

BEYOND THE UNIQUE PAIR: A TWO-PARAMETER FAMILY OF RATIONAL TRIANGLES WITH EQUAL PERIMETER AND AREA

JESSE ALLEN, OLIVIER BEAUDRY-OGDEN, THÉOPHANE BOUCHARD, MATÉO FRÉLY,
MATILDE LALÍN, ABEL-JIMMY OYONO-MONTOKI, AND BEREND RINGELING

ABSTRACT. We study pairs consisting of a rational isosceles triangle and a rational triangle having a prescribed angle θ , with equal perimeter and equal area. Writing $\rho = \cos(\theta) \in \mathbb{Q}$, we obtain a two-parameter description of the solutions and, for fixed ρ , a family of curves C_ρ which are generically of genus 2. We determine the two singular specializations: there is no genuine pair for $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, while $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$ admits infinitely many genuine pairs. We completely parametrize two natural one-parameter families in which the θ -triangle is isosceles, and prove several density results for values of ρ admitting one or more genuine pairs. For thirty-five explicit values of ρ , Chabauty–Coleman computations determine $C_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$ completely and show that the corresponding pair is unique up to homothety. We also study multiplicity when one triangle is fixed; the condition for a scalene θ -triangle to have two isosceles partners leads to an elliptic $K3$ surface and yields a dense set of such values of ρ . Finally, we construct infinite families with at least four genuine pairs and exhibit examples carrying at least five, and in two cases at least six, genuine pairs.

1. INTRODUCTION

A classical question in the arithmetic of triangles asks for two non-congruent triangles, with rational side lengths, that share both their perimeter and their area. The special case in which one triangle is right and the other is isosceles was posed by Denis Boris as an IBM Research *Ponder This Challenge* [?]. The first systematic answer in a modern form is due to Hirakawa and Matsumura [HM19, HM23], who proved that, up to homothety, there is a *unique* pair consisting of a rational right triangle and a rational isosceles triangle with equal perimeter and equal area, namely the right triangle with sides (135, 352, 377) and the isosceles triangle with sides (132, 366, 366). To prove this, they reduce the problem to the determination of the rational points on a genus 2 curve, which is then made precise by Chabauty’s method. Related work of Andrica and Țurcaș [AT21] treats pairs sharing other pairs of invariants (such as the inradius and circumradius, or the semiperimeter and circumradius), reducing in each case to rational points on a curve of genus 3 that are found by an elliptic-curve Chabauty computation.

The broader problem of finding non-congruent rational triangles with equal perimeter and area has also been studied extensively in the setting of Heron triangles. Kramer and Luca [?] and Bremner [Bre81] constructed parametric families, while van Luijk [?] proved, using an elliptic $K3$ surface, that arbitrarily many Heron triangles can have the same perimeter and area. We emphasize that throughout this paper a rational triangle means a triangle with rational side lengths; its area need not be rational.

In this paper we return to the perimeter and area setting, and consider the natural generalization in which the right angle is replaced by an arbitrary angle.

Date: September 24, 2026.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 11G30; Secondary 14G05, 14H40, 14J28, 11G05.

Key words and phrases. rational triangles, equal perimeter and area, genus-2 curves, Chabauty–Coleman method, Jacobians, Richelot isogenies, elliptic $K3$ surfaces.

Question. Fix θ with $\cos(\theta) = \rho \in \mathbb{Q}$. Do there exist two non-congruent rational triangles, one isosceles and one having an angle θ , with the same perimeter and area?

We call such a pair a *genuine pair*. Equating the two invariants leads to a family of curves

$$C_\rho: y^2 = F_\rho(u),$$

which are generically of genus 2. The discriminant in the u -variable shows that, inside $-1 < \rho < 1$, there are exactly two singular specializations, namely $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$, whose normalizations have genus 1. The right-angle setting of Hirakawa and Matsumura is recovered at $\rho = 0$. (Remark 3.2 recovers their classical pair explicitly.)

Our results address both the existence and the uniqueness of genuine pairs. For $\rho \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (-1, 1)$, let $N(\rho)$ denote the number of distinct genuine pairs, up to homothety, having $\cos(\theta) = \rho$. The two exceptional values discussed above already display very different behaviour. For $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, corresponding to an angle of 60° , there is no genuine pair (Theorem 4.2), while there are infinitely many for $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$ (Theorem 4.5). In fact, by Corollary 4.6,

$$N(\rho) = \infty \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \rho = \frac{47}{49}.$$

We also show that the supplementary angle of 120° , equivalent to $\rho = -\frac{1}{2}$, admits no genuine pair (Remark 4.3).

We also obtain a two-parameter description of the solutions (Theorem 3.1). For a fixed parameter q , the equations expressing equality of perimeter and area lead to a singular cubic curve, and intersecting it with a suitable line gives the parametrization

$$\rho = \rho(t, q) = \frac{q(q+1) + (1-q)(4t^3 - t)}{(q+1) + (1-q)(4t^3 + t)}, \quad u = 2t(1 - \rho).$$

This parametrization is the starting point for both the theoretical constructions and the computational searches carried out in the paper.

In contrast to the infinite family at $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$, we obtain a collection of explicit uniqueness results. For thirty-five values of ρ arising from a rational one-parameter family, we determine all the rational points of C_ρ by Chabauty–Coleman. In each of these cases $\#C_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 10$, but exactly one of these rational points gives a genuine pair. This implies that

$$N(\rho) = 1$$

for each of the thirty-five values listed in Table 1 (Theorem 8.1).

The existence of genuine pairs is a frequent phenomenon. When the θ -triangle is itself isosceles, two natural families arise, according to whether θ is the apex angle or one of the base angles in the θ -triangle. We call these the apex and base families, respectively. The apex family admits a complete rational parametrization (Theorem 5.2), and the corresponding rational values of ρ are dense in $(-1, 1)$ (Corollary 5.3). The base family is also rationally parametrized (Theorem 5.5). Moreover, the set of values $\rho \in (0, 1)$ belonging simultaneously to both families is dense in $(0, 1)$. In particular, the set of rational values $\rho \in (0, 1)$ for which

$$N(\rho) \geq 2$$

is dense in $(0, 1)$ (Theorem 5.7).

We also study a different form of multiplicity, in which one of the two triangles is held fixed. A fixed isosceles triangle has at most one genuine θ -triangle partner, up to congruence (Proposition 6.3). In the opposite direction, a fixed scalene θ -triangle can have at most two genuine isosceles partners, and we obtain an explicit square condition characterizing when the second partner exists (Proposition 6.1). The surface defined by this square condition is birational to an elliptic $K3$ surface (Proposition 7.1). Using a section of infinite order on this surface, we prove that the set

of rational $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ for which a scalene θ -triangle has two distinct genuine isosceles partners is dense in $(-1, 1)$ (Theorem 7.5).

There are families with even higher multiplicities. We construct a rational one-parameter family for which every admissible parameter gives at least four distinct genuine pairs (Theorem 9.1). The resulting values of ρ are dense in the interval

$$\left[\frac{3239209}{6414409}, \frac{85249}{150049} \right]$$

(Corollary 9.2). We also give a second construction, governed by an elliptic curve of rank 1, which produces infinitely many further rational values of ρ carrying at least four distinct genuine pairs (Theorem 9.4).

Our computational search also reveals examples of still higher multiplicity (Proposition 9.5). In particular,

$$N\left(\frac{1952}{3977}\right) \geq 6, \quad N\left(\frac{2619}{5069}\right) \geq 6,$$

while

$$N(\rho) \geq 5$$

for

$$\rho \in \left\{ -\frac{327}{1241}, \frac{613}{1495}, \frac{817}{1969}, \frac{7671}{16121}, \frac{302}{527}, \frac{2341}{4141}, \frac{171}{221} \right\}.$$

The corresponding pairs are displayed in Tables 3 and 4. These are lower bounds: we do not claim that the displayed lists exhaust all genuine pairs for these values of ρ .

The arithmetic techniques behind these results vary considerably with ρ . For fixed ρ , the problem is generically reduced to the determination of rational points on a genus-2 curve. In the rank-1 cases we use Chabauty–Coleman to obtain complete determinations of the rational points, but for many specializations in our computational range a 2-descent does not prove rank 1, so classical Chabauty cannot be applied directly. This difference already appears in the two isosceles families: the Jacobian of the generic apex-family curve has rank 1 over $\mathbb{Q}(t)$ (Proposition 5.4), whereas the Jacobian of the generic base-family curve has rank at least 2 over $\mathbb{Q}(m)$ (Proposition 5.6). Other parts of the paper use elliptic curves and density of their rational points, as well as the elliptic $K3$ surface arising from the second-partner condition. Throughout, one must also separate genuine solutions from degenerate and coincident configurations.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the general configuration and parametrize the two types of triangles. Section 3 develops two complementary parametrizations of the equal-perimeter, equal-area condition, leading both to the genus-2 curves C_ρ and to the two-parameter description of the solutions. In Section 4 we study the two singular specializations $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$. Section 5 is devoted to the apex and base families arising when the θ -triangle is itself isosceles, together with their parametrizations and density properties. In Sections 6 and 7 we study multiplicity when one triangle is fixed and the elliptic $K3$ surface arising from the condition for a second isosceles partner. Section 8 concerns the Mordell–Weil ranks of the Jacobians J_ρ , including the thirty-five rank-1 specializations for which we prove uniqueness. In Section 9 we construct families with four genuine pairs and present examples of higher multiplicity. Finally, Appendix A contains the MAGMA code used for the computational results.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors are grateful to Jennifer Balakrishnan for helpful discussions.

FUNDING SOURCES

BR and ML are grateful to Anthropic for providing access and guidance to CLAUDE MAX during the workshop “AI and number theory” that took place in May 2026 at the American Institute of Mathematics.

This work was partially supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (RGPIN-2022-03651 to ML, Undergraduate Student Research Awards to JA and to AJOM), the Fonds de recherche du Québec - Nature et technologies (Projet de recherche en équipe 345672 to ML, Suppléments aux bourses de 1er cycle en milieu académique du CRSNG to AJOM), the Institut des sciences mathématiques (Postdoctoral Fellowship to BR, Bourse de recherche de premier cycle to OBO), the Centre de recherches mathématiques (Postdoctoral Fellowship to BR), the École Normale Supérieure de Lyon (Stage de recherche to TB and to MF).

DECLARATION OF GENERATIVE AI AND AI-ASSISTED TECHNOLOGIES

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors used artificial intelligence (AI) tools to assist with mathematical discussions, code writing, and manuscript editing.

Anthropic’s CLAUDE contributed to the proof of Proposition 7.1 and assisted in the search of examples, particularly those listed in Theorem 8.1.

OpenAI’s CHATGPT contributed to the proofs for Propositions 5.4 and 5.6, found several of the examples in Theorem 8.1 and Proposition 9.5 and was essential to the discovery of Theorems 9.1 and 9.4. It also provided the final versions of the Magma codes and was used to improve the readability, grammar, and style of the author-drafted text.

The original research questions were entirely directed by the human authors. After using these tools, the authors reviewed, verified, and rewrote all outputs to ensure accuracy and eliminate potential hallucinations. The authors accept full accountability for the content and integrity of the final work.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All code needed to verify the computational results in this article is included in the Appendix.

2. THE GENERAL CONFIGURATION

Let us fix θ with $\cos(\theta) = \rho \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $-1 < \rho < 1$. We start by parametrizing the two families of triangles and continue by imposing the conditions that the perimeters and areas be equal.

