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# ON SPECIAL PLANE NETS 

Alois Švec, Brno
(Received February 15, 1988)

The local projective differential geometry of nets has been studied extensively; see [1]-[3]. In the paper, I prove a global result.

1. Let $P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ be the projective plane over reals. Let $N$ be a net of curves given on a domain $D \subset P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$; let $D_{0} \subset \mathbb{R}^{2}$ be a domain with coordinates $(x, y)$ and $m: D_{0} \rightarrow$ $\rightarrow D$ a diffeomorphism mapping the lines $x=$ const. and $y=$ const. into the lines of our net. The points $m(x, y), m_{x}(x, y), m_{y}(x, y)$ being linearly independent (here $m_{x}=\partial m / \partial x$, etc.), the homogeneous coordinates of the point $m(x, y)$ satisfy hyperbolic partial differential equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{x y}=a m_{x}+b m_{y}+c m ; \quad a=a(x, y), \ldots, c=c(x, y) \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $D_{0}$. Of course, we may choose other coordinates $\tilde{x}=\tilde{x}(x), \tilde{y}=\tilde{y}(y)$ and another analytic point $\tilde{m}=\varrho(x, y) m$; the net $N$ determines thus the equation (1.1) up to these changes.

The theory of the equation (1.1) is well known. The Laplace transform of our net $N$ given as above is a mapping $m^{\prime}: D_{0} \rightarrow P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ such that there is a tangent field $t(x, y)$ on $D_{0}$ satisfying $t(x, y) m^{\prime}(x, y) \in\left\{m(x, y), m^{\prime}(x, y)\right\}$ for each $(x, y) \in D_{0}$; by $\left\{z_{1}, z_{2}\right\}$, we denote the subspace through $z_{1}, z_{2} \in P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$. It is known that our net has exactly two Laplace transforms

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{1}=m_{y}-a m, \quad m_{-1}=m_{x}-b m ; \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

indeed,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(\partial / \partial x) m_{1}=b m_{1}+h m, \quad(\partial / \partial y) m_{-1}=a m_{-1}+k m \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
h=c+a b-a_{x}, \quad k=c+a b-b_{y} . \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The functions $h, k$ are the so-called Laplace-Darboux invariants. In fact, they are not invariants, but the quadratic point forms

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{1}=h \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} y, \quad \varphi_{-1}=k \mathrm{~d} x \mathrm{~d} y \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

are invariants of (1.1) with respect to the changes $x \rightarrow \tilde{x}(x), y \rightarrow \tilde{y}(y), m \rightarrow \varrho m$,
and are thus invariants of our net $N$. The point $m_{1}$ satisfies, if $h \neq 0$ on $D_{0}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& m_{1 x y}=a_{1} m_{1 x}+b_{1} m_{1 y}+c_{1} m_{1} \quad \text { with } \quad a_{1}=a+(\log h)_{y}, \quad b_{1}=b,  \tag{1.6}\\
& c_{1}=c+h-k-b(\log h)_{y} ; \quad(\log h)_{y}:=h^{-1} h_{y} ;
\end{align*}
$$

and the Laplace transforms of the net $N_{1}$ are

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{2}:=\left(m_{1}\right)_{1}=m_{1 y}-a_{1} m_{1}, \quad\left(m_{1}\right)_{-1}=m_{1 x}-b_{1} m_{1}=h m ; \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

similarly for $N_{-1}$.
Let us consider the complexification $P_{\mathrm{C}}^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ of $P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ and of $D_{0}$. An elliptic net $N$ on a domain $D \subset P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ is a diffeomorphism $f: D_{0} \rightarrow D$ carrying the lines $x \pm \mathrm{i} y=$ $=$ const. of $D_{0}$ into the lines of $N$. Let us introduce the complex coordinate $z=$ $=x+\mathrm{i} y$ and the usual operators $\partial / \partial z=\frac{1}{2}(\partial / \partial u-\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial v), \partial / \partial \bar{z}=\frac{1}{2}(\partial / \partial u+\mathrm{i} \partial / \partial v)$. As in the real case, an elliptic net induces an equation of the type

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{z \bar{z}}=\mathscr{A} m_{z}+\overline{\mathscr{A}} m_{\bar{z}}+\mathscr{C}_{m} ; \mathscr{C}=\overline{\mathscr{C}} \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $D_{0}$; it may be rewritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{x x}+m_{y y}=2(\overline{\mathscr{A}}+\mathscr{A}) m_{x}+2 \mathrm{i}(\bar{a}-a) m_{y}+4 \mathscr{C} m . \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then the Laplace transforms are

