(\ell) = h. \tag{7}$$


Solutions to this two-point boundary value problem will determine a value of  $x(0)$ , which we denote by  $\delta/2$ . We will later use this as a parameter in the process of constructing approximate solutions, but it is immediately useful in determining a volume formula as follows.

**Theorem 3.1.** *The volume enclosed by the upper plate, lower plate, and the fluid-air interface given by area per unit distance in the  $y$ -direction satisfies*


$$\mathcal{V} = (h - \lambda) \left( x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2} \right) + \sin \gamma_0 - \sin \gamma_h, \tag{8}$$

where the solutions  $x, u$ , and  $\psi$  are parametrized by arc length  $s$ , with  $s = 0$  at height  $u = 0$  and  $s = \ell$  at height  $u = h$ .

*Proof.* We find the volume of the enclosed fluid by computing the right half of the volume. The geometric idea is to start with a rectangle with height  $h$  and width  $\delta/2$ , and then add to it the additional volume outside this region. The first configuration is illustrated in Figure 3. This configuration contains a vertical point given by  $(\bar{x}, \bar{u})$ , and this partitions the volume outside of the rectangle into two regions. The lower



**Figure 3.** The configuration used in the volume computation, with only the portion  $x > 0$  shown. Here  $x = \bar{x}$  and  $u = \bar{u}$ , and the plate heights are 0 and  $h$ .



**Figure 4.** Two volume configurations. Here  $x = \bar{x}$  and  $u = \bar{u}$ , and plate heights are 0 and  $h$ .

region is bounded by  $\delta/2$  on the left,  $u = \bar{u}$  above, and the fluid interface on the right. The upper region is bounded by  $x = x(\ell)$  on the left,  $u = \bar{u}$  below, and the fluid interface on the right. Added to this upper region is a second, smaller, rectangle of height  $h - \bar{u}$  and width  $x(\ell) - \delta/2$ . So, we calculate using equations (3)–(5) and integration by parts as follows:

$$\mathcal{V} = \int_{\delta/2}^{\bar{x}} (\bar{u} - u) dx + \int_{x(\ell)}^{\bar{x}} (u - \bar{u}) dx + \left(x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)(h - \bar{u}) \tag{9}$$

$$= \bar{u}\left(\bar{x} - \frac{\delta}{2} + x(\ell) - \bar{x}\right) + \left(x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2}\right)(h - \bar{u}) + \int_{x(\ell)}^{\bar{x}} u dx - \int_{\delta/2}^{\bar{x}} u dx \tag{10}$$

$$= h\left(x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \bar{u}(0) + \int_{x(\ell)}^{\bar{x}} u dx - \int_{\delta/2}^{\bar{x}} u dx \tag{11}$$

$$= h\left(x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \int_{x(\ell)}^{\bar{x}} \left(\frac{d\psi}{ds} + \lambda\right) dx - \int_{\delta/2}^{\bar{x}} \left(\frac{d\psi}{ds} + \lambda\right) dx \tag{12}$$


$$= (h - \lambda)\left(x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \int_{x(\ell)}^{\bar{x}} \frac{d\psi}{ds} dx - \int_{\delta/2}^{\bar{x}} \frac{d\psi}{ds} dx \tag{13}$$

$$= (h - \lambda)\left(x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \int_{\gamma_h - \pi}^{\pi/2} \cos \psi d\psi - \int_{-\gamma_0}^{\pi/2} \cos \psi d\psi \tag{14}$$

$$= (h - \lambda)\left(x(\ell) - \frac{\delta}{2}\right) + \sin \gamma_0 - \sin \gamma_h. \tag{15}$$

There are multiple possible configurations; however, it suffices to adapt the above calculation to these remaining cases:

- $x(s) < \delta/2$  for  $0 < s < \ell$  and  $x(\ell) < \delta/2$ . See [Figure 4](#) (left).
- $x(s) < \delta/2$  for some initial  $s > 0$ , and then  $x(s)$  increases and  $x(\ell) > \delta/2$ . See [Figure 4](#) (right).



**Figure 5.** Two remaining volume configurations. Here  $x = \bar{x}$  and  $u = \bar{u}$ , and plate heights are 0 and  $h$ .