2.1. A triangle with angle θ . Let a triangle have rational sides a, b, c with the angle θ between a and b . We will call such a triangle a θ -triangle. We remark that its area is given by $ab\sqrt{1-\rho^2}/2$. By the law of cosines, $c^2 = a^2 + b^2 - 2\rho ab$. We write $x = a/c$, $y = b/c$ and we intersect the conic $1 = x^2 + y^2 - 2\rho xy$ with the line $y = qx + 1$ through $(0, 1)$. After discarding the trivial solution $x = 0$, we obtain the parametrization

$$x = \frac{2(\rho - q)}{q^2 - 2\rho q + 1}, \quad y = \frac{1 - q^2}{q^2 - 2\rho q + 1}.$$

Clearing the common denominator, the triangles of this type are homothetic to those parametrized by

$$\tau(q) = (2(\rho - q), 1 - q^2, q^2 - 2\rho q + 1), \quad q \in \mathbb{Q},$$

with perimeter $2(1 + \rho)(1 - q)$ and area $(\rho - q)(1 - q^2)\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}$. We remark that this gives a non-degenerate triangle (that is, the three sides have positive length and the triangle inequalities are satisfied) if and only if $|q| < 1$ and $\rho > q$.

2.2. An isosceles triangle. Now we consider an isosceles triangle with rational sides $2r, s, s$ and such that its area lies in $\sqrt{1-\rho^2}\mathbb{Q}$ and therefore has height $h\sqrt{1-\rho^2}$ for some $h \in \mathbb{Q}$ with respect to the side $2r$. By Pythagoras' theorem, $s^2 = r^2 + (1-\rho^2)h^2$. This leads to an analogous construction (intersecting the conic $1 = y^2 + (1-\rho^2)x^2$ with the line $y = ux + 1$), and to the parametrization

$$\iota(u) = (2(1-\rho^2-u^2), u^2-\rho^2+1, u^2-\rho^2+1), \quad u \in \mathbb{Q},$$

with perimeter $4(1-\rho^2)$ and area $-2u(1-\rho^2-u^2)\sqrt{1-\rho^2}$. This gives a non-degenerate triangle if and only if $-\sqrt{1-\rho^2} < u < 0$.

3. TWO COMPLEMENTARY GEOMETRIES

3.1. Equating perimeter and area: the fixed ρ parametrization. Scaling the θ -triangle by $k \in \mathbb{Q}^\times$ and equating the two perimeters and the two areas gives

$$(1) \quad \begin{cases} k(1-q) = 2(1-\rho), \\ k^2(\rho-q)(1-q^2) = -2u(1-\rho^2-u^2). \end{cases}$$

Eliminating q and excluding the degenerate cases $\rho = 1, k = 0$ leads to the quadratic equation in k :

$$-2(1-\rho)^2k^2 + \left(2(1-\rho)^3 + (4-u)(1-\rho)^2 + 2u(1-\rho) - u^3\right)k - 4(1-\rho)^3 = 0.$$

Since we are looking for solutions with $k \in \mathbb{Q}$, the quadratic equation has a rational solution if and only if its discriminant $F_\rho(u)$ is a rational square. Thus we reach the curve

$$(2) \quad C_\rho: \quad y^2 = F_\rho(u) = Q_\rho(u) S_\rho(u),$$

where

$$Q_\rho(u) = u^2 - 2(1-\rho)u + \rho^2 - 1$$

and

$$S_\rho(u) = u^4 + 2(1-\rho)u^3 + (1-\rho)(3-5\rho)u^2 - 4(1-\rho)^2(1+\rho)u - 4(1-\rho)^3(1+\rho).$$

A direct discriminant computation gives

$$\text{disc}_u F_\rho = -2^{27}(\rho-1)^{21}(\rho+1)^3(2\rho-1)^2(49\rho-47).$$

Therefore, for $-1 < \rho < 1$, the curve C_ρ is smooth of genus 2 except at $\rho = \frac{1}{2}, \rho = \frac{47}{49}$, where its normalizations have genus 1. For every smooth specialization we write J_ρ for its Jacobian. The curve $C_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$ always has two points at infinity, as well as the following trivial points:

$$(0, \pm 2(1-\rho)^2(1+\rho)) \quad (\text{degenerate}), \quad (\rho-1, \pm 2(\rho-1)^2(2\rho-1)) \quad (\text{coincidence points}),$$

The latter points will be called the *coincidence points*. For $\rho > 0$ they correspond to the configuration $q = 2\rho - 1, k = 1$, where the two triangles coincide. For $\rho \leq 0$ this configuration is non-admissible, but the corresponding rational points of C_ρ are valid and useful.

A solution to the system (1) will be a *genuine pair* if $k\tau(q)$ and $\iota(u)$ are non-degenerate triangles that are non-congruent.

3.2. The complete parametrization with q fixed. We fix $q \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{\pm 1\}$ and consider the system (1) as we eliminate k . This leads to the following cubic equation on u :

$$(3) \quad \Phi_q: \quad u^3 - (1-\rho^2)u - \frac{2(1-\rho)^2(\rho-q)(1+q)}{1-q} = 0.$$

Theorem 3.1. *For every $q \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{\pm 1\}$, the point $(\rho, u) = (1, 0)$ is a node of Φ_q . The rational points of Φ_q other than the node are parametrized by*

$$(4) \quad \rho = \rho(t, q) = \frac{q(q+1) + (1-q)(4t^3 - t)}{(q+1) + (1-q)(4t^3 + t)},$$

for $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $(q+1) + (1-q)(4t^3 + t) \neq 0$.

Proof. We can immediately see that at $(\rho, u) = (1, 0)$ we have $\Phi_q(1, 0) = 0$. We also have $\frac{\partial \Phi_q}{\partial \rho} = 2\rho u - 2\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \frac{(1-\rho)^2(\rho-q)(1+q)}{1-q}$, which is zero at $(1, 0)$ since $\rho = 1$ is a double root in the second term. Finally we have $\frac{\partial \Phi_q}{\partial u} = 3u^2 - (1 - \rho^2)$, which again is zero at $(1, 0)$. The Taylor series around $(\rho, u) = (1, 0)$ is given by

$$\Phi_q(\rho, u) = 2(\rho - 1)(u - (q + 1)(\rho - 1)) + \frac{2(q + 1)}{q - 1}(\rho - 1)^3 + (\rho - 1)^2 u + u^3.$$

Since the degree-two part is a product of two different linear forms, we have two different tangents and a node. Finally, we intersect the equation $\Phi_q(\rho, u) = 0$ with the line $u = 2t(1 - \rho)$ through $(1, 0)$ to get parametrization (4). Moreover, $(1, 0)$ is the only point of Φ_q with $\rho = 1$. Hence every rational point $(\rho, u) \neq (1, 0)$ lies on a unique line of the form $u = 2t(1 - \rho)$, with $t = \frac{u}{2(1-\rho)} \in \mathbb{Q}$. Thus (4) parametrizes all rational points of Φ_q other than the node. $\square$

Remark 3.2 (The right-angle case). The classical right-angle case is recovered directly from the complete parametrization. Taking

$$t = -\frac{5}{12}, \quad q = -\frac{11}{16}, \quad \text{in (4) gives} \quad \rho = 0, \quad u = -\frac{5}{6}.$$

The perimeter equation in (1) then gives $k = \frac{32}{27}$, and

$$k\tau \left(-\frac{11}{16} \right) = \left(\frac{44}{27}, \frac{5}{8}, \frac{377}{216} \right), \quad \iota \left(-\frac{5}{6} \right) = \left(\frac{11}{18}, \frac{61}{36}, \frac{61}{36} \right).$$

Multiplying both triangles by 216 gives

$$(352, 135, 377) \quad \text{and} \quad (132, 366, 366),$$

which, up to reordering of the sides, is precisely the pair of Hirakawa and Matsumura.

4. THE SINGULAR SPECIALIZATIONS OF C_ρ

In this section we treat the two singular specializations of the family C_ρ , namely $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$. In both cases, the normalization of C_ρ has genus 1 and is birational over $\mathbb{Q}$ to an elliptic curve. However, the two cases lead to very different pictures in terms of the number of genuine pairs.

4.1. The case $\rho = 1/2$. The value $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ corresponds to $\theta = \frac{\pi}{3}$. We will show that this case admits no genuine pair, by reducing it to a single elliptic curve of rank zero.

Recall from Section 2 that we wrote $C_\rho: y^2 = F_\rho(u)$. In this case,

$$(5) \quad F_{1/2}(u) = \frac{1}{16}(2u+1)^2 g_{1/2}(u), \quad g_{1/2}(u) = (2u-3)(u-1)(2u^2+3u+3).$$

Setting $w = \frac{4y}{2u+1}$ gives the birational model

$$(6) \quad D_{1/2}: \quad w^2 = g_{1/2}(u).$$

Since $g_{1/2}(u)$ is a squarefree quartic, $D_{1/2}$ is a smooth curve of genus 1 and hence gives the normalization of $C_{1/2}$. It has, for instance, the rational point $(u, w) = (0, 3)$.

Proposition 4.1. *The genus-one curve $D_{1/2}$ is birational over $\mathbb{Q}$ to the elliptic curve*

$$E_{1/2}: Y^2 + XY + Y = X^3 - X^2 - 8X + 11.$$

This is the global minimal model of the elliptic curve with LMFDB label 90.b3 [LMF24]. It has conductor 90, Mordell–Weil rank 0, and $E_{1/2}(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} \cong \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$, generated, for example, by the point $(3, 1)$.

Proof. One can use the point $(0, 3)$ to convert the quartic model to a Weierstrass equation and then further transform it to the global minimal model.

An explicit birational map $D_{1/2} \dashrightarrow E_{1/2}$ is given by

$$X = \frac{3(w + 3 - u)}{2u^2}, \quad Y = \frac{-4u^3 - 3u^2 - 3uw - 18u + 9w + 27}{2u^3}.$$

The inverse map is

$$u = \frac{3(X - 1)}{Y + X + 2}, \quad w = -3 + u + \frac{2Xu^2}{3}.$$

A direct substitution verifies that these maps are inverse to one another on their respective domains of definition and carry the equation of $D_{1/2}$ to that of $E_{1/2}$. $\square$

Theorem 4.2. *For $\theta = \frac{\pi}{3}$, that is, for $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, there is no genuine pair.*

Proof. Let $\overline{D_{1/2}}$ denote the smooth projective model of $D_{1/2}$. By Proposition 4.1, $E_{1/2}(\mathbb{Q}) \cong \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$, generated by $P = (3, 1)$. Its rational points are

$$\mathcal{O}, \quad P = (3, 1), \quad 2P = (1, 1), \quad 3P = (-3, 1), \quad 4P = (1, -3), \quad 5P = (3, -5).$$

Since the birational map of Proposition 4.1 extends to an isomorphism of the smooth projective models, $\overline{D_{1/2}}(\mathbb{Q})$ also has six points:

$$\overline{D_{1/2}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \left\{ (0, 3), (0, -3), (1, 0), \left(\frac{3}{2}, 0\right), \infty_+, \infty_- \right\}.$$

Let $\overline{C_{1/2}}$ denote the projective closure of $C_{1/2}$. The six rational points of $\overline{D_{1/2}}$ map to rational points of $\overline{C_{1/2}}$. Together with the rational singular point $(-\frac{1}{2}, 0)$, they give all the rational points

$$\overline{C_{1/2}}(\mathbb{Q}) = \left\{ \infty_+, \infty_-, \left(0, \frac{3}{4}\right), \left(0, -\frac{3}{4}\right), (1, 0), \left(\frac{3}{2}, 0\right), \left(-\frac{1}{2}, 0\right) \right\}.$$

To obtain a non-degenerate isosceles triangle, we need $-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} = -\sqrt{1 - \rho^2} < u < 0$. The only possible value among those above is $u = -\frac{1}{2}$. However, $u = -\frac{1}{2} = \rho - 1$, which is the coincidence point. Indeed, substituting $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$ and $u = -\frac{1}{2}$ into (1) gives $q = 0$ and $k = 1$, and hence $\iota(-\frac{1}{2}) = \tau(0) = (1, 1, 1)$. Thus this corresponds to the coincidence of the two equilateral triangles.

