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We would first like to point out that for this variational problem there is no configuration for which $E$ (or $\bar{E}$ ) attains its absolute minimum, so that we can only expect to find a local minimum. To see this, consider problem (2). Let $\varepsilon>0$ be given. By detaching two small identical pieces from the sphere at volume $k_{1}$ and placing them symmetrically on either side of the remainder of the sphere on an axis which is perpendicular to the axis of rotation, it is possible by pushing the two small pieces far away from the sphere to obtain a configuration, $\Omega$, such that $E(\Omega)=a_{1}+c$ where $a_{1}$ is the surface area of the sphere of volume $k_{1}$. Thus the absolute minimum for $E$ is $a_{1}$ if it exists. But clearly no configuration has this value for $\bar{E}$ provided that $k_{2} \neq 0$, since che sphere of volume $k_{1}$ is the only possibility.

Applying the classical methods of the calculus of variations we obtain as the EulerLagrange equation for this problem the equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
C(p)=-\left(A r^{2}+B\right), \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C(p)$ is the mean curvature of the surface $\partial \Omega$ at the point $p e a \Omega, r^{2}=x^{2}+y^{2}$ where we have taken the $z$-axis is the axis of rotation, and $A$ and $B$ are constants which involve Lagrange multipliers and must be chosen to satisfy the constraints. It is reassuring to note that this equation can be obtained directly by balancing the forces at each point on as without considering the variational problem at all. Since the pressure inside the globules must be greater than the outside pressure, we may conclude that the constants A and $B$ are positive. Here we have adopted the convention that inward curvature is negative.

It is possible to write this equation as a free boundary value problem for a nonlinear partial differential equation. But this problem seems difficult to treat even numerically. We will introduce additional symmetries into the problem so that we are led to consider an approximate problem involving ordinary differential equations.

## The oblate solutions

There exist exact solutions to (3) which are surfaces of resolution with respect to the z-axis (the axis of rotation). By taking advantage of the assumed symetries, we see that these solutions will be solutions to the free boundary value problen.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.f^{\prime \prime}=\left(1+\left(f^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right)\left(1-2 f\left(1+\left(f^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right)^{1 /\left(A f^{2}\right.}+B\right)\right)  \tag{4}\\
& f^{\prime}(0)=0: f(b)=0, f^{\prime}(b)=-\infty .
\end{align*}
$$

Here, $f$ and $b$ are unknown and $A$ and $B$ are positive constants which must be chosen to satisfy the constraints. The function $x=f(z)$ generates the surface of the globule when rotated about the z-axis. Remarkably, this equation can be integrated exactly in terms of elliptic integrals. (See Chandrasehkar [2].) However, it is easier to do numerically. These solutions while they are exact solutions to the Euler-Lagrange equation (3), they almost surely are not local minima for our variational problem except possibly near the sphere i.e., for small values of the angular momentum. Nevertheless, there is a smooth one parameter family of these solutions for a given volume starting with the sphere ( $k_{2}=0$ ) and becoming more and more oblate. A convenient parameter to index these solutions is, $I$, their moment of inertia. Table l contains some important numbers for a few members of this family.

## The approximate prolate and dumbbell solutions

Motivated by the fact that the actually occurring shapes are close to being surfaces of revolution with respect to an axis (which we call the $x$-axis) which is perpendicular to the axis of rotation, we consider the variational problem modified so as to include in the class of possible globules only those which are surfaces of revolution with respect to the $x$-axis. Now the appropriate functional to minimize is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \int_{0}^{b} \frac{\rho \pi}{8} f^{4} \omega^{2}+\frac{\rho \pi}{2} f^{2} x^{2} \omega^{2}+2 \pi T f \sqrt{1+(f)^{2}} \\
& \quad+\lambda_{1} \pi f^{2}+\lambda_{2}\left[\frac{\rho \pi}{4} f^{4}+\rho \pi f^{2} x^{2}\right] \omega d x
\end{aligned}
$$

where the function $y=f(x)$ generates the surface of the globule by rotation about the $x$-axis, 0 is the density, and $\lambda_{1}$ and $\lambda_{2}$ are Lagrange Multipliers. Here $\omega$ is treated as a parameter. As before, both $f$ and $b$ are unknown. This leads to the free boundary value problem,

$$
\begin{align*}
& f^{\prime \prime}=\left(1+\left(f^{\prime} 2\right)\left(1-2 f\left(1+\left(f^{\prime} 2\right)^{4}\left(A x^{2}+\frac{A}{2} f^{2}+B\right)^{\prime}\right.\right.\right.  \tag{5}\\
& f^{\prime}(0)=0: f(b)=0, f^{\prime}(b)=-\cdots
\end{align*}
$$