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{1}=m_{\bar{z}}-\mathscr{A} m, \quad m_{-1}=\bar{m}_{1}=m_{z}-\overline{\mathscr{A}} m \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{align*}
& m_{1 z}=\overline{\mathscr{A}} m_{1}+H m, \quad m_{-1 \bar{z}}=\mathscr{A} m_{-1}+K m ;  \tag{1.11}\\
& H=\mathscr{C}+\mathscr{A} \overline{\mathscr{A}}-\mathscr{A}_{z}, \quad K=\bar{H} ;
\end{align*}
$$

the associated invariant point forms are then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{1}=H \mathrm{~d} z \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}, \quad \varphi_{-1}=\bar{\varphi}_{1}=K \mathrm{~d} z \mathrm{~d} \bar{z} \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

2. In this section we introduce a certain elliptic net $N^{\varepsilon}, \varepsilon= \pm 1$, on $P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ (or, as the case may be, a part of it). Consider the domain

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{\varepsilon}=\{z \in \overline{\mathbb{C}} \equiv \mathbb{C} \cup\{\infty\} ; 1+\varepsilon z \bar{z}>0\} ; \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

of course, $D_{+1}=\overline{\mathbb{C}}$. With each point $z \in D_{\varepsilon}$ let us associate the point

$$
\begin{equation*}
m(z)=(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-1}(\bar{z}+z, \mathrm{i}(\bar{z}-z), 1-\varepsilon z \bar{z}) \in P^{2}(\mathbb{R}) ; \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

the elliptic net $N^{\varepsilon}$ on $m\left(D_{\varepsilon}\right)$ is formed by the images of the lines $z=$ const. and $\bar{z}=$ $=$ const. It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
m_{z \bar{z}}=-2 \varepsilon(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-2} m \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the point forms (1.12) are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{1}=\varphi_{-1}=-2 \varepsilon(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-2} \mathrm{~d} z \mathrm{~d} \bar{z} . \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consider an affine space $A^{3}$ over reals with a fixed basis $\left\{O ; e_{1}, e_{2}, e_{3}\right\}$ and the coordinates $(X, Y, Z)$ defined by $P=O+X e_{1}+Y e_{2}+Z e_{3}$. Let $\iota: D_{\mathrm{e}} \rightarrow A^{3}$ be
an inclusion map given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\prime(z)=O+\frac{1}{2}(\bar{z}+z) e_{1}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{i}(\bar{z}-z) e_{2} . \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further, consider the point $S=O-e_{3}$ and the quadric $Q_{\varepsilon}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
X^{2}+Y^{2}+\varepsilon Z^{2}=\varepsilon \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

in $A^{3}$; of course, $S \in Q_{\varepsilon}$. Let the mapping $\mu_{\varepsilon}: D_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow Q_{\varepsilon}$ be defined as follows: $\mu_{\varepsilon}(z)$ is the intersection of the line $\{\ell(z), S\}$ with $Q_{\varepsilon}$ and $\mu_{1}(\infty)=S$. It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{align*}
\mu_{\varepsilon}(z) & =O+X(z) e_{1}+Y(z) e_{2}+Z(z) e_{3} \quad \text { with }  \tag{2.7}\\
X(z) & =(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-1}(\bar{z}+z), \quad Y(z)=\mathrm{i}(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-1}(\bar{z}-z), \\
Z(z) & =(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-1}(1-\varepsilon z \bar{z}) .
\end{align*}
$$

In $A^{3}$, let us introduce the scalar product (for $\varepsilon=-1$ non-definite) by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\langle e_{1}, e_{1}\right\rangle_{\varepsilon}=\left\langle e_{2}, e_{2}\right\rangle_{\varepsilon}=1,\left\langle e_{3}, e_{3}\right\rangle_{\varepsilon}=\varepsilon ;\left\langle e_{i}, e_{j}\right\rangle_{\varepsilon}=0 \text { otherwise . } \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{d} X(z)=(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-2}\left\{\left(1-\varepsilon \bar{z}^{2}\right) \mathrm{d} z+\left(1-\varepsilon z^{2}\right) \mathrm{d} \bar{z}\right\},  \tag{2.9}\\
& \left.\mathrm{d} Y(z)=-\mathrm{i}(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-2}\left\{1+\varepsilon \bar{z}^{2}\right) \mathrm{d} z-\left(1+\varepsilon z^{2}\right) \mathrm{d} \bar{z}\right\}, \\
& \mathrm{d} Z(z)=-2 \varepsilon(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-2}(\bar{z} \mathrm{~d} z+z \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}),
\end{align*}
$$

and the mapping $\mu_{\varepsilon}$ induces, on $D_{\varepsilon}$, the metric

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{d} s_{\varepsilon}^{2} & =(\mathrm{d} X(z))^{2}+(\mathrm{d} Y(z))^{2}+\varepsilon(\mathrm{d} Z(z))^{2}=  \tag{2.10}\\
& =4(1+\varepsilon z \bar{z})^{-2} \mathrm{~d} z \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}=-2 \varepsilon \varphi_{1}
\end{align*}
$$