Thus none of the rational points of $C_{1/2}$ leads to a genuine pair. $\square$

Remark 4.3 (The supplementary angle). It is natural to ask about the supplementary angle $\theta = \frac{2\pi}{3}$, that is, $\rho = -\frac{1}{2}$. In contrast with the 60° case, this is not a singular specialization: $C_{-1/2}$ is a smooth curve of genus 2. In fact,

$$F_{-1/2}(u) = \frac{1}{16}(4u^2 - 12u - 3)(4u^4 + 12u^3 + 33u^2 - 18u - 27),$$

and both factors are irreducible over $\mathbb{Q}$, so $C_{-1/2}$ has no rational Weierstrass point.

A 2-descent gives $\text{rank } J_{-1/2}(\mathbb{Q}) \leq 1$, while the coincidence class has positive canonical height. Hence $\text{rank } J_{-1/2}(\mathbb{Q}) = 1$, and a Chabauty–Coleman computation gives

$$C_{-1/2}(\mathbb{Q}) = \left\{ \infty_+, \infty_-, \left(0, \pm\frac{9}{4}\right), \left(-\frac{3}{2}, \pm 9\right), \left(-\frac{7}{4}, \pm\frac{781}{64}\right) \right\};$$

see Appendix A.1. For $\rho = -\frac{1}{2}$, a non-degenerate isosceles triangle requires

$$-\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} < u < 0.$$

None of the three affine u -coordinates above lies in this interval. Hence the 120° case admits no genuine pair.

4.2. The case $\rho = 47/49$. We now consider the second singular specialization $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$. In contrast with the case $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, we will show that this case admits infinitely many genuine pairs, by reducing it to a single elliptic curve of rank one.

At $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$, we have

$$(7) \quad F_{47/49}(u) = \frac{1}{49^6} (49u + 8)^2 g_{47/49}(u),$$

where

$$g_{47/49}(u) = (49u - 16)(49u + 12)(2401u^2 - 588u - 48).$$

Setting $w = \frac{49^3 y}{49u + 8}$ gives the birational model

$$(8) \quad D_{47/49}: \quad w^2 = g_{47/49}(u).$$

The quartic $g_{47/49}(u)$ is squarefree, so $D_{47/49}$ is a smooth curve of genus 1 and hence gives the normalization of $C_{47/49}$. It has, for instance, the rational point $(u, w) = (\frac{16}{49}, 0)$.

Proposition 4.4. *The genus-one curve $D_{47/49}$ is birational over $\mathbb{Q}$ to the elliptic curve*

$$E_{47/49}: \quad Y^2 = X^3 - 348X + 2497.$$

This is the global minimal model of the elliptic curve with LMFDB label 1260.d4 [LMF24]. It has conductor 1260, Mordell–Weil rank 1, and $E_{47/49}(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} \cong \mathbb{Z}/6\mathbb{Z}$. A generator of the free part is $G = (6, 25)$, and a generator of the torsion subgroup is $T = (26, 105)$.

Proof. One can use the point $(\frac{16}{49}, 0)$ to convert the quartic model to a Weierstrass equation and then further transform it to the global minimal model.

An explicit birational map $D_{47/49} \dashrightarrow E_{47/49}$ is given by

$$X = \frac{4(147u - 41)}{49u - 16}, \quad Y = \frac{7w}{(49u - 16)^2}.$$

The inverse map is

$$u = \frac{4(4X - 41)}{49(X - 12)}, \quad w = \frac{112Y}{(X - 12)^2}.$$

A direct substitution verifies that these maps are inverse to one another on their respective domains of definition and carry the equation of $D_{47/49}$ to that of $E_{47/49}$. The arithmetic invariants of $E_{47/49}$ are recorded in the LMFDB [LMF24]. $\square$

Theorem 4.5. *For $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$, there are infinitely many distinct genuine pairs.*

Proof. Consider the point $Q = -2G = (\frac{276}{25}, \frac{101}{125}) \in E_{47/49}(\mathbb{Q})$. Since G has infinite order, so does Q . We will show that Q corresponds to a genuine pair.

Using the inverse birational map in Proposition 4.4, this corresponds to $(u, w) = (-\frac{79}{294}, \frac{3535}{36}) \in D_{47/49}(\mathbb{Q})$. One of the two corresponding q -parameters is $q = \frac{421}{448}$, and (1) gives $k = \frac{256}{189}$. The associated pair is

$$\iota\left(-\frac{79}{294}\right) = \left(\frac{671}{43218}, \frac{1879}{12348}, \frac{1879}{12348}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad k\tau\left(\frac{421}{448}\right) = \left(\frac{488}{9261}, \frac{869}{5488}, \frac{112879}{1037232}\right).$$

Moreover, $-1 < \frac{421}{448} < \frac{47}{49} < 1$ and $-\frac{8\sqrt{3}}{49} = -\sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{47}{49}\right)^2} < -\frac{79}{294} < 0$. Thus both triangles are non-degenerate. The first is isosceles and the second is scalene, so they are non-congruent. Hence this is a genuine pair.

We now show that there are infinitely many such pairs. Since $E_{47/49}(\mathbb{Q})$ has rank 1 by Proposition 4.4, it has infinitely many rational points. By the Poincaré–Hurwitz theorem [Sko50, Satz 11, p. 78], every real neighbourhood of a rational point of $E_{47/49}$ contains infinitely many rational points of $E_{47/49}$.

The birational maps above, together with the correspondence of Sections 2 and 3, are regular in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of Q . Since the inequalities defining a genuine pair are strict, genuineness is an open condition. Thus there is a real neighbourhood of Q in which every rational point gives a genuine pair. By the Poincaré–Hurwitz theorem, this neighbourhood contains infinitely many rational points of $E_{47/49}$.

Finally, $u = \frac{4(4X-41)}{49(X-12)}$ is a nonconstant rational function on $E_{47/49}$ and therefore has finite fibres. Hence infinitely many of these rational points give distinct values of u , and therefore distinct isosceles triangles and distinct genuine pairs. $\square$

Corollary 4.6. *Let $N(\rho)$ denote the number of distinct genuine pairs, up to homothety, for a fixed $\rho \in \mathbb{Q} \cap (-1, 1)$. Then*

$$N(\rho) = \infty \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \rho = \frac{47}{49}.$$

Proof. If $\rho \notin \{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{47}{49}\}$, then C_ρ is a smooth curve of genus 2. By Faltings’ theorem [Fal83, Fal84], $C_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$ is finite, and hence only finitely many genuine pairs can occur. For $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, Theorem 4.2 shows that there are no genuine pairs, whereas Theorem 4.5 gives infinitely many for $\rho = \frac{47}{49}$. $\square$

5. WHEN THE θ -TRIANGLE IS ISOSCELES

In this section we consider two important families arising when the θ -triangle $\tau(q)$ is itself isosceles, but is not homothetic to $\iota(u)$. We first determine all values of q for which $\tau(q)$ is isosceles.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\tau(q) = (2(\rho - q), 1 - q^2, q^2 - 2\rho q + 1)$ be a non-degenerate rational θ -triangle. Apart from the coincidence case $q = 2\rho - 1$, the triangle $\tau(q)$ is isosceles if and only if*

$$q = 0 \quad \text{with } \rho > 0, \quad \text{or} \quad q = 1 - \sqrt{2(1 - \rho)} \quad \text{with } \sqrt{2(1 - \rho)} \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Proof. Set $s = \sqrt{2(1 - \rho)}$. Equating the three possible pairs of sides of $\tau(q)$ gives $q \in \{1 - s, 1 + s, 0, \rho, 2\rho - 1, -1\}$. The values $q = \rho$ and $q = -1$ give degenerate triangles, while $q = 1 + s$ does not satisfy the admissibility conditions $|q| < 1$. The value $q = 2\rho - 1$ is admissible precisely when $\rho > 0$ and gives the coincidence case.

For $q = 0$, the admissibility conditions reduce to $\rho > 0$. Finally, if $q = 1 - s$, then $-1 < \rho < 1$ implies $0 < s < 2$, and hence $-1 < q < 1$. Moreover, $\rho - q = \frac{s(2-s)}{2} > 0$. Thus $q = 1 - s$ is admissible. This proves the result. $\square$

The family with $q = 1 - s$ and $s = \sqrt{2(1 - \rho)}$ occurs whenever $-1 < \rho < 1$ and $2(1 - \rho) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. It corresponds to the case where θ is the apex angle of an isosceles θ -triangle. In this case, the equations of (1) become $k = s$ and $4u^3 - s^2(4 - s^2)u - s^4(2 - s)^2 = 0$. The second equation factors as

$$(9) \quad (2u + s(2 - s))(2u^2 - s(2 - s)u - s^3(2 - s)) = 0.$$

The linear factor gives a pair of congruent triangles. Thus a non-coincidence rational solution can occur only when the quadratic factor has rational roots, that is, when $(2 - s)(2 + 7s) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Setting

$w = \sqrt{(2-s)(2+7s)}$, the two remaining roots are

$$(10) \quad u_{\pm} = \frac{s}{4}(2-s \pm w).$$

Since $0 < s < 2$, we have $w > 2-s$, and hence $u_+ > 0$ and $u_- < 0$. Therefore only u_- can give a non-degenerate isosceles triangle.

Thus this family of genuine pairs is governed by the conditions $2(1-\rho) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and $(2-s)(2+7s) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, where $-1 < \rho < 1$ and $\rho \neq \frac{1}{2}$. We will call this the *apex family*.

The family with $q = 0$ occurs when $0 < \rho < 1$, equivalently when $0 < \theta < \frac{\pi}{2}$. Notice that in this case, the equations of (1) become $k = 2(1-\rho)$ and $u^3 - (1-\rho^2)u - 2\rho(1-\rho)^2 = 0$. The second equation factors as

$$(11) \quad (u + (1-\rho))(u^2 - (1-\rho)u - 2\rho(1-\rho)) = 0.$$

The first factor gives the coincidence point $u = \rho - 1$. Thus a non-coincidence rational solution can occur only when the quadratic factor has rational roots, that is, when $(1-\rho)(1+7\rho) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Setting $w = \sqrt{(1-\rho)(1+7\rho)}$, the two remaining roots are

$$(12) \quad u_{\pm} = \frac{(1-\rho) \pm w}{2}.$$

Since $w^2 - (1-\rho)^2 = 8\rho(1-\rho) > 0$, we have $w > 1-\rho$, and hence $u_+ > 0$ and $u_- < 0$. Therefore, only u_- can give a non-degenerate isosceles triangle.

Thus this family of genuine pairs is governed by the conditions $(1-\rho)(1+7\rho) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$, where $0 < \rho < 1$, and $\rho \neq \frac{1}{2}$. In this case, θ is one of the two angles adjacent to the base of an isosceles θ -triangle. We will call this the *base family*.

Apart from these two families and the coincidence case $q = 2\rho - 1$, every non-degenerate θ -triangle is scalene.

5.1. The apex family. Assume that $2(1-\rho) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and let $s = \sqrt{2(1-\rho)}$. By Lemma 5.1 and the preceding discussion, this corresponds to the apex family. We now parametrize the square condition $(2-s)(2+7s) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$.

Theorem 5.2. *The apex family is completely parametrized by*

$$(13) \quad s_A(t) = \frac{2(t+1)}{2t^2+t+1}, \quad \rho_A(t) = \frac{4t^4+4t^3+3t^2-2t-1}{(2t^2+t+1)^2},$$

where $t \in (-1, 0) \cap \mathbb{Q}$, and $t \neq -\frac{1}{2}$. For every such t , these formulas give a genuine apex pair, and every genuine apex pair arises uniquely in this way.