- $x(s) > \delta/2$  for some initial  $s > 0$ , and then  $x(s)$  decreases and  $x(\ell) < \delta/2$ . See [Figure 5](#) (left).
- There is no vertical point on the interface profile curve. There are many such configurations; see [Figure 5](#) (right) for a typical example. The volume computation is straightforward in these cases, only requiring use of (3)–(5).  $\square$

#### 4. Numerical solver

We use a shooting method to solve the two-point boundary value problem of (3)–(5) with boundary conditions (6) and (7). We implement this by nesting two algorithms, namely an inner implementation of an adaptive Runge–Kutta–Fehlberg method and an outer implementation of a multidimensional root finder.

Values for the initial and terminal contact angles  $\gamma_0$ ,  $\gamma_h$ , volume  $\mathcal{V}$ , and height  $h$  are prescribed for the desired solution. The lower conditions for the boundary value problem are

$$r(0) = \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad (16)$$

$$u(0) = 0, \quad (17)$$


$$\psi(0) = \gamma_0, \quad (18)$$

where the tangent to the curve forms the contact angle  $\gamma_0$  with the lower plate, and the upper boundary conditions are

$$u(\ell) = h, \quad (19)$$

$$\psi(\ell) = -\gamma_h, \quad (20)$$

where the ending arc length  $\ell$  is chosen to terminate at height  $h$  with the tangent to the curve forming the angle  $\gamma_h$  with the upper parallel plate.



**Figure 6.** A liquid bridge with contact angle  $\pi/2$  on the upper plate.

Again, the boundary value problem is solved using a shooting method based on an adaptive ODE solver. The solver uses the adaptive Runge–Kutta–Fehlberg method for 4th and 5th order, implemented by Matlab as ODE45. The absolute and relative tolerances were both set to  $1e-8$ . To begin to solve the problem, reasonable guesses are given for the free parameters: the distance between the generating curves  $\delta$ , the ending arc length  $\ell$ , and the Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda$ . These values are used to generate candidates satisfying the ODE. Then the solutions to (3)–(5) with these values of the free parameters are used to evaluate the equations

$$\mathcal{V} - V(\ell) = 0, \quad (21)$$


$$h - u(\ell) = 0, \quad (22)$$

$$\gamma_h - \psi(\ell) = 0, \quad (23)$$


which are not, in general, solved. The parameters  $\delta$ ,  $\ell$ , and  $\lambda$  are adjusted in the multidimensional root finder implemented in Matlab as FSOLVE, which defaults to a trust region method. The tolerances for this portion of the algorithm were set to  $1e-6$ . We recompute the solutions to (3)–(5) with new values of the parameters  $\delta$ ,  $\ell$ , and  $\lambda$  at each step, until (21)–(23) are satisfied to the prescribed tolerance.

## 5. Examples

We present some examples of note generated with the algorithm described in the previous section. In Figure 2 we saw a typical example of a configuration where  $\gamma_0, \gamma_h \in [0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ . Figure 6 shows a configuration where  $\gamma_h = \pi/2$ , and Figure 7 shows a configuration where both  $\gamma_0, \gamma_h > \pi/2$ . If the volume does not span the gap between  $P_0$  and  $P_h$ , then it will rest on the plate  $P_0$  as a sessile drop. We see in Figure 8 a configuration where  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h) = (2.57, 1.05)$ , which appears to be close to the maximum height  $h$  before the liquid bridge pinches off of the upper plate  $P_h$  and becomes a sessile drop.




**Figure 7.** A liquid bridge with both  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_h$  larger than  $\pi/2$ .




**Figure 8.** A liquid bridge that is visually similar to a sessile drop.

### 6. Minimum spanning volume

Consider configurations where the contact angles  $\gamma_0$  and  $\gamma_h$  are both less than  $\pi/2$ . The phenomenon explored is the minimum volume which admits a solution spanning the two plates  $P_0$  and  $P_h$ . In [Figure 9](#) we see that for angles  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h) = (0.99, 0)$  and a particular volume, we have a point on the interior of the fluid interface on the right that touches a corresponding point on the interior of the fluid interface on the left.



**Figure 9.** A liquid bridge with interfaces touching on the interior.



**Figure 10.** The minimum spanning volume over a grid of  $50 \times 50$  samples in the  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h)$ -space.

This is clearly nonphysical and represents an absolute minimum spanning volume. It is apparent that this contact between the left and right interfaces occurs on either  $P_0$  or  $P_h$  if either  $\gamma_0 > \pi/2$  or  $\gamma_h > \pi/2$ . Therefore, we restrict our attention to the region  $0 \leq \gamma_0 \leq \pi/2$  and  $0 \leq \gamma_h \leq \pi/2$ . We seek a minimum volume where  $x(s) = 0$  for some  $s \in [0, \ell]$ .