As before, the positive constants $A$ and $B$ must be chosen to satisfy the constraints. As in the oblate case, if we fix the volume, we can generate, numerically, a continuous one parameter family of solutions starting at this sphere and proceeding through prolate shapes to dumbbell shapes with narrower and narrower necks. Again. I, the moment of inertia is an increasing parameter along this family of deformations of the sphere. Figure 2 contains araphs of some of the members of this family. The volumes of all the globules in this graph are equal. The reader is asked to compare the shapes in this figure with the photographs in Fiqure 1. Mathematically, this equation is more difficult to handle than (4). It cannot be integrated in terms of elliptic intearals and no existence theorem is known for this free boundary velue problem. Table 2 contains extensive information about this family. The number is defined as the thickness at the axis of rotation divided by the
length of the globule. The number, $D$, is defined by $D=\frac{1}{3}$. We note that both of these numbers are invariant under similarity transformations and that if a qlobule is a solution to our free boundary value problem then so is any similar qlobule. Both tables 1 and 2 were computed assuming that the volume is one and that the density is one.

We have, therefore, two families of deformations of the sphere each parameterized by, 1 , the moment of inertia of the qlobule with respect to its axis of rotatic.1. We denote the oblate family by so(I) and the prolate family by ap(I). For qiven $I$, the two corresponding members are local minimum for the variatanal problem modified in two ways. Firet, we add the constraint that $I=$ const. Second, we restrict the variations allowed to be such that they produce in the case of the oblate family surfaces which are surfaces of revolution with respect to the axis of rotation (the x-axis) and in the prolate family surfaces which dre surfaces of revolution with respect to the x-axis. We caution that if more general variations are allowed the prolate family ylobule cannot be a local minimum since they do not satisfy (3). While the oblate family qlobule is also not a local minimum, at least sufficiently far from the sphere, even though it does satisfy (3).

The first constraint, $I=$ constant, is eliminated by considering $\bar{E}$ as a function of $I$ along either of the families. We have

$$
\tilde{E}(I)=\frac{c k_{2}^{2}}{I}+A(I)
$$

At a minimum for the problem where the constraint, $I=$ constant, is dropped but the restrictions on the variations are retained we must have $\frac{d \bar{E}}{d I}=0$. That is $I: \frac{d A}{d I}=E K_{2}{ }^{2}$. Nlso we must have $\frac{d^{2} \vec{E}}{d T^{j}}, 0$. Some simple calculations show that this condition is equivalent to the condition $\frac{d}{d I}\left(I \cdot \frac{d A}{d T}\right.$ ), 0 assuming that $\frac{d \bar{E}}{d I}=0$ at the point considered. An examination of Table 2 leads to the conclusion that these qlobules are no longer a minimum beyond qlobule 25. That is beyond this point the qlobules are clearly unstable. If this theory is correct, the dumbell shaped globule in Fiqure 1 is near the limit of stability. If it were much narrower at the neck it would break apart.

## Comparisun of the energies

We assume now that this volume of all globules is fixed at one. If $k_{2}$ is sufficiently small, ihere is exactly one local minimum for the modified variational problems along each of the families $n o(I)$ and $u p(I)$. The value of $E$ at a point where $\frac{d E}{d T}=0$ is given by the expression $T \frac{d A}{d \bar{I}}+A$ which forms the last column in the tables. By inspecting rables 1 and 2
we see that for a given $k_{2}$ the energy, $E_{p}\left(k_{2}\right)$ of the minimizing globule from the ap (I) family is smaller than the energy $\bar{E}_{0}\left(k_{2}\right)$ at the minimizing globule from the no(I) family from globules 16 or 117 on to the end of the table, while up to that point $\bar{E}_{0}\left(k_{2}\right)$ is
smaller than $\bar{E}_{p}\left(k_{2}\right)$. However, since chere exist purturbations of any of the prolate family ylobules which produce an even smaller enerqy there are alobules near the prolate family which protuce smaller values of E nearer to the sphere than qlobule 16.

We conjecture that there is a one parameter family of qlobules which start from the sphere and develops essentially like the prolate family but which contains true local minimum for the variational prohlem (1). (Chandrasehkar 121 expects that the oblate spheroids are stable near the sphere and that a bifurcation occurs along this family which contains ellipsoids with different lengths for all three axes.)

## Conclusion

The good agreement between the actual shapes of the Lunar alobules and the numerica: results in Fiqure 2 certainly lend some support to the rotational theory. However, since the existence of true local minima has not been established and since the theoretical understanding of the thermokenetics is still to be attained, there is certainly room for doubt.