Proof. The conic $w^2 = (2-s)(2+7s)$ contains the rational point $(0, 2)$. Intersecting it with the line $w = 2 - (4t+1)s$ gives, after removing the solution $s = 0$,

$$s = \frac{2(t+1)}{2t^2+t+1}, \quad w = -\frac{4t(t+2)}{2t^2+t+1}.$$

Hence

$$\rho = 1 - \frac{s^2}{2} = \frac{4t^4+4t^3+3t^2-2t-1}{(2t^2+t+1)^2}.$$

Taking the root u_- in (10) gives $u = ts^2$. Since $2t^2+t+1 > 0$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$, the condition $0 < s < 2$ is equivalent to $t > -1$ and $t \neq 0$. Since $u < 0$ is necessary for a non-degenerate isosceles triangle, we must also have $t < 0$. Thus $-1 < t < 0$. For such t , $1 - \rho^2 - u^2 = \frac{-16t^3(t+1)^2}{(2t^2+t+1)^4} > 0$, so $\iota(u)$ is non-degenerate. Moreover, $q = 1 - s$ satisfies $|q| < 1$, and $\rho - q = \frac{s(2-s)}{2} > 0$, so the θ -triangle is also non-degenerate.

It remains to exclude the congruent case. The root of the linear factor in (9) is $-\frac{s(2-s)}{2}$, and $u + \frac{s(2-s)}{2} = \frac{4t(t+1)(2t+1)}{(2t^2+t+1)^2}$. Thus, for $-1 < t < 0$, the quadratic branch meets the congruent branch only when $t = -\frac{1}{2}$. At this value, $s = 1, \rho = \frac{1}{2}, q = 0$, and $u = -\frac{1}{2}$, and both triangles are equilateral. Hence $t = -\frac{1}{2}$ must be excluded, while every other rational $t \in (-1, 0)$ gives a genuine apex pair.

Conversely, every genuine apex pair comes from the quadratic factor in (9), and hence from a rational point on the conic $w^2 = (2-s)(2+7s)$. The parameter t is uniquely determined by $t = \frac{u}{s^2} = \frac{u}{2(1-\rho)}$. Therefore every genuine apex pair occurs uniquely in the stated parametrization. $\square$

Corollary 5.3. *The set of rational values $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ admitting a genuine apex pair is dense in $(-1, 1)$.*

Proof. The function

$$\rho_A(t) = \frac{4t^4 + 4t^3 + 3t^2 - 2t - 1}{(2t^2 + t + 1)^2}$$

satisfies

$$\rho'_A(t) = \frac{8t(t+1)(t+2)}{(2t^2 + t + 1)^3} < 0 \quad (-1 < t < 0),$$

and

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow -1^+} \rho_A(t) = 1, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^-} \rho_A(t) = -1.$$

Hence ρ_A maps $(-1, 0)$ homeomorphically onto $(-1, 1)$. Every nonempty open subinterval therefore has a nonempty open preimage, which contains a rational $t \neq -\frac{1}{2}$. By Theorem 5.2, the corresponding rational value $\rho_A(t)$ admits a genuine apex pair. $\square$

Proposition 5.4. *Let J^A be the Jacobian of the generic apex-family curve $C_{\rho(t)}: y^2 = F_{\rho(t)}(u)$ over $\mathbb{Q}(t)$, where $s(t) = \frac{2(t+1)}{2t^2+t+1}$ and $\rho(t) = 1 - \frac{1}{2}s(t)^2$. Then $\text{rank } J^A(\mathbb{Q}(t)) = 1$.*

Proof. For computational convenience, we set $n = -\frac{1}{t}$ and $A = n^2 - n + 1$. Since $\mathbb{Q}(n) = \mathbb{Q}(t)$, it is enough to determine the rank over $\mathbb{Q}(n)$. In terms of n , we have $s = \frac{2n(n-1)}{n^2-n+2}$. After the change of variables

$$X = \frac{(n^2 - n + 2)^2}{4n(n-1)}u, \quad Y = \frac{(n^2 - n + 2)^6}{64n^3(n-1)^3}y,$$

the generic apex curve becomes

$$\mathcal{C}_A: Y^2 = G_1(X)G_2(X)G_3(X),$$

where $G_1(X) = (X-n)(X+1)$, $G_2(X) = (X+n-1)(X-A)$, and $G_3(X) = X^2 + AX + n(n-1)A$. The identities in this proof are verified by direct computation in Appendix A.2. The factorization $G_1G_2G_3$ defines a Richelot isogeny $\phi: J^A \rightarrow \hat{J}^A$ over $\mathbb{Q}(n)$; see, for example, [BD11, Section 4]. Indeed, the determinant of the coefficient matrix of G_1, G_2, G_3 is n^2R , where $R = n^4 - 6n^3 + 13n^2 - 13n + 7$, which is nonzero in $\mathbb{Q}(n)$. In particular, the kernel of ϕ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}(n)$.

We now apply the specialization argument of [Sto19, Section 5]. In particular, [Sto19, Remark 5.4] states that the isogeny–dual-isogeny argument of Remark 5.3 applies to genus-2 Jacobians admitting a Richelot isogeny whose kernel is rational over the function field.

For the present family, the discriminant of $G_1G_2G_3$ factors as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{disc}_X(G_1G_2G_3) = & -n^{12}(n-1)^{12}(n-2)^2(n+1)^2(2n-1)^2 \\ & \times (n^2 - n + 1)^3(n^2 - n + 2)^6 \\ & \times (3n^2 - 3n - 1)(3n^2 - 3n + 2)^2. \end{aligned}$$

For the dual Richelot construction, put

$$\widehat{G}_1 = [G_2, G_3], \quad \widehat{G}_2 = [G_3, G_1], \quad \widehat{G}_3 = [G_1, G_2],$$

where $[F, G] = F'G - FG'$. Up to the usual scalar factor given by the Richelot determinant, the dual curve is defined by $\widehat{G}_1\widehat{G}_2\widehat{G}_3$. This scalar factor introduces no additional irreducible divisors beyond those already appearing below. A direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{disc}_X(\widehat{G}_1\widehat{G}_2\widehat{G}_3) &= 2^6 n^{36} (n-1)^6 (n-2)(n+1)^4 (2n-1) \\ &\quad \times (n^2 - n + 1)^3 (n^2 - n + 2)^3 \\ &\quad \times (3n^2 - 3n - 1)^2 (3n^2 - 3n + 2) R^{12}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $K = \mathbb{Q}(n)$. Since the kernels of ϕ and $\widehat{\phi}$ are K -rational of order 4, after choosing generators their Kummer descent targets may be identified with subgroups of $(K^\times/K^{\times 2})^2$ for each of ϕ and $\widehat{\phi}$. We denote the corresponding descent maps by δ_ϕ and $\delta_{\widehat{\phi}}$.

As in the specialization argument of [Sto19, Section 5, Remarks 5.3–5.4], the coordinates of these descent maps are represented by square classes unramified away from 2 and the prime divisors in $\mathbb{Z}[n]$ of the discriminants of the two Richelot models. Hence the images of both descent maps are contained in a finite product of copies of the subgroup $V \subset K^\times/K^{\times 2}$ generated by

$$\begin{aligned} &-1, \ 2, \ n, \ n-1, \ n+1, \ n-2, \ 2n-1, \\ &n^2 - n + 1, \ n^2 - n + 2, \ 3n^2 - 3n - 1, \ 3n^2 - 3n + 2, \ R. \end{aligned}$$

We now specialize at $n = 12$ or equivalently, $t = -\frac{1}{12}$. The preceding generators specialize to

$$-1, \ 2, \ 12, \ 11, \ 13, \ 10, \ 23, \ 133, \ 134, \ 395, \ 398, \ 12091.$$

Their square classes are linearly independent in $\mathbb{Q}^\times/\mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} 12 &\sim 3, & 133 &= 7 \cdot 19, & 134 &= 2 \cdot 67, \\ 395 &= 5 \cdot 79, & 398 &= 2 \cdot 199, & 12091 &= 107 \cdot 113. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, in any relation among these square classes, the primes 3, 11, 13, 23, 19, 67, 79, 199, 107 successively force the exponents of 12, 11, 13, 23, 133, 134, 395, 398, 12091 to vanish. The prime 5 then forces the exponent of 10 to vanish, the prime 2 forces the exponent of 2 to vanish, and finally the sign forces the exponent of -1 to vanish. Hence specialization at $n = 12$ is injective on V , and therefore coordinatewise on the square-class bounding groups for the Richelot descent and its dual.

Moreover, the Richelot determinant and both discriminants above are nonzero at $n = 12$. Hence the kernels of the Richelot isogeny and its dual specialize without degeneration. Since each kernel has four geometric points and all four are already rational over $\mathbb{Q}(n)$, specialization is surjective on these kernel groups.

Thus the hypotheses of the isogeny–dual-isogeny specialization argument of [Sto19, Corollary 5.2 and Remarks 5.3–5.4] are satisfied: specialization is injective on the square-class bounding groups for the two descents and surjective on the two kernel groups. Therefore the specialization homomorphism $J^A(\mathbb{Q}(n)) \rightarrow J_{12}^A(\mathbb{Q})$ is injective.

At $n = 12$ we have $t = -\frac{1}{12}$ and $\rho = -\frac{4223}{4489}$. Let J_{12}^A denote the Jacobian of this specialization. A 2-descent gives $\text{rank } J_{12}^A(\mathbb{Q}) \leq 1$. On the other hand, the divisor class obtained from the coincidence point has positive canonical height, and hence infinite order. Therefore $\text{rank } J_{12}^A(\mathbb{Q}) = 1$. Since specialization is injective, this gives $\text{rank } J^A(\mathbb{Q}(n)) \leq 1$.

It remains to prove the opposite inequality. Let $P = (\rho - 1, 2(\rho - 1)^2(2\rho - 1))$ be one of the coincidence points on the generic curve, and choose one of the rational points at infinity, say ∞_+ . Then $[P - \infty_+] \in J^A(\mathbb{Q}(n))$. Its specialization at $n = 12$ is the coincidence class considered above,

which has positive canonical height and therefore infinite order. Consequently $[P - \infty_+]$ cannot be torsion over $\mathbb{Q}(n)$. Thus $\text{rank } J^A(\mathbb{Q}(n)) \geq 1$.

Since $\mathbb{Q}(n) = \mathbb{Q}(t)$, combining the two inequalities gives

$$\text{rank } J^A(\mathbb{Q}(t)) = 1.$$

□

5.2. The base family. Assume that $q = 0$, $0 < \rho < 1$ with $\rho \neq \frac{1}{2}$, and $(1 - \rho)(1 + 7\rho) \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$ and let $w = \sqrt{(1 - \rho)(1 + 7\rho)}$. By Lemma 5.1, this corresponds to the base family.

Theorem 5.5. *The base family is completely parametrized by*

$$\rho_B(m) = \frac{6 - 2m}{m^2 + 7}, \quad u_B(m) = \frac{(m + 1)(m - 3)}{m^2 + 7},$$

where $m \in (-1, 3) \cap \mathbb{Q}$, and $m \neq 1$. For every such m , these formulas give a genuine base pair, and every genuine base pair arises uniquely in this way.

Proof. The conic $w^2 = (1 - \rho)(1 + 7\rho)$ contains the rational point $(0, 1)$. Intersecting it with the line $w = 1 + m\rho$ gives

$$\rho = \frac{6 - 2m}{m^2 + 7}, \quad w = \frac{(7 - m)(m + 1)}{m^2 + 7}.$$

Taking the root u_- in (12) gives $u = \frac{(m+1)(m-3)}{m^2+7}$. The conditions $0 < \rho < 1$ and $w > 0$ are equivalent to $-1 < m < 3$. For such m , we have $u < 0$ and $1 - \rho^2 - u^2 = \frac{4(m+1)^3}{(m^2+7)^2} > 0$, so $\iota(u)$ is non-degenerate. Since $\rho > 0$, the triangle $\tau(0)$ is also non-degenerate.

Finally, $u - (\rho - 1) = \frac{2(m-1)(m+1)}{m^2+7}$, so the pair is coincident exactly when $m = 1$, corresponding to $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$. Excluding this value gives a genuine pair.