Let us remark that $\mathrm{d} s_{-1}^{2}$ is exactly the complete Caley metric on $D_{-1}$, and $\mathbb{H}^{2}=$ $=\left(D_{-1}, \mathrm{ds} s_{-1}^{2}\right)$ is the hyperbolic plane.
Consider the ,sphere" $S^{2} \subset A^{3}$ given by $X^{2}+Y^{2}+Z^{2}=1$; let $v_{\varepsilon}: Q_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow S^{2}$ be the projection from the origin $O$ and $\pi: S^{2} \rightarrow P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ the usual identification mapping. Comparing (2.2) and (2.7), we see that our net $N^{\varepsilon}$ is induced by the map $\pi \circ v_{\varepsilon} \circ \mu_{\varepsilon}: D_{\varepsilon} \rightarrow P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$, and the lines of $N^{\varepsilon}$ are the images of the isotropic lines of the metric $\mathrm{d} s_{\varepsilon}^{2}$. In this way, the geometric construction of $N^{\varepsilon}$ is fully described.
3. On a domain $D \subset P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$ let an elliptic net $N$ be given. With each point $m \in D$ let us associate a moving frame $\{m, M, \bar{M}\}$ such that $M=m_{1}$ and $\bar{M}=m_{-1}$ are the Laplace transforms; let the analytic points $m, M$ be chosen in such a way that

$$
\begin{equation*}
m=\bar{m}, \quad[m, M, \bar{M}]=\mathrm{i} \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then we may write

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{d} m=\tau_{0}^{0} m+\tau M+\bar{\tau} \bar{M}, \quad \mathrm{~d} M=\tau_{1}^{0} m+\tau_{1}^{1} M+\tau_{1}^{2} \bar{M},  \tag{3.2}\\
& \mathrm{~d} \bar{M}=\tau_{2}^{0} m+\tau_{2}^{1} M+\tau_{2}^{2} \bar{M}
\end{align*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{2}^{0}=\bar{\tau}_{1}^{0}, \quad \tau_{2}^{1}=\bar{\tau}_{1}^{2}, \quad \tau_{2}^{2}=\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1} ; \quad \tau_{0}^{0}=\bar{\tau}_{0}^{0}, \quad \tau_{0}^{0}+\tau_{1}^{1}+\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}=0 ; \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

the last two identities result from (3.1). Further, we have to take into account the integrability conditions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} \tau_{i}^{j}=\sum_{k=0}^{2} \tau_{i}^{k} \wedge \tau_{k}^{j} \quad \text { with } \quad \tau_{0}^{1}:=\tau, \tau_{0}^{2}:=\bar{\tau} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously, the lines of $N$ are given by $\tau \bar{\tau}=0$. The point $M$ being the Laplace transform, we have
(3.5) $\tau_{1}^{2}=a \tau$.

The exterior differentiation yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{\mathrm{d} a+a\left(\tau_{0}^{0}-2 \tau_{1}^{1}+\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}\right)\right\} \wedge \tau-\tau_{1}^{0} \wedge \bar{\tau}=0 . \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

According to Cartan's lemma, there are functions such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} a+a\left(\tau_{0}^{0}-2 \tau_{1}^{1}+\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}\right)=b_{1} \tau-b_{2} \bar{\tau}, \quad \tau_{1}^{0}=b_{2} \tau+b_{3} \bar{\tau} . \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} M=\tau_{1}^{1} M+\tau\left(b_{2} m+a \bar{M}\right)+\bar{\tau} b_{3} m . \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

This means that the second Laplace transorm $m_{2}$ either does not exist (in the case $a=b_{2}=0$ ) or is situated on the straight line $\left\{M, b_{2} m+a \bar{M}\right\}$.

Definition. The elliptic net $N$ will be called special if, at each point $m \in D$, the second Laplace transform $m_{2}$ either does not exist or is situated on the straight line $\left\{m_{1}, m_{-1}\right\}$.

It is easy to see that $N$ is special if and only if

$$
\begin{equation*}
b_{2}=0, \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and this is equivalent to the condition that $m_{-2}$ either does not exist or is situated on the same line $\left\{m_{1}, m_{-1}\right\}$. From now on, let $N$ be a special net.