The numerical computation
The simplification of the variational problem yielis a seond urder ordinary differential equation (oDE) for $f(x)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{d^{2} f}{d x^{y}}=\frac{1}{f(x)}\left(1+\left(\frac{d f}{d x}\right)=\left[1-2 f(x)\left(1+\left(\frac{d f}{d x}\right)^{2}\left(A x^{2}+R+C(f(x)):\right]\right]\right.\right. \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and one must find a positive value of the independent variable, say $x_{f}$, so that the following boundary conditions hold

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{d f}{d x}\right|_{x=0}=0 ; \quad f\left(x_{f}\right)=0 ;\left.\quad \frac{d f}{d x}\right|_{x=x_{f}}=\cdots \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

i.e., the function should start off flat from the $f$-axis and should cross the x-axis going straight down.

The numerical solutions present in this paper were computed using 14 digit precision BAStC on a $z-80$ busod microcomputer employing two routines from the small machine oriented library of mathematical software, SCRUNCH [\$] to solve this variant of a two-point boundary value problem by simple shooting. ?EROIN, a robust root finder developed by $L$. F. Shampine and R. C. Allen, Jr. which uses a careful combination of bisection and the secant rule, was used to find the missing end point, $x$, RKF4S, a fourth, fifth order Runge-Kutta-Fehlbera method oriqinally coded by H. A. Watts and f . F. Shampine for solving the initial value problem for systems of first order differmetial equations with automatic step selection and reliable rror control, intearated the obes for each trial value of $x_{f}$.

The differential equations and boundary conditions were reformulated in terms of are length and inteqrated from $x^{\pi} x_{f}$ to $s=0$ using a suggestion of $C$. W. Gear to avoid the sinqularities present at the boundaries and the instability due to a large, positive eigenvalue of the ODE system (6) at $x=x_{f}$. Chanaing the direction of integration caused the system to be initially stiff due to the large, neqative eigenvalue present, but this causes no problem due to the small step sizes typically necessary to start the inteqration. Letting $x=x(s) ; y=y(s)=f(x(s))$, the problem actually computed was

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{d^{2} x}{d s}=-2 \frac{d y}{d s}\left(A x^{2}+B+C y^{2}\right)-\frac{d y}{d s}\left(\frac{d x}{d s} \frac{1}{y(s)}\right) \\
& \frac{d^{2} y}{d s^{2}}=2 \frac{d x}{d s}\left(A x^{2}+B+C y^{2}\right)+\frac{d x}{d s}\left(\frac{d x}{d s} \frac{1}{y(s)}\right) \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

with boundary conditions at $x_{f}=x(0)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
x(0)=x_{f} ;\left.\quad \frac{d x}{d s}\right|_{g=0}=0 ; \quad y(0)=0 ;\left.\quad \frac{d y}{d z}\right|_{g=0}=1 \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and defining the total length of the arc, $s_{T}$, by the condition $x\left(s_{T}\right)=0$

$$
\begin{equation*}
x\left(s_{T}\right)=0 ;\left.\quad \frac{d x}{d s}\right|_{X=s_{T}}=-1 ; \quad y\left(s_{T}\right)=\text { positive; }\left.\quad \frac{d y}{d s}\right|_{s=s_{T}}=0 . \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The singularity still present at the starting point $x_{f}$ due to the term $\frac{d x}{d s} \frac{1}{y(s)}$ in ( 8 ) is avoided by using the approximation

$$
\left.\left(\frac{d x}{d s} \frac{1}{y(s)}\right)\right|_{s=0} \stackrel{\dot{=}}{ }-\left(A x^{2}+B+C y^{2}\right)_{\substack{x=x_{f} \\ y=0}}=\cdot\left(A x_{f}^{2}+B\right)
$$

which comes from using the first two terms of a Taylor series for $\frac{d x}{d s}$ and $y(s)$ near $s=0$ and the known properties of the prodem.

The final BASIC program takes as input the values of the parameters $A$ and $B$ (using the relation that $C=A / 8)$ and an interval $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}\right)$ in which to search for the unknown $x_{f}$, the root of the function

$$
\left.G(x) \equiv \frac{d y}{d s}\right|_{s=s_{T}}
$$

obtained by integrating ( 8 ) backwards from the trial starting point $x$ using initial conditions (9) until the function crosses the $y$-axis. The differential equations were integrated using a mixed relative and absolute error tolerance of $10^{-6}$ and the root was found to a similar mixed tolerance of $10^{-5}$. These tolerances were easily met using the 14 digit BASIC now that the problem is formulated in a numerically stable manner. Once the missing value $x_{f}$ was obtained, the initial value problem ( 8 and 9 ) was solved and the values $(x, y)$ obtained at each step of the integration were plotted using a simple line-printer/plotter routine.