Conversely, from (11), every genuine base pair must arise from $u^2 - (1 - \rho)u - 2\rho(1 - \rho) = 0$. Choosing the positive square root w and parametrizing as before gives $m = (w - 1)/\rho$ uniquely, so every genuine base pair occurs uniquely in the stated parametrization. □

Proposition 5.6. *Let J^B be the Jacobian of the generic base-family curve $C_{\rho(m)}: y^2 = F_{\rho(m)}(u)$ over $\mathbb{Q}(m)$, where $\rho(m) = \frac{6-2m}{m^2+7}$. Then $\text{rank } J^B(\mathbb{Q}(m)) \geq 2$.*

Proof. In addition to the genuine base point of Theorem 5.5,

$$P_B(m) = \left(\frac{(m + 1)(m - 3)}{m^2 + 7}, \frac{2(m - 1)(m + 1)^4(m + 5)}{(m^2 + 7)^3} \right),$$

the curve has the coincidence point

$$P_c(m) = \left(-\frac{(m + 1)^2}{m^2 + 7}, -\frac{2(m - 1)(m + 1)^4(m + 5)}{(m^2 + 7)^3} \right).$$

Choosing one of the rational points at infinity, say ∞_+ , we obtain the divisor classes in $J^B(\mathbb{Q}(m))$ $D_B(m) = [P_B(m) - \infty_+]$, and $D_c(m) = [P_c(m) - \infty_+]$. We prove that these two classes are independent by specializing at $m = \frac{7}{3}$ and $\rho = \frac{3}{28}$. At this specialization,

$$P_B = \left(-\frac{5}{28}, \frac{6875}{5488} \right), \quad P_c = \left(-\frac{25}{28}, -\frac{6875}{5488} \right).$$

The specialized curve is smooth. A canonical-height computation in MAGMA (see Appendix A.3) gives

$$\hat{h}(D_c) = 0.8666169291607799 \dots, \quad \hat{h}(D_B) = 1.9604493795720781 \dots,$$

and $\langle D_c, D_B \rangle = 0.5827133855804506 \dots$. Hence the determinant of their Néron–Tate height-pairing matrix is

$$\widehat{h}(D_c)\widehat{h}(D_B) - \langle D_c, D_B \rangle^2 = 1.3594037313652797 \dots > 0.$$

Thus the specialized classes are independent modulo torsion.

If $D_c(m)$ and $D_B(m)$ were dependent modulo torsion in $J^B(\mathbb{Q}(m))$, then, after multiplying by the order of the torsion class, we would obtain a nontrivial integral relation between them. Specializing at $m = 7/3$ would give the same relation between the two specialized classes, contradicting the positive determinant above. Therefore $D_c(m)$ and $D_B(m)$ are independent in $J^B(\mathbb{Q}(m))$ modulo torsion, and we conclude that $\text{rank } J^B(\mathbb{Q}(m)) \geq 2$. $\square$

5.3. The intersection of both families.

Theorem 5.7. *The set of rational values $\rho \in (0, 1)$ having at least two distinct genuine pairs is dense in $(0, 1)$. More precisely, these values may be chosen so that one genuine pair belongs to the apex family and the other belongs to the base family.*

Proof. Recall from Theorem 5.2 that the apex family is parametrized by $\rho_A(t)$ satisfying (13). Such a value also belongs to the base family precisely when $(1 - \rho_A(t))(1 + 7\rho_A(t))$ is a rational square. A direct substitution gives

$$(1 - \rho_A(t))(1 + 7\rho_A(t))(2t^2 + t + 1)^4 = 4(t + 1)^2(16t^4 + 16t^3 + 13t^2 - 6t - 3).$$

Thus the simultaneous apex–base condition is governed by the genus-one curve

$$\mathcal{E} : \quad v^2 = 16t^4 + 16t^3 + 13t^2 - 6t - 3.$$

This quartic is birational over $\mathbb{Q}$ to the elliptic curve

$$E : \quad Y^2 + XY + Y = X^3 + 2X + 32.$$

An explicit birational map $\mathcal{E} \dashrightarrow E$ is given by

$$X = 8t^2 + 4t - 2v + 1, \quad Y = -32t^3 - 28t^2 + 8tv - 15t + 3v + 2,$$

with inverse

$$t = \frac{7 - 3X - 2Y}{8X + 10}, \quad v = 4t^2 + 2t + \frac{1 - X}{2}.$$

A direct substitution verifies that these maps carry the equation of $\mathcal{E}$ to that of E on their respective domains of definition.

The displayed equation is the global minimal model of the elliptic curve with LMFDB label 294.c2 [LMF24]. It has Mordell–Weil rank 1 and discriminant $\Delta_E = -444528 < 0$. Thus $E(\mathbb{R})$ is connected, and since $E(\mathbb{Q})$ has positive rank, its rational points are dense in $E(\mathbb{R})$ by the Poincaré–Hurwitz theorem [Sko50, Satz 11, p. 78]. Equivalently, $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{Q})$ is dense in $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R})$.

We now determine the range of the corresponding values of ρ . Differentiating gives $\rho'_A(t) = \frac{8t(t+1)(t+2)}{(2t^2+t+1)^3}$. Thus $\rho'_A(t) < 0$ ($-1 < t < 0$). Since $\rho_A(-1) = 1$, $\rho_A(0) = -1$, there is a unique $t_0 \in (-1, 0)$ for which $\rho_A(t_0) = 0$, and $\rho_A : (-1, t_0) \rightarrow (0, 1)$ is a homeomorphism.

For every $t \in (-1, t_0)$ the identity above gives $16t^4 + 16t^3 + 13t^2 - 6t - 3 > 0$, because $0 < \rho_A(t) < 1$. Hence the real curve $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R})$ has points above every $t \in (-1, t_0)$.

Let $U \subset (0, 1)$ be a nonempty open interval. Then $I_U := \rho_A^{-1}(U)$ is a nonempty open subinterval of $(-1, t_0)$. Removing $t = -\frac{1}{2}$ if necessary still leaves a nonempty open set. The corresponding subset $\{(t, v) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathbb{R}) : t \in I_U, t \neq -\frac{1}{2}\}$ is therefore nonempty and open. It contains infinitely many rational points, since the rational points are dense.

For any such rational point (t, v) , the value $\rho = \rho_A(t)$ is rational and, by Theorem 5.2, gives a genuine apex pair. Furthermore,

$$(1 - \rho)(1 + 7\rho) = \left(\frac{2(t+1)v}{(2t^2 + t + 1)^2} \right)^2,$$

so ρ also satisfies the base-family condition. Since $0 < \rho < 1$ and $\rho \neq \frac{1}{2}$, Theorem 5.5 gives a genuine base pair.

These two pairs are distinct: in the first the angle θ is the apex angle of the isosceles θ -triangle, whereas in the second it is a base angle. A non-degenerate isosceles triangle can have θ both as an apex angle and as a base angle only in the equilateral case $\rho = \frac{1}{2}$, which has been excluded.

Finally, each value of t gives at most two points $(t, \pm v)$ on $\mathcal{E}$, while ρ_A is strictly monotone on $(-1, t_0)$. Thus the infinitely many rational points above I_U yield infinitely many distinct values of ρ in U . This proves the result. $\square$

6. MULTIPLICITY WHEN ONE TRIANGLE IS FIXED

In this section we study multiplicity from the point of view of one fixed triangle, rather than only the angle. That is, we ask how many triangles of the other type can have the same perimeter and area.

6.1. Fixed θ -triangle. Fix ρ and q such that $\tau(q)$ is non-degenerate. Recall that the scaling factor is fixed by $k = \frac{2(1-\rho)}{1-q}$ from the equality of perimeters.

Suppose that $k\tau(q)$ and $\iota(u_0)$ form a genuine pair. By (4), there is a uniquely determined $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $u_0 = 2t(1 - \rho)$.

We first treat the case in which the fixed θ -triangle is scalene.

Proposition 6.1. *Suppose that $k\tau(q)$ is scalene and that $(k\tau(q), \iota(u_0))$ is a genuine pair. Put*

$$\Delta_{t,q} = -(q-1)(q+2t+1)(3q^2t^2 + q^2 - 2qt^3 + 2q + 2t^3 - 3t^2 + 1).$$

Then the fixed triangle $k\tau(q)$ has a second genuine rational isosceles partner if and only if $\Delta_{t,q} \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. When this condition holds, the second partner is $\iota(u_1)$, where

$$u_1 = \frac{-u_0 - \sqrt{4(1-\rho^2) - 3u_0^2}}{2}.$$

In particular, a fixed scalene θ -triangle has at most two genuine rational isosceles partners.

Proof. Since u_0 is a root of the cubic Φ_q in (3), we have

$$\Phi_q(u) = (u - u_0)(u^2 + u_0u + u_0^2 - (1 - \rho^2)).$$

Thus the two remaining roots are rational if and only if $\delta := 4(1 - \rho^2) - 3u_0^2 \in \mathbb{Q}^{\times 2}$. Substituting $\rho = \rho(t, q)$ and $u_0 = 2t(1 - \rho)$, gives

$$\delta = \frac{4\Delta_{t,q}}{(4qt^3 + qt - q - 4t^3 - t - 1)^2}.$$

Hence δ is a nonzero rational square if and only if $\Delta_{t,q}$ is a nonzero rational square.

Assume this condition holds. The two remaining roots are $u_{\pm} = \frac{-u_0 \pm \sqrt{\delta}}{2}$. Because the original pair is genuine, $-\sqrt{1 - \rho^2} < u_0 < 0$. It follows immediately that $u_+ > 0$, so u_+ does not lead to a non-degenerate isosceles triangle.

For the other root, since $\delta - u_0^2 = 4(1 - \rho^2 - u_0^2) > 0$, we have $\sqrt{\delta} > -u_0$, and hence $u_- < 0$. Moreover, one can directly check that $(-u_0 + 2\sqrt{1 - \rho^2})^2 > 4(1 - \rho^2) - 3u_0^2$. Therefore $u_- > -\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}$ and $\iota(u_-)$ is non-degenerate.

Finally, $k\tau(q)$ is scalene whereas $\iota(u_-)$ is isosceles, so the two triangles cannot be congruent. Thus $u_- = u_1$ gives a second genuine pair. Conversely, any second rational isosceles partner must come from one of the two remaining roots of Φ_q , so the square condition is necessary. $\square$

Remark 6.2. The assumption that the fixed θ -triangle is scalene is essential. If $k\tau(q)$ is isosceles and u_0 gives a genuine pair, then the other admissible negative root of Φ_q corresponds to the congruent pair. Thus an isosceles θ -triangle does not acquire a second genuine partner from Proposition 6.1.

6.2. Fixed isosceles triangle. We now consider the reverse question. Fix ρ and a non-degenerate isosceles triangle $\iota(u)$, and ask how many θ -triangles can have the same perimeter and area. In contrast with the situation of Proposition 6.1, there is no multiplicity up to congruence.

Proposition 6.3. *Fix $-1 < \rho < 1$ and $-\sqrt{1-\rho^2} < u < 0$. Suppose that $(k\tau(q), \iota(u))$ is a genuine pair. Then any other solution $k'\tau(q')$ for the same fixed isosceles triangle is congruent to $k\tau(q)$. More precisely, the only possible second set of parameters is*

$$q' = \frac{2\rho - 1 - q}{1 - q}, \quad k' = 1 - q,$$

and

$$k'\tau(q') = (k(1 - q^2), 2k(\rho - q), k(q^2 - 2\rho q + 1)).$$

Thus $k'\tau(q')$ is obtained from $k\tau(q)$ simply by interchanging the first two sides. In particular, a fixed isosceles triangle has at most one genuine θ -triangle partner up to congruence.