Observe the crucial fact of the system (3)–(5) that

$$\frac{d\psi}{ds} = \kappa u - \lambda$$

is independent of  $x$ , and so the  $x$  solution may be translated by a constant. We are able to use this to some degree to adjust the volume spanned. If the left and right interfaces are rigidly moved apart in the  $x$ -direction, then the spanned volume increases while still solving the boundary value problem, and conversely, if they are rigidly moved together, they will eventually touch. At this point there exists an arc length  $s$  such that  $x(s) = 0$  for both the left and right portions of the configuration. We are able to use this idea in conjunction with our previous solver to obtain the minimum spanning volume at a fixed height  $h$  for a given pair of contact angles  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h)$ .


We use the following algorithm to run over a grid of  $50 \times 50$  samples in the  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h)$ -space. We solve the constrained boundary value problem similar to the method in Section 4, however, we replace the condition

$$\mathcal{V} - V(\ell) = 0$$

with

$$x(s) = 0 \quad \text{for some } s \in [0, \ell]. \quad (24)$$

The results are collected in Figure 10. Here it is worth noting that the examples from Figure 11 are generated from interesting points on the minimum spanning volume



**Figure 11.** Left: The minimum spanning volume. Here  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h) \approx (\frac{\pi}{2}, 1.35)$ . Right: A very small spanning volume, but not the minimum spanning volume. Here  $(\gamma_0, \gamma_h) = (\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ .

surface. The minimum spanning volume on the left is actually the minimum volume of all the contact angle pairs, and perhaps surprisingly, it is not the  $(\pi/2, \pi/2)$  case (which is pictured on the right).

## References

- [Athanassenas 1992] M. Athanassenas, “A free boundary problem for capillary surfaces”, *Manuscripta Math.* **76**:1 (1992), 5–19. [MR 93g:35144](#) [Zbl 0768.49025](#)
- [Bhatnagar and Finn 2006] R. Bhatnagar and R. Finn, “Equilibrium configurations of an infinite cylinder in an unbounded fluid”, *Phys. Fluids* **18**:4 (2006), 047103. [MR 2007f:76032](#) [Zbl 1185.76469](#)
- [Concus et al. 2001] P. Concus, R. Finn, and J. McCuan, “Liquid bridges, edge blobs, and Scherk-type capillary surfaces”, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **50**:1 (2001), 411–441. [MR 2002g:76023](#) [Zbl 0996.76014](#)
- [Finn 1986] R. Finn, *Equilibrium capillary surfaces*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften **284**, Springer, New York, 1986. [MR 88f:49001](#) [Zbl 0583.35002](#)
- [Finn and Vogel 1992] R. Finn and T. I. Vogel, “On the volume infimum for liquid bridges”, *Z. Anal. Anwendungen* **11**:1 (1992), 3–23. [MR 95d:76021](#) [Zbl 0760.76015](#)
- [McCuan 2013] J. McCuan, “Extremities of stability for pendant drops”, pp. 157–173 in *Geometric analysis, mathematical relativity, and nonlinear partial differential equations*, edited by M. Ghomi et al., Contemp. Math. **599**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2013. [MR 3202478](#) [Zbl 1276.00026](#)
- [McCuan and Treinen 2013] J. McCuan and R. Treinen, “Capillarity and Archimedes’ principle of flotation”, *Pacific J. Math.* **265**:1 (2013), 123–150. [MR 3095116](#) [Zbl 06218270](#)
- [McCuan and Treinen  $\geq$  2015] J. McCuan and R. Treinen, “On floating equilibria in a finite container”. To appear.
- [Treinen 2012] R. Treinen, “On the symmetry of solutions to some floating drop problems”, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **44**:6 (2012), 3834–3847. [MR 3023432](#) [Zbl 06138483](#)
- [Vogel 1982] T. I. Vogel, “Symmetric unbounded liquid bridges”, *Pacific J. Math.* **103**:1 (1982), 205–241. [MR 84f:53007](#) [Zbl 0504.76025](#)