Let us choose other analytic points

$$
\begin{equation*}
m^{*}=\alpha m, \quad M^{*}=\beta M ; \quad \alpha \beta \bar{\beta}=1 ; \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

the last relation arising from (3.12). Writting down the equations (3.2) with (3.5) + $+\left(3.7_{2}\right)+(3.9)$ and the similar equations $\left(3.2^{*}\right)$, we easily find

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau^{*}=\alpha \beta^{-1} \tau, \quad a^{*}=\alpha^{-1} \beta^{2} \bar{\beta}^{-1} a, \quad b_{3}^{*}=\alpha^{-2} \beta \bar{\beta} b_{3} . \tag{3.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus the forms

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi_{1}=b_{3} \tau \bar{\tau}, \quad \varphi_{-1}=\bar{\beta}_{3} \tau \bar{\tau} \tag{3.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

are invariant; they are exactly the point forms (1.12) of $N$.
Theorem. Let $N$ be an elliptic special net on $P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$. Let us suppose $\varphi_{1}=\varphi_{-1}$ to be an $\mathbb{R}$-valued definite form. If it is positive definite, let it have positive curvature. Then $N=N^{+1}$.
Proof. We have $b_{3}=\bar{b}_{3} \neq 0$ on $P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$; it follows from $\left(3.10_{3}\right)+\left(3.11_{3}\right)$ that
we may choose $b_{3}=-\varepsilon=\mp 1$, i.e., our fundamental equations are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{1}^{2}=a \tau, \quad \tau_{1}^{0}=-\varepsilon \bar{\tau} \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The differential consequences are

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{\mathrm{d} a+a\left(\tau_{0}^{0}-2 \tau_{1}^{1}+\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}\right)\right\} \wedge \tau=0, \quad\left(2 \tau_{0}^{0}-\tau_{1}^{1}-\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}\right) \wedge \bar{\tau}=0 . \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

The complex conjugate of $\left(3.14_{2}\right)$ being $\left(2 \tau_{0}^{0}-\tau_{1}^{1}-\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}\right) \wedge \tau=0$, we have $2 \tau_{0}^{0}-$ $-\tau_{1}^{1}-\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}=0$. Taking into regard $\left(3.3_{5}\right)$, we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{0}^{0}=0, \quad \tau_{1}^{1}+\bar{\tau}_{1}^{1}=0 \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we get, from (3.14 $)$ and Cartan's lemma, the existence of a function $b$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} a-3 a \tau_{1}^{1}=b \tau \tag{3.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The exterior differentiation yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\mathrm{d} b-4 b \tau_{1}^{1}\right) \wedge \tau=-3 a(a \bar{a}+\varepsilon) \tau \wedge \bar{\tau} \tag{3.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the existence of a new function $c$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} b-4 b \tau_{1}^{1}=c \tau+3 a(a \bar{a}+\varepsilon) \tau \wedge \bar{\tau} . \tag{3.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

We have $\varphi_{1}=\varphi_{-1}=-\varepsilon \tau \bar{\tau}$. On $P^{2}(\mathbb{R})$, consider the metric

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} s^{2}:=\left|\varphi_{1}\right|=\tau \bar{\tau}=\left(\omega^{1}\right)^{2}+\left(\omega^{2}\right)^{2} \tag{3.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3.20) $\tau=\omega^{1}+\mathrm{i} \omega^{2}$,
$\omega^{1}$ and $\omega^{2}$ being $\mathbb{R}$-valued 1 -forms. Considering the Hodge *-operator with respect to $\mathrm{d} s^{2}$, we have $* \omega^{1}=\omega^{2}, * \omega^{2}=-\omega^{1}$, i.e.,

$$
\begin{equation*}
* \tau=-\mathrm{i} \tau \tag{3.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further,
(3.22) $\tau \wedge \bar{\tau}=-2 \mathrm{id} o$,
$\mathrm{d} o:=\omega^{1} \wedge \omega^{2}$ being the area element with respect to $\mathrm{d} s^{2}$. Let us calculate the Laplacian of the $\mathbb{R}$-valued function $a \bar{a}$. We have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{d}(a \bar{a})=\bar{a} b \tau+a \bar{b} \bar{\tau}, \quad * \mathrm{~d}(a \bar{a})=-\mathrm{i}(\bar{a} b \tau-a \bar{b} \bar{\tau}),  \tag{3.23}\\
& \mathrm{d} * \mathrm{~d}(a \bar{a})=\Delta(a \bar{a}) \cdot \mathrm{d} o=4\{b \bar{b}+3 a \bar{a}(a \vec{a}+\varepsilon)\} \mathrm{d} o .
\end{align*}
$$