Proof. From the perimeter equation in (1), we have $k = \frac{2(1-\rho)}{1-q}$. Substituting this into the area equation in (1) gives the following quadratic equation in q :

$$2(1 - \rho)^2(\rho - q)(1 + q) + u(1 - \rho^2 - u^2)(1 - q) = 0.$$

Hence there are at most two possible values of q .

Suppose that q is one root. Using that the equation is satisfied by q , the other root can be expressed as $q' = \frac{2\rho-1-q}{1-q}$. The corresponding scaling factor is given by $k' = \frac{2(1-\rho)}{1-q'} = 1 - q$. A direct substitution gives

$$k'\tau(q') = (k(1 - q^2), 2k(\rho - q), k(q^2 - 2\rho q + 1)),$$

whereas

$$k\tau(q) = (2k(\rho - q), k(1 - q^2), k(q^2 - 2\rho q + 1)).$$

Thus the two scaled θ -triangles differ only by interchanging the two sides adjacent to the angle θ , and are therefore congruent. $\square$

Remark 6.4. The transformation $q \mapsto \frac{2\rho-1-q}{1-q}$ is an involution. Its admissible fixed point satisfies $q = 1 - \sqrt{2(1-\rho)}$, which is precisely the apex-isosceles case of Lemma 5.1.

7. THE SQUARE-CONDITION SURFACE

Proposition 6.1 shows that the problem of finding a second isosceles partner for a fixed scalene θ -triangle is governed by a square condition. Consider the surface

$$S : \quad w^2 = \Delta_{t,q} = -(q-1)(q+2t+1)(3q^2t^2 + q^2 - 2qt^3 + 2q + 2t^3 - 3t^2 + 1).$$

A rational point (t, q, w) on S gives a parameter pair (t, q) for which all three roots of the cubic Φ_q are rational. Under the hypotheses of Proposition 6.1, a rational point with $w \neq 0$ is precisely the condition that the fixed scalene θ -triangle admit a second genuine rational isosceles partner. In this section we study the surface S .

Proposition 7.1. *The surface S is birational over $\mathbb{Q}$ to a relatively minimal elliptic surface*

$$\pi : E \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}_t^1$$

whose generic fibre is given by

$$y^2 = (x - c(t))(x^2 - 4d(t)),$$

where $c(t) = 2t(t^3 - 2t^2 - 3t - 2)$ and $d(t) = t^3(t - 4)(t - 1)^2(t + 1)^2$. The surface E is a K3 surface.

Proof. Put

$$\alpha = -8(t + 1), \quad \beta = 2(t + 1)(t^3 - 3t^2 - 2).$$

The birational change of variables

$$x = \beta + \frac{\alpha}{q - 1}, \quad y = \frac{\alpha w}{(q - 1)^2},$$

with inverse

$$q = 1 + \frac{\alpha}{x - \beta}, \quad w = \frac{\alpha y}{(x - \beta)^2},$$

transforms $w^2 = \Delta_{t,q}$ into

$$y^2 = (x - c(t))(x^2 - 4d(t)).$$

The discriminant of this Weierstrass model is

$$2^{16}t^7(t - 4)(t - 1)^2(t + 1)^2(2t + 1)^4.$$

A calculation with Tate's algorithm (see Appendix A.4) shows that the singular fibres are precisely

$$I_1^* \text{ at } t = 0, \quad I_8 \text{ at } t = \infty, \quad I_4 \text{ at } t = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad I_2 \text{ at } t = \pm 1, \quad I_1 \text{ at } t = 4.$$

Their Euler numbers add up to $7 + 8 + 4 + 2 + 2 + 1 = 24$. Hence $e(E) = 24 = 12\chi(\mathcal{O}_E)$, so $\chi(\mathcal{O}_E) = 2$. (See, for example, [SS10, Sections 6.6–6.7].)

Since the fibration has a section, it has no multiple fibres, and the canonical bundle formula gives

$$\omega_E \simeq \pi^*(\omega_{\mathbb{P}^1} \otimes \mathcal{L}), \quad \deg \mathcal{L} = \chi(\mathcal{O}_E) = 2.$$

Thus $\mathcal{L} \simeq \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(2)$ and $\omega_E \simeq \mathcal{O}_E$. By Serre duality, $h^2(E, \mathcal{O}_E) = 1$, and hence $2 = \chi(\mathcal{O}_E) = 1 - h^1(E, \mathcal{O}_E) + 1$. Therefore $h^1(E, \mathcal{O}_E) = 0$, and E is a K3 surface. $\square$

The elliptic fibration has the following useful rational sections.

Lemma 7.2. *The points*

$$P = (2t^2(t + 1)(t + 5), 8t^2(t + 1)(2t + 1)^2) \quad \text{and} \quad P_4 = (2t^2(t - 1)^2, 8t^2(t - 1)(2t + 1))$$

define rational sections of $\pi : E \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_t^1$. Moreover, $2P_4 = (c(t), 0)$, so P_4 has order 4 on the generic fibre.

Proof. One can see by direct computation that P and P_4 lie on the generic fibre. The duplication formula gives $2P_4 = (c(t), 0)$, which is a nontrivial point of order 2, and hence P_4 has order 4. $\square$

Lemma 7.3. *The section P has infinite order on the generic fibre of E . Therefore, for all but finitely many $t_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ for which the fibre E_{t_0} is smooth, the specialization $P(t_0)$ has infinite order. In particular, $\text{rank } E_{t_0}(\mathbb{Q}) > 0$ for all but finitely many such t_0 .*

Proof. Specializing at $t = 2$ gives

$$E_2 : \quad y^2 = (x + 32)(x^2 + 576), \quad P(2) = (168, 2400).$$

The change of variables $x = 4X - 12$, $y = 8Y$ gives the model $Y^2 = X^3 - X^2 + 15X + 225$, with LMFDB label 480.c4 [LMF24].

The curve has good reduction at 7 and 13, and a direct count (see Appendix A.4) gives $\#E_2(\mathbb{F}_7) = 12$ and $\#E_2(\mathbb{F}_{13}) = 16$. Thus any rational torsion point has order dividing 4. On the other hand,

$2P(2) = (32, 320)$, which is neither the identity nor a point of order 2. Hence $P(2)$ has infinite order, and therefore the section P has infinite order on the generic fibre. The result now follows from Silverman's specialization theorem [Sil83]. $\square$

Remark 7.4. An elliptic $K3$ surface also appears in van Luijk's study [?] of Heron triangles with common perimeter and area. The two surfaces are different. Indeed, the reducible fibres of the elliptic fibration above contribute rank $5 + 7 + 3 + 1 + 1 = 17$ to the trivial lattice, which therefore has rank 19. Since the section P of Lemma 7.2 has infinite order by Lemma 7.3, the Shioda–Tate formula gives $\rho(E) \geq 20$. Hence $\rho(E) = 20$, the maximal possible Picard number for a complex $K3$ surface. By contrast, van Luijk's $K3$ surface has Picard number 18.

Theorem 7.5. *The set of rational values $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ for which a scalene rational θ -triangle has two distinct genuine rational isosceles partners with the same perimeter and area is dense in $(-1, 1)$.*

Proof. Let $U \subset (-1, 1)$ be a nonempty open interval. For $t > 0$, put

$$\eta(t) = \rho(t, -1) = \frac{4t^2 - 1}{4t^2 + 1}.$$

The map $\eta : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (-1, 1)$ is a homeomorphism. Hence we may choose $t \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $\eta(t) \in U$, the fibre E_t is smooth, $P(t)$ has infinite order, and $t \neq \frac{1}{2}$. This is possible by Lemma 7.3, since only finitely many rational values of t need to be avoided.

Although $q = -1$ is not admissible for the geometric problem, since $\tau(-1)$ is degenerate, it is a convenient boundary point of the square-condition curve. We use it only as a base point and then move to admissible values $q > -1$ nearby. At $q = -1$ we have $\Delta_{t,-1} = 16t^4$, so $(t, -1, -4t^2)$ is a rational point of the square-condition surface. Under the birational map of Proposition 7.1, it corresponds to

$$B_t = (4t + c(t), 8t^2(t + 1)) \in E_t(\mathbb{Q}).$$

We claim that $B_t \in E_t(\mathbb{R})^0$, the connected component containing the identity. If $0 < t < 4$, then $d(t) < 0$, apart from the singular value $t = 1$, so $E_t(\mathbb{R})$ is connected. If $t > 4$, then $d(t) > 0$, $c(t) > 0$, and $c(t)^2 - 4d(t) = 16t^2(2t + 1)^2 > 0$. Thus $c(t)$ is the largest real root of the cubic. Since $x(B_t) - c(t) = 4t > 0$, the point B_t lies on the unbounded component, namely $E_t(\mathbb{R})^0$.

For any real elliptic curve, the quotient $E_t(\mathbb{R})/E_t(\mathbb{R})^0$ has order at most 2, so the double of any real point belongs to the identity component. Hence $2P(t) \in E_t(\mathbb{R})^0$ and has infinite order. Since $E_t(\mathbb{R})^0$ is topologically a circle, $\langle 2P(t) \rangle$ is dense in $E_t(\mathbb{R})^0$.

We next work near $(q, w) = (-1, -4t^2)$. Since $w \neq 0$, the equation $w^2 = \Delta_{t,q}$ defines a real branch with q as a local coordinate. For $q > -1$ sufficiently close to -1 , continuity gives

$$-1 < q < \rho(t, q) < 1, \quad \rho(t, q) \in U, \quad \Delta_{t,q} > 0.$$

After shrinking the interval if necessary, the corresponding θ -triangle is scalene. Indeed, by Lemma 5.1, the only non-degenerate isosceles cases are $q = 0$, $q = 1 - \sqrt{2(1 - \rho)}$, and $q = 2\rho - 1$. None can accumulate at $q = -1$, except possibly the last when $\eta(t) = 0$, which would give $t = \frac{1}{2}$, and this value was excluded.

The corresponding points with $q > -1$ sufficiently close to -1 form a nonempty open arc $\mathcal{N} \subset E_t(\mathbb{R})^0$. By the density of $\langle 2P(t) \rangle$, the arc $\mathcal{N}$ contains infinitely many rational points. For every such point, the corresponding q and w are rational and satisfy $w^2 = \Delta_{t,q}$.

Fix one of these rational points and write $\rho = \rho(t, q)$ and $u_0 = 2t(1 - \rho) > 0$. Since u_0 is a root of Φ_q , we have

$$\Phi_q(u) = (u - u_0)(u^2 + u_0u + u_0^2 - (1 - \rho^2)).$$

The identity computed in the proof of Proposition 6.1 shows that the discriminant of the quadratic factor is a nonzero rational square whenever $\Delta_{t,q}$ is. Let $u_1, u_2 \in \mathbb{Q}$ be its two distinct roots.

Since $-1 < q < \rho < 1$, every root u of Φ_q satisfies

$$u(u^2 - (1 - \rho^2)) = \frac{2(1 - \rho)^2(\rho - q)(1 + q)}{1 - q} > 0.$$

Applying this first to $u_0 > 0$ gives $u_0^2 > 1 - \rho^2$. Therefore

$$u_1 + u_2 = -u_0 < 0, \quad u_1 u_2 = u_0^2 - (1 - \rho^2) > 0,$$

so $u_1, u_2 < 0$. Applying the same identity to each u_i then gives $u_i^2 < 1 - \rho^2$, and hence

$$-\sqrt{1 - \rho^2} < u_i < 0 \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

Thus $\iota(u_1)$ and $\iota(u_2)$ are two distinct non-degenerate rational isosceles triangles. Both have the same perimeter and area as the same scaled θ -triangle $k\tau(q)$, and since this θ -triangle is scalene, both pairs are genuine.