- [Vogel 1987] T. I. Vogel, “Stability of a liquid drop trapped between two parallel planes”, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **47**:3 (1987), 516–525. MR 88e:53010 Zbl 0627.53004
- [Vogel 1989] T. I. Vogel, “Stability of a liquid drop trapped between two parallel planes, II: General contact angles”, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **49**:4 (1989), 1009–1028. MR 90k:53013 Zbl 0691.53007
- [Vogel 2005] T. I. Vogel, “Comments on radially symmetric liquid bridges with inflected profiles”, *Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. suppl.* (2005), 862–867. MR 2006h:76048 Zbl 1158.53307
- [Vogel 2006] T. I. Vogel, “Convex, rotationally symmetric liquid bridges between spheres”, *Pacific J. Math.* **224**:2 (2006), 367–377. MR 2007f:76033 Zbl 1118.53006
- [Vogel 2013] T. I. Vogel, “Liquid bridges between balls: The small volume instability”, *J. Math. Fluid Mech.* **15**:2 (2013), 397–413. MR 3061769 Zbl 1267.76016
- [Wente 1980] H. C. Wente, “The symmetry of sessile and pendent drops”, *Pacific J. Math.* **88**:2 (1980), 387–397. MR 83j:49042a Zbl 0473.76086
- [Wente 2006] H. C. Wente, “New exotic containers”, *Pacific J. Math.* **224**:2 (2006), 379–398. MR 2007f:76034 Zbl 1118.53007

Received: 2014-07-19

Accepted: 2014-07-28

[icolter08@gmail.com](mailto:icolter08@gmail.com)

*Department of Mathematics, Texas State University,  
601 University Drive San Marcos, TX 78666, United States*

[rt30@txstate.edu](mailto:rt30@txstate.edu)

*Department of Mathematics, Texas State University,  
601 University Drive, San Marcos, TX 78666, United States*

## MANAGING EDITOR

Kenneth S. Berenhaut, Wake Forest University, USA, [berenhks@wfu.edu](mailto:berenhks@wfu.edu)