We now have to evaluate the curvature of (3.19). It is well known that there exists exactly one 1 -form $\omega$ such that $\mathrm{d} \omega^{1}=-\omega^{2} \wedge \omega, \mathrm{~d} \omega^{2}=\omega^{1} \wedge \omega$, and the curvature $x$ is given by $\mathrm{d} \omega=-x \omega^{1} \wedge \omega^{2}$. Now, let $\mathrm{d} \tau=\tau \wedge \varrho, \mathrm{d} \varrho=k \tau \wedge \bar{\tau}$. Then $\varrho=\mathrm{i} \omega$, and we get $\varkappa=2 k$ from the second equation. In our particular case, $\varrho=\tau_{1}^{1}$ and $\mathrm{d} \varrho=(a \bar{a}+\varepsilon) \tau \wedge \bar{\tau}$. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=2(a \vec{a}+\varepsilon) . \tag{3.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the case $\varepsilon=1$, we have $a \bar{a}+\varepsilon>0$, and ( $3.23_{3}$ ) yields, via the maximum principle, $a=0$.

In the case $\varepsilon=-1, x>0$ implies the same equation (3.25). However, then (3.24) yields $x=-2$, a contradiction.

The equations (3.18) are now reduced to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau_{1}^{2}=0, \quad \tau_{1}^{0}=-\bar{\tau} \tag{3.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

and we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{d} \tau=\tau \wedge \tau_{1}^{1}, \quad \mathrm{~d} \tau_{1}^{1}=\tau \wedge \bar{\tau} \tag{3.27}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to check that we are in position to satisfy them by taking

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tau=\sqrt{ } 2 \cdot(1+z \bar{z})^{-1} \mathrm{~d} z, \quad \tau_{1}^{1}=-(1+z \bar{z})^{-1}(\bar{z} \mathrm{~d} z-z \mathrm{~d} \bar{z}) . \tag{3.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

The equations (3.2) may be written as

$$
\begin{align*}
& m_{z}=\sqrt{ } 2 \cdot(1+z \bar{z})^{-1} M, \quad M_{z}=-(1+z \bar{z})^{-1} \bar{z} M,  \tag{3.29}\\
& M_{\bar{z}}=-(1+z \bar{z})^{-1}(\sqrt{ } 2 \cdot m-z M)
\end{align*}
$$

and the complex conjugate equation; here we take into account (3.3), (3.15) and (3.26). From $\left(3.29_{2}\right)$ we get the existence of a function $\varphi(\bar{z})$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
M=(1+z \bar{z})^{-1} \varphi(\bar{z}) . \tag{3.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Calculating then $m$ from $\left(3.29_{3}\right)$ and $\bar{M}$ from $(\overline{3.29})$, we get

$$
\begin{align*}
& m=\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{ } 2 \cdot(1+z \bar{z})^{-1}\left\{2 z \varphi(\bar{z})-(1+z \bar{z}) \varphi^{\prime}(\bar{z})\right\},  \tag{3.31}\\
& \bar{M}=-(1+z \bar{z})^{-1} z^{2} \varphi(\bar{z})+z \varphi^{\prime}(\bar{z})-\frac{1}{2}(1+z \bar{z}) \varphi^{\prime \prime}(\bar{z}),
\end{align*}
$$

respectively. Inserting this into $\left(\overline{3.29_{2}}\right)$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi^{\prime \prime \prime}(\bar{z})=0 \text {, i.e., } \varphi(\bar{z})=B_{0}+B_{1} \bar{z}+B_{2} \bar{z}^{2} \quad \text { with } \quad B_{i} \in \mathbb{C} . \tag{3.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
m=\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{ } 2 \cdot(1+z \bar{z})^{-1}\left\{2 B_{0} z+2 B_{2} \bar{z}+B_{1}(z \bar{z}-1)\right\} . \tag{3.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

The condition $m=\bar{m}$ yields $B_{0}+\bar{B}_{2}=0, B_{1}=\bar{B}_{1}$. Put $2 B_{0}=A_{1}-\mathrm{i} A_{2}, B_{1}=$ $=-A_{3}$ with $A_{i} \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
m=\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{ } 2 \cdot(1+z \bar{z})^{-1}\left\{A_{1}(\bar{z}+z)+A_{2} \mathrm{i}(\bar{z}-z)+A_{3}(1-z \bar{z})\right\} . \tag{3.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we get the general solution of $(3.29)+(\overline{3.29})$. Now, it is sufficient to compare it with (2.2) for $\varepsilon=1$. QED.
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