Finally, for fixed t the inverse birational map is $q = 1 + \alpha/(x - \beta)$, so q has finite fibres on E_t . Hence the infinitely many rational points of $\mathcal{N}$ give infinitely many rational values of q . For fixed t , the equation $\rho(t, q) = r$ is quadratic in q , so each value of ρ arises from at most two values of q . Therefore infinitely many distinct rational values of ρ occur in U . Since U was arbitrary, the desired set is dense in $(-1, 1)$. $\square$

Remark 7.6. Theorem 7.5 also contains explicit one-parameter subfamilies. Applying the inverse birational map of Proposition 7.1 to the section P gives $q = \rho = \frac{4t^2 - 1}{4t^2 + 1}$, which corresponds to a degenerate θ -triangle. Applying the same map to $2P$ instead gives

$$q_t = \frac{4t^2 - 2t - 1}{4t^2 + 1} \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_t = \frac{16t^4 + 16t^3 + 16t^2 - 12t - 3}{(4t^2 + 1)(4t^2 + 4t + 5)}.$$

For $t \in \mathbb{Q}$, $t > \frac{1}{4}$, put

$$\begin{aligned} T_t &= ((4t^2 + 1)^2, t(4t - 1)(4t^2 + 4t + 5), (t + 1)(20t^2 - 4t + 1)), \\ I_{1,t} &= (4t(t + 1)(4t - 1), 16t^4 + 8t^3 + 14t^2 - 2t + 1, 16t^4 + 8t^3 + 14t^2 - 2t + 1), \\ I_{2,t} &= (4t(t + 1)(4t^2 + 1), 8t^4 + 8t^3 + 18t^2 - 6t + 1, 8t^4 + 8t^3 + 18t^2 - 6t + 1). \end{aligned}$$

A direct calculation shows that T_t has an angle with cosine ρ_t , and that all three triangles have perimeter

$$2(16t^4 + 16t^3 + 20t^2 - 4t + 1)$$

and squared area

$$4t^2(t + 1)^2(4t - 1)^2(4t^2 + 1)^2(16t^4 + 16t^3 + 20t^2 - 4t + 1).$$

For $t > \frac{1}{4}$ all three triangles are non-degenerate, and $I_{1,t}$ and $I_{2,t}$ are distinct isosceles triangles. Moreover, for rational $t > \frac{1}{4}$, the triangle T_t is scalene unless $t = \frac{1}{2}$ or $t = \frac{3}{2}$. Thus, for

$$t \in \mathbb{Q}, \quad t > \frac{1}{4}, \quad t \notin \left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\},$$

the pairs $(T_t, I_{1,t})$ and $(T_t, I_{2,t})$ are two distinct genuine pairs with the same value $\rho = \rho_t$.

8. JACOBIAN RANKS

We now investigate the Mordell–Weil ranks of the Jacobians J_ρ . The apex family is particularly suitable for a systematic computation, since it is parametrized by a single rational parameter $t \in (-1, 0)$. Proposition 5.4 shows that the generic Jacobian in this family has rank 1 over $\mathbb{Q}(t)$,

but the rank may increase after specialization. We computed the 2-descent rank bound for every reduced parameter

$$(14) \quad -1 < t < 0, \quad t \neq -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{den}(t) \leq 25,$$

where $\text{den}(t)$ denotes the denominator of t when written in lowest terms.

Exactly thirty-five of these specializations have rank bound 1; they are the values listed in Table 1 below. The same search also produces specializations with larger rank bounds, some of which are investigated in Proposition 8.2. The computation is described in Appendix A.5.

8.1. Rank-one specializations and uniqueness.

Theorem 8.1. *For each of the thirty-five values of ρ listed in Table 1,*

$$\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \#C_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 10.$$

Moreover, exactly one rational point of C_ρ gives a genuine pair. Consequently, the apex pair displayed in Table 1 is the unique genuine pair for each of these values of ρ .

t	ρ	pair	t	ρ	pair
$-\frac{1}{18}$	$-\frac{11551}{11858}$	(77, 77, 153) (9, 149, 149)	$-\frac{11}{21}$	$\frac{14513}{25538}$	(420, 452, 452) (431, 431, 462)
$-\frac{1}{16}$	$-\frac{14159}{14641}$	(121, 121, 240) (16, 233, 233)	$-\frac{11}{20}$	$\frac{28321}{44521}$	(180, 211, 211) (191, 191, 220)
$-\frac{1}{12}$	$-\frac{4223}{4489}$	(67, 67, 132) (12, 127, 127)	$-\frac{13}{23}$	$\frac{27103}{40328}$	(460, 568, 568) (499, 499, 598)
$-\frac{2}{21}$	$-\frac{152753}{165649}$	(407, 407, 798) (84, 764, 764)	$-\frac{13}{22}$	$\frac{26111}{35912}$	(99, 134, 134) (112, 112, 143)
$-\frac{1}{8}$	$-\frac{727}{841}$	(29, 29, 56) (8, 53, 53)	$-\frac{14}{23}$	$\frac{273103}{358801}$	(414, 599, 599) (484, 484, 644)
$-\frac{1}{7}$	$-\frac{199}{242}$	(44, 44, 84) (14, 79, 79)	$-\frac{9}{14}$	$\frac{5503}{6728}$	(35, 58, 58) (44, 44, 63)
$-\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{97}{128}$	(8, 8, 15) (3, 14, 14)	$-\frac{11}{17}$	$\frac{12191}{14792}$	(204, 344, 344) (259, 259, 374)
$-\frac{3}{17}$	$-\frac{5969}{8192}$	(256, 256, 476) (102, 443, 443)	$-\frac{18}{25}$	$\frac{616079}{677329}$	(350, 823, 823) (548, 548, 900)
$-\frac{3}{14}$	$-\frac{2231}{3698}$	(43, 43, 77) (21, 71, 71)	$-\frac{18}{23}$	$\frac{555719}{582169}$	(230, 763, 763) (464, 464, 828)
$-\frac{5}{23}$	$-\frac{15937}{26912}$	(464, 464, 828) (230, 763, 763)	$-\frac{19}{24}$	$\frac{170041}{177241}$	(120, 421, 421) (253, 253, 456)
$-\frac{3}{13}$	$-\frac{1487}{2738}$	(148, 148, 260) (78, 239, 239)	$-\frac{4}{5}$	$\frac{1319}{1369}$	(10, 37, 37) (22, 22, 40)
$-\frac{1}{4}$	$-\frac{23}{49}$	(7, 7, 12) (4, 11, 11)	$-\frac{21}{25}$	$\frac{236081}{241081}$	(200, 982, 982) (557, 557, 1050)
$-\frac{2}{7}$	$-\frac{601}{1849}$	(43, 43, 70) (28, 64, 64)	$-\frac{7}{8}$	$\frac{2777}{2809}$	(8, 53, 53) (29, 29, 56)
$-\frac{7}{22}$	$-\frac{4327}{22898}$	(107, 107, 165) (77, 151, 151)	$-\frac{9}{10}$	$\frac{3673}{3698}$	(5, 43, 43) (23, 23, 45)
$-\frac{2}{5}$	$\frac{79}{529}$	(23, 23, 30) (20, 28, 28)	$-\frac{19}{21}$	$\frac{72521}{72962}$	(84, 764, 764) (407, 407, 798)
$-\frac{4}{9}$	$\frac{1879}{5929}$	(77, 77, 90) (72, 86, 86)	$-\frac{11}{12}$	$\frac{16057}{16129}$	(12, 127, 127) (67, 67, 132)
$-\frac{9}{20}$	$\frac{12281}{36481}$	(191, 191, 220) (180, 211, 211)	$-\frac{14}{15}$	$\frac{165199}{165649}$	(30, 407, 407) (212, 212, 420)
$-\frac{13}{25}$	$\frac{56761}{101761}$	(600, 638, 638) (613, 613, 650)			

TABLE 1. The thirty-five specializations of Theorem 8.1, ordered by increasing ρ down the left block and then down the right. In each pair, the θ -triangle is displayed above its isosceles partner, at a common integral scale.

Proof. The exhaustive computation described in Appendix A.5, obtained by running the search in batches covering all reduced $t \in (-1, 0)$ with $t \neq -\frac{1}{2}$ and $\text{den}(t) \leq 25$, gives $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \leq 1$ for exactly the thirty-five parameters listed in Table 1.

For each of these specializations, let $P_c = (\rho - 1, 2(\rho - 1)^2(2\rho - 1)) \in C_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$ be a coincidence point, and let ∞_+ be one of the rational points at infinity. The computations in Appendix A.6 give $\widehat{h}([P_c - \infty_+]) > 0$ in every case. Thus the coincidence class has infinite order, and therefore $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 1$.

Since C_ρ has genus 2 and $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 1$, the Chabauty–Coleman method applies. The coincidence class has infinite order. The MAGMA routine **Chabauty** does not require this class to generate the free part of $J_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$; in rank 1, any non-torsion class suffices. In every case, the computation returns exactly ten rational points.

The four rational Weierstrass points have u -coordinates

$$u_1 = -\frac{4t(t+1)}{(2t^2+t+1)^2}, \quad u_2 = -\frac{4t^2(t+1)}{(2t^2+t+1)^2},$$

$$u_3 = \frac{4t(t+1)^2}{(2t^2+t+1)^2}, \quad u_4 = \frac{4(t+1)(t^2+t+1)}{(2t^2+t+1)^2}.$$

Thus

$$C_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = \{\infty_+, \infty_-, (0, \pm 2(1-\rho)^2(1+\rho)),$$

$$(\rho - 1, \pm 2(\rho - 1)^2(2\rho - 1)), (u_1, 0), (u_2, 0), (u_3, 0), (u_4, 0)\}.$$

In particular, $\#C_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 10$. It remains to determine which of these points give genuine pairs. The points above $u = 0$ are degenerate, while the points above $u = \rho - 1$ are the coincidence points and do not give a genuine pair. The points at infinity do not correspond to affine triangle parameters. For the four Weierstrass points, note first that

$$u_3 = \frac{4t(t+1)^2}{(2t^2+t+1)^2} = t s(t)^2$$

is precisely the apex point of Theorem 5.2. Since $t \in (-1, 0)$ and $t \neq -\frac{1}{2}$, it gives a genuine apex pair. The remaining three Weierstrass points do not give new genuine pairs. Indeed, $u_1 > 0$ and $u_4 > 0$, so they do not satisfy the admissibility condition for an isosceles triangle. Finally, $u_2 < 0$, but it gives the congruent pair: taking $q = 1 - s(t)$ and $k = s(t)$, a direct substitution shows that $k\tau(q)$ and $\iota(u_2)$ differ only by a permutation of their sides.

Therefore among the ten rational points of C_ρ , exactly one gives a genuine pair, namely the point $(u_3, 0)$ corresponding to the apex pair. Thus the apex pair is the unique genuine pair. $\square$

8.2. Higher-rank apex specializations. The same search produces specializations in which the rank increases. The following examples have exact ranks 2, 3, and 4.

Proposition 8.2. *For the following apex-family specializations, the Mordell–Weil ranks are*

t	$\rho_A(t)$	$\text{rank } J_{\rho_A(t)}(\mathbb{Q})$
$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{8}$	2
$-\frac{1}{5}$	$-\frac{79}{121}$	3
$-\frac{4}{7}$	$\frac{1927}{2809}$	4.

Proof. For the three specializations, a 2-descent gives the respective upper bounds 2, 3, and 4. The MAGMA computation in Appendix A.7 finds finite-index subgroups of the corresponding Mordell–Weil groups having torsion-free ranks 2, 3, and 4, respectively. Hence the upper and lower bounds agree in each case. $\square$

8.3. Other rank-two specializations. The following four scalene examples arose in the computational search for genuine pairs.

Proposition 8.3. *For*

$$\rho \in \left\{ -\frac{3}{5}, -\frac{17}{32}, \frac{2}{7}, \frac{4}{5} \right\},$$

the Jacobian J_ρ has Mordell–Weil rank $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 2$. The corresponding genuine pairs are displayed in Table 2. In each case, the class arising from the genuine pair and the coincidence class are independent.

Proof. For each of the four values, a 2-descent in MAGMA (see Appendix A.8) gives $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \leq 2$.