Table 1

| $C$ <br> $V=1$ | 20 | 25 | 50 | 75 | 150 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I$ | .12768 | 1.9094 | .19978 | .20477 | .21300 |
| $A$ | 4.8833 | 4.9297 | 4.9742 | 5.0022 | 5.0523 |
| $\frac{d A}{d I}$ | 3.499 | 5.034 | 5.611 | 6.087 | 7.107 |
| $I^{2} \frac{d A}{d I}$ | .1105 | .1835 | .2239 | .2553 | .3235 |
| $I^{d A}+A$ | 5.505 | 5.891 | 6.065 | 6.249 | 6.566 |

Table 2

| 1 | e | D | I | $\lambda$ | $\frac{d A}{d I}$ | $I^{2} \frac{d A}{d I}$ | $I \frac{d A}{d I}+A$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | . 15401 | 4.8363 | . 26 |  |  |
| 2 | 1.05 | . 125 | . 15554 | 4.8367 | 1.09 |  |  |
| 3 | 1.07 | . 25 | . 15691 | 4.8382 | 1.98 |  |  |
| 4 | 1.10 | . 5 | 15934 | 4.8430 | 2.59 |  |  |
| 5 | 1.14 | . 75 | . 16181 | 4.8494 | 3.22 |  |  |
| 6 | 1.21 | 1.25 | . 16694 | 4.8659 | 4.14 |  |  |
| 7 | 1.43 | 2.5 | . 18516 | 4.9413 | 4.52 |  |  |
| 8 | 1.45 | 2.625 | . 18815 | 4.9548 | 4.55 |  |  |
| 9 | 1.47 | 2.6375 | . 18848 | 4.9563 | 4.57 |  |  |
| 10 | 1.48 | 2.6875 | . 18986 | 4.9626 | 4.46 | . 161 | 5.81 |
| 11 | 1.49 | 2.71875 | . 19078 | 4.9667 | 4.54 | . 165 | 5.83 |
| 12 | 1.50 | 2.75 | . 19175 | 4.9711 | 4.50 | . 166 | 5.83 |
| 13 | 1.55 | 3.05 | . 20779 | 5.0433 | 4.38 | . 189 | 5.95 |
| 14 | 1.92 | 3.0 | . 23741 | 5.1729 | 4.13 | . 233 | 6.15 |
| 15 | 2.02 | 2.875 | . 25021 | 5.2257 | 3.99 | . 250 | 6.22 |
| 16 | 2.15 | 2.6875 | . 26628 | 5.2898 | 3.87 | . 275 | 6.32 |
| 17 | 2.15 | 2.5375 | . 26770 | 5.2953 | 3.88 | . 278 | 6.33 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Dumbell } \\ 18 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 2.18 | 2.625 | . 27139 | 5.3096 | 3.78 | . 278 | 6.34 |
| 19 | 2.26 | 2.5 | 2.8150 | 5.3478 | 3.62 | . 287 | 6.37 |
| 20 | 2.41 | 2.25 | . 30217 | 5.4227 | 342 | . 312 | 6.46 |
| 21 | 2.58 | 2.0 | . 32432 | 5.4984 | 3.20 | . 336 | 6.54 |
| 22 | 2.67 | 1.75 | 3.4908 | 5.5775 | 2.98 | . 363 | 6.62 |
| 23 | 2.95 | 1.5 | . 37758 | 5.6623 | 2.75 | . 392 | 6.70 |
| 24 | 3.21 | 1.25 | . 41136 | 5.7552 | 2.34 | . 396 | 6.72 |
| 25 | 3.98 | . 75 | . 50533 | 5.0755 | 1.98 | . 506 | 6.98 |
| 26 | 4.66 | . 5 | . 57291 | 6.1059 | 1.52 | . 500 | 6.98 |
| 27 | 6.30 | . 25 | . 65168 | 6.2258 | 1.02 | . 431 | 6.88 |
| 28 | 9.15 | . 125 | . 68487 | 6.2595 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 1
Photographs supplied courtesy of Dr. Gertrude Hinsch, Department of Bioloqy, University of South Florida and Dr. H. Fertig, Max Plank Institute fưr Kerm Physik, Heidelterg, Germany.


The numbers appearing on the graph are values of $D$.
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