## BOARD OF EDITORS

Colin Adams	Williams College, USA <a href="mailto:colin.c.adams@williams.edu">colin.c.adams@williams.edu</a>	David Larson	Texas A&M University, USA <a href="mailto:larson@math.tamu.edu">larson@math.tamu.edu</a>
John V. Baxley	Wake Forest University, NC, USA <a href="mailto:baxley@wfu.edu">baxley@wfu.edu</a>	Suzanne Lenhart	University of Tennessee, USA <a href="mailto:lenhart@math.utk.edu">lenhart@math.utk.edu</a>
Arthur T. Benjamin	Harvey Mudd College, USA <a href="mailto:benjamin@hmc.edu">benjamin@hmc.edu</a>	Chi-Kwong Li	College of William and Mary, USA <a href="mailto:ckli@math.wm.edu">ckli@math.wm.edu</a>
Martin Bohner	Missouri U of Science and Technology, USA <a href="mailto:bohner@mst.edu">bohner@mst.edu</a>	Robert B. Lund	Clemson University, USA <a href="mailto:lund@clemson.edu">lund@clemson.edu</a>
Nigel Boston	University of Wisconsin, USA <a href="mailto:boston@math.wisc.edu">boston@math.wisc.edu</a>	Gaven J. Martin	Massey University, New Zealand <a href="mailto:g.j.martin@massey.ac.nz">g.j.martin@massey.ac.nz</a>
Amarjit S. Budhiraja	U of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, USA <a href="mailto:budhiraj@email.unc.edu">budhiraj@email.unc.edu</a>	Mary Meyer	Colorado State University, USA <a href="mailto:meyer@stat.colostate.edu">meyer@stat.colostate.edu</a>
Pietro Cerone	La Trobe University, Australia <a href="mailto:P.Cerone@latrobe.edu.au">P.Cerone@latrobe.edu.au</a>	Emil Minchev	Ruse, Bulgaria <a href="mailto:eminchev@hotmail.com">eminchev@hotmail.com</a>
Scott Chapman	Sam Houston State University, USA <a href="mailto:scott.chapman@shsu.edu">scott.chapman@shsu.edu</a>	Frank Morgan	Williams College, USA <a href="mailto:frank.morgan@williams.edu">frank.morgan@williams.edu</a>
Joshua N. Cooper	University of South Carolina, USA <a href="mailto:cooper@math.sc.edu">cooper@math.sc.edu</a>	Mohammad Sal Moselehian	Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, Iran <a href="mailto:ferdowsi.um.ac.ir">ferdowsi.um.ac.ir</a>
Jem N. Corcoran	University of Colorado, USA <a href="mailto:corcoran@colorado.edu">corcoran@colorado.edu</a>	Zuhair Nashed	University of Central Florida, USA <a href="mailto:znashed@mail.ucf.edu">znashed@mail.ucf.edu</a>
Toka Diagana	Howard University, USA <a href="mailto:tdiagana@howard.edu">tdiagana@howard.edu</a>	Ken Ono	Emory University, USA <a href="mailto:ono@mathcs.emory.edu">ono@mathcs.emory.edu</a>
Michael Dorff	Brigham Young University, USA <a href="mailto:mdorff@math.byu.edu">mdorff@math.byu.edu</a>	Timothy E. O'Brien	Loyola University Chicago, USA <a href="mailto:tbriell@luc.edu">tbriell@luc.edu</a>
Sever S. Dragomir	Victoria University, Australia <a href="mailto:sever@matilda.vu.edu.au">sever@matilda.vu.edu.au</a>	Joseph O'Rourke	Smith College, USA <a href="mailto:orourke@cs.smith.edu">orourke@cs.smith.edu</a>
Behrouz Emamizadeh	The Petroleum Institute, UAE <a href="mailto:bemamizadeh@pi.ac.ae">bemamizadeh@pi.ac.ae</a>	Yuval Peres	Microsoft Research, USA <a href="mailto:peres@microsoft.com">peres@microsoft.com</a>
Joel Foisy	SUNY Potsdam <a href="mailto:foisyjs@potsdam.edu">foisyjs@potsdam.edu</a>	Y.-F. S. Pétermann	Université de Genève, Switzerland <a href="mailto:petermann@math.unige.ch">petermann@math.unige.ch</a>
Errin W. Fulp	Wake Forest University, USA <a href="mailto:fulp@wfu.edu">fulp@wfu.edu</a>	Robert J. Plemmons	Wake Forest University, USA <a href="mailto:rplemmons@wfu.edu">rplemmons@wfu.edu</a>
Joseph Gallian	University of Minnesota Duluth, USA <a href="mailto:jpgallian@d.umn.edu">jpgallian@d.umn.edu</a>	Carl B. Pomerance	Dartmouth College, USA <a href="mailto:carl.pomerance@dartmouth.edu">carl.pomerance@dartmouth.edu</a>
Stephan R. Garcia	Pomona College, USA <a href="mailto:stephan.garcia@pomona.edu">stephan.garcia@pomona.edu</a>	Vadim Ponomarenko	San Diego State University, USA <a href="mailto:vadim@sciences.sdsu.edu">vadim@sciences.sdsu.edu</a>
Anant Godbole	East Tennessee State University, USA <a href="mailto:godbole@etsu.edu">godbole@etsu.edu</a>	Bjorn Poonen	UC Berkeley, USA <a href="mailto:poonen@math.berkeley.edu">poonen@math.berkeley.edu</a>
Ron Gould	Emory University, USA <a href="mailto:rg@mathcs.emory.edu">rg@mathcs.emory.edu</a>	James Propp	U Mass Lowell, USA <a href="mailto:jpropp@cs.uml.edu">jpropp@cs.uml.edu</a>
Andrew Granville	Université Montréal, Canada <a href="mailto:andrew@dms.umontreal.ca">andrew@dms.umontreal.ca</a>	József H. Przytycki	George Washington University, USA <a href="mailto:przytyck@gwu.edu">przytyck@gwu.edu</a>
Jerrold Griggs	University of South Carolina, USA <a href="mailto:griggs@math.sc.edu">griggs@math.sc.edu</a>	Richard Rebarber	University of Nebraska, USA <a href="mailto:rrebarbe@math.unl.edu">rrebarbe@math.unl.edu</a>
Sat Gupta	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA <a href="mailto:sgupta@uncg.edu">sgupta@uncg.edu</a>	Robert W. Robinson	University of Georgia, USA <a href="mailto:rwr@cs.uga.edu">rwr@cs.uga.edu</a>
Jim Haglund	University of Pennsylvania, USA <a href="mailto:jhaglund@math.upenn.edu">jhaglund@math.upenn.edu</a>	Filip Saidak	U of North Carolina, Greensboro, USA <a href="mailto:f_saidak@uncg.edu">f_saidak@uncg.edu</a>
Johnny Henderson	Baylor University, USA <a href="mailto:johnny_henderson@baylor.edu">johnny_henderson@baylor.edu</a>	James A. Sellers	Penn State University, USA <a href="mailto:sellersj@math.psu.edu">sellersj@math.psu.edu</a>
Jim Hoste	Pitzer College <a href="mailto:jhoste@pitzer.edu">jhoste@pitzer.edu</a>	Andrew J. Sterge	Honorary Editor <a href="mailto:andy@ajsterge.com">andy@ajsterge.com</a>
Natalia Hritonenko	Prairie View A&M University, USA <a href="mailto:nahritonenko@pvamu.edu">nahritonenko@pvamu.edu</a>	Ann Trenk	Wellesley College, USA <a href="mailto:atrenk@wellesley.edu">atrenk@wellesley.edu</a>
Glenn H. Hurlbert	Arizona State University, USA <a href="mailto:hurlbert@asu.edu">hurlbert@asu.edu</a>	Ravi Vakil	Stanford University, USA <a href="mailto:vakil@math.stanford.edu">vakil@math.stanford.edu</a>
Charles R. Johnson	College of William and Mary, USA <a href="mailto:crjohnso@math.wm.edu">crjohnso@math.wm.edu</a>	Antonia Vecchio	Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche, Italy <a href="mailto:antonia.vecchio@cnr.it">antonia.vecchio@cnr.it</a>
K. B. Kulasekera	Clemson University, USA <a href="mailto:kk@ces.clemson.edu">kk@ces.clemson.edu</a>	Ram U. Verma	University of Toledo, USA <a href="mailto:verma99@msn.com">verma99@msn.com</a>
Gerry Ladas	University of Rhode Island, USA <a href="mailto:gladas@math.uri.edu">gladas@math.uri.edu</a>	John C. Wierman	Johns Hopkins University, USA <a href="mailto:wierman@jhu.edu">wierman@jhu.edu</a>
		Michael E. Zieve	University of Michigan, USA <a href="mailto:zieve@umich.edu">zieve@umich.edu</a>

## PRODUCTION

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

Cover: Alex Scorpan

See inside back cover or [msp.org/involve](http://msp.org/involve) for submission instructions. The subscription price for 2015 is US \$140/year for the electronic version, and \$190/year (+\$35, if shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to MSP.

Involve (ISSN 1944-4184 electronic, 1944-4176 printed) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, 798 Evans Hall #3840, c/o University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

Involve peer review and production are managed by EditFlow® from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY



**mathematical sciences publishers**

nonprofit scientific publishing

<http://msp.org/>

© 2015 Mathematical Sciences Publishers

# involve

2015

vol. 8

no. 4

The $\Delta^2$ conjecture holds for graphs of small order	541
COLE FRANKS	
Linear symplectomorphisms as $R$ -Lagrangian subspaces	551
CHRIS HELLMANN, BRENNAN LANGENBACH AND MICHAEL VANVALKENBURGH	
Maximization of the size of monic orthogonal polynomials on the unit circle corresponding to the measures in the Steklov class	571
JOHN HOFFMAN, MCKINLEY MEYER, MARIYA SARDARLI AND ALEX SHERMAN	
A type of multiple integral with log-gamma function	593
DUOKUI YAN, RONGCHANG LIU AND GENG-ZHE CHANG	
Knight's tours on boards with odd dimensions	615
BAOYUE BI, STEVE BUTLER, STEPHANIE DEGRAAF AND ELIZABETH DOEBEL	
Differentiation with respect to parameters of solutions of nonlocal boundary value problems for difference equations	629
JOHNNY HENDERSON AND XUEWEI JIANG	
Outer billiards and tilings of the hyperbolic plane	637
FILIZ DOGRU, EMILY M. FISCHER AND CRISTIAN MIHAI MUNTEANU	
Sophie Germain primes and involutions of $\mathbb{Z}_n^\times$	653
KARENNA GENZLINGER AND KEIR LOCKRIDGE	
On symplectic capacities of toric domains	665
MICHAEL LANDRY, MATTHEW MCMILLAN AND EMMANUEL TSUKERMAN	
When the catenary degree agrees with the tame degree in numerical semigroups of embedding dimension three	677
PEDRO A. GARCÍA-SÁNCHEZ AND CATERINA VIOLA	
Cylindrical liquid bridges	695
LAMONT COLTER AND RAY TREINEN	
Some projective distance inequalities for simplices in complex projective space	707
MARK FINCHER, HEATHER OLNEY AND WILLIAM CHERRY	