Let D_0 be the divisor class obtained from the coincidence point and let D_1 be the divisor class obtained from the indicated genuine scalene point. A canonical-height computation gives a positive determinant for the Néron–Tate height-pairing matrix of D_0, D_1 in each case (see Table 2).

ρ	u	genuine pair	MAGMA rank bound	$\det H$
$-\frac{3}{5}$	$-\frac{2}{15}$	$((224, 675, 829), (444, 444, 840))$	2	1.2555737833...
$-\frac{17}{32}$	$-\frac{35}{48}$	$((64, 108, 152), (42, 141, 141))$	2	1.9685750897...
$\frac{2}{7}$	$-\frac{9}{14}$	$((224, 275, 301), (220, 290, 290))$	2	1.9295003865...
$\frac{4}{5}$	$-\frac{17}{30}$	$((675, 3293, 3808), (420, 3678, 3678))$	2	1.0964546558...

TABLE 2. The four scalene specializations of Proposition 8.3. In the pair column, the first triple is the scalene θ -triangle and the second is the isosceles triangle; the two are represented at a common integral scale. The quantity $\det H$ is the determinant of the Néron–Tate height-pairing matrix of the coincidence class and the class arising from the genuine pair.

Hence the two classes are independent and $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \geq 2$ and the result follows. $\square$

The base family also contains simple specializations of exact rank 2.

Proposition 8.4. *The base-family specializations $(m, \rho) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{4})$ and $(m, \rho) = (2, \frac{2}{11})$ satisfy $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 2$.*

Proof. In both cases a 2-descent (see Appendix A.9) gives $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) \leq 2$. The coincidence class and the class arising from the genuine base pair are independent, since the determinants of their Néron–Tate height-pairing matrices are, respectively, 0.3000196095129455... and 0.9190585159633787.... Hence $\text{rank } J_\rho(\mathbb{Q}) = 2$ in both cases. $\square$

9. FOUR OR MORE GENUINE PAIRS

In this section we consider values of ρ carrying at least four distinct genuine pairs.

9.1. A rational four-pair family. We first give a rational one-parameter family of values of ρ carrying at least four distinct genuine pairs. For $z \in \mathbb{Q}$, let

$$I(z) = \left(1 - z^2, \frac{1 + z^2}{2}, \frac{1 + z^2}{2} \right),$$

which is an isosceles triangle of perimeter 2 whenever $0 < z < 1$ with area $z(1 - z^2)/2$. Thus two distinct triangles $I(\alpha)$ and $I(\beta)$ have the same area precisely when

$$\alpha^2 + \alpha\beta + \beta^2 = 1.$$

This is a rational conic. A convenient parametrization is

$$\alpha = \frac{4\lambda}{\lambda^2 + 3}, \quad \beta = \frac{(1-\lambda)(\lambda+3)}{\lambda^2 + 3}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{Q}.$$

Hence $I(\alpha)$ and $I(\beta)$ have the same area.

The same parametrization also produces a second equal-area pair. For this parametrization, put

$$r = r(\lambda) = \frac{6\lambda(1-\lambda^2)(9-\lambda^2)}{(\lambda^2+3)^3} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \delta(\lambda) = \frac{(3-\lambda^2)(3+6\lambda-\lambda^2)(3-6\lambda-\lambda^2)}{(\lambda^2+3)^3}.$$

A direct calculation gives $\delta^2 + 3r^2 = 1$. Thus, if

$$z_{\pm} = r \pm \delta,$$

then

$$z_-^2 + z_- z_+ + z_+^2 = 3r^2 + \delta^2 = 1.$$

Hence $I(z_-)$ and $I(z_+)$ form a second equal-area pair. The formulas below package these two simultaneous equal-area coincidences so that the corresponding scalene θ -triangles have the same value of ρ . Define $\rho_4(\lambda) = \frac{1-r^2}{1+r^2}$, and put

$$T_0 = (2 - 4r^2, 2r^2 + \delta, 2r^2 - \delta), \quad T_1 = \left(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{2+\delta}{3}, \frac{2-\delta}{3}\right).$$

Theorem 9.1. *For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $\frac{1}{3} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3}{7}$, the value $\rho = \rho_4(\lambda)$ admits at least four distinct genuine pairs, namely*

$$(T_0, I(z_-)), \quad (T_0, I(z_+)), \quad (T_1, I(\alpha)), \quad (T_1, I(\beta)).$$

In particular, there are infinitely many rational values of ρ carrying at least four distinct genuine pairs.

Proof. All six triangles have perimeter 2. We first check that T_0 and T_1 have an angle θ with $\cos(\theta) = \rho_4(\lambda)$. In both cases we take the distinguished angle to be the angle between the last two sides. Using $\delta^2 + 3r^2 = 1$, the law of cosines applied to T_0 gives

$$\frac{(2r^2 + \delta)^2 + (2r^2 - \delta)^2 - (2 - 4r^2)^2}{2(2r^2 + \delta)(2r^2 - \delta)} = \frac{1 - r^2}{1 + r^2},$$

and similarly to T_1 ,

$$\frac{\left(\frac{2+\delta}{3}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{2-\delta}{3}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^2}{2\left(\frac{2+\delta}{3}\right)\left(\frac{2-\delta}{3}\right)} = \frac{1 - r^2}{1 + r^2}.$$

Thus both T_0 and T_1 are rational θ -triangles for $\rho = \rho_4(\lambda)$.

For an isosceles triangle $I(z)$ with $0 < z < 1$, its area is $\text{Area}(I(z)) = \frac{z(1-z^2)}{2}$. Since $z_{\pm} = r \pm \delta$ and $\delta^2 = 1 - 3r^2$, we have $1 - z_{\pm}^2 = 2r(r \mp \delta)$. Therefore,

$$\text{Area}(I(z_-)) = \text{Area}(I(z_+)) = r(r^2 - \delta^2) = r(4r^2 - 1).$$

On the other hand, Heron's formula, together with $\delta^2 + 3r^2 = 1$, gives $\text{Area}(T_0) = r(4r^2 - 1)$ and similarly, $\text{Area}(T_1) = \frac{r}{3}$.

A direct calculation also gives $r = \frac{3}{2}\alpha(1-\alpha^2) = \frac{3}{2}\beta(1-\beta^2)$. Therefore $\text{Area}(I(\alpha)) = \text{Area}(I(\beta)) = \frac{r}{3}$.

Thus the four displayed pairs have equal perimeter and equal area.

It remains to check that they are genuine and distinct. On the interval $\frac{1}{3} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3}{7}$ one has

$$\frac{1}{2} < r < \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}, \quad 0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}, \quad 0 < z_- < z_+ < 1,$$

and

$$\frac{3}{7} \leq \alpha \leq \frac{7}{13} < \frac{8}{13} \leq \beta \leq \frac{5}{7}.$$

Hence all four isosceles triangles are non-degenerate.

For T_0 , the preceding bounds and the identity $\delta^2 + 3r^2 = 1$ give

$$0 < 2r^2 - \delta < 2 - 4r^2 < 2r^2 + \delta < 1,$$

since $1 - (2r^2 + \delta) = \frac{(1-2\delta)(1-\delta)}{3} > 0$. Since the three sides lie in $(0, 1)$ and the perimeter is 2, T_0 is a non-degenerate scalene triangle. Likewise,

$$0 < \frac{2-\delta}{3} < \frac{2}{3} < \frac{2+\delta}{3} < 1.$$

Since the perimeter is 2, T_1 is also non-degenerate and scalene.

The inequalities $z_- \neq z_+$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$ show that each of T_0 and T_1 has two distinct isosceles partners. Moreover, T_0 and T_1 are not congruent, as the side opposite the distinguished angle has length $2 - 4r^2 > \frac{2}{3}$ for T_0 , while it has length $\frac{2}{3}$ for T_1 . Hence the four displayed pairs are distinct and genuine.

Finally, for $\frac{1}{3} \leq \lambda \leq \frac{3}{7}$,

$$r'(\lambda) = -\frac{6(\lambda^2 - 3)(\lambda^2 - 6\lambda - 3)(\lambda^2 + 6\lambda - 3)}{(\lambda^2 + 3)^4} > 0.$$

Thus $r(\lambda)$ is strictly increasing, and therefore $\rho_4(\lambda) = \frac{1-r(\lambda)^2}{1+r(\lambda)^2}$ is strictly decreasing. Since there are infinitely many rational λ in the stated interval, this gives infinitely many distinct rational values of ρ carrying at least four genuine pairs. $\square$

Corollary 9.2. *The set of rational values ρ carrying at least four distinct genuine pairs is dense in*

$$\left[\frac{3239209}{6414409}, \frac{85249}{150049} \right].$$

Proof. By the proof of Theorem 9.1, the function $\rho_4(\lambda)$ is continuous and strictly decreasing on $[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{7}]$. Moreover,

$$\rho_4\left(\frac{1}{3}\right) = \frac{85249}{150049}, \quad \rho_4\left(\frac{3}{7}\right) = \frac{3239209}{6414409}.$$

Hence ρ_4 maps this interval homeomorphically onto $[\frac{3239209}{6414409}, \frac{85249}{150049}]$. Since $\mathbb{Q} \cap [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{7}]$ is dense in $[\frac{1}{3}, \frac{3}{7}]$, its image under ρ_4 is dense in the displayed interval. Every such rational value of ρ carries at least four distinct genuine pairs by Theorem 9.1. $\square$

9.2. An elliptic four-pair family. We now give a second construction of values of ρ carrying at least four genuine pairs. In contrast with the preceding rational family, this construction is governed by an elliptic curve.

For $X \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $z \in \mathbb{Q}$, put $h(z) = z(1 - z^2)$, $H_X(z) = \frac{h(z)}{X}$, and $\Delta_X(z) = 1 - (2 + X^2)H_X(z) + H_X(z)^2$. Whenever $\Delta_X(z) = d^2$ is a rational square, define

$$T_X(z, d) = \left(1 - H_X(z), \frac{1 + H_X(z) + d}{2}, \frac{1 + H_X(z) - d}{2} \right).$$

Lemma 9.3. *Suppose that $X > 1$, $0 < z < 1$, and $\Delta_X(z) = d^2$ for some $d \in \mathbb{Q}$. Then $T_X(z, d)$ and*

$$I(z) = \left(1 - z^2, \frac{1 + z^2}{2}, \frac{1 + z^2}{2} \right)$$

are non-degenerate rational triangles with the same perimeter and area. Moreover, $T_X(z, d)$ has an angle θ satisfying $\rho = \cos(\theta) = \frac{4-X^2}{4+X^2}$.

Proof. Both triangles have perimeter 2. Since $0 < z < 1$ and $X > 1$, we have $0 < H_X(z) < 1$. Moreover, $(1 - H_X(z))^2 - d^2 = X^2 H_X(z) > 0$, and hence $|d| < 1 - H_X(z)$. It follows that all three sides of $T_X(z, d)$ lie strictly between 0 and 1. Since their sum is 2, each side is strictly smaller than the sum of the other two, and therefore $T_X(z, d)$ is non-degenerate.

Heron's formula gives

$$\text{Area}(T_X(z, d))^2 = H_X(z) \frac{(1 - H_X(z))^2 - d^2}{4} = \frac{X^2 H_X(z)^2}{4}.$$

Thus

$$\text{Area}(T_X(z, d)) = \frac{X H_X(z)}{2} = \frac{z(1 - z^2)}{2} = \text{Area}(I(z)).$$

Finally, applying the law of cosines to the angle between the last two sides of $T_X(z, d)$ gives $\cos(\theta) = \frac{4 - X^2}{4 + X^2}$. $\square$

Therefore, to obtain four genuine pairs with the same value of ρ , it suffices to find a single rational value of X and four distinct rational values z_i for which $\Delta_X(z_i)$ is a rational square. To do this, we consider rational points on the following genus-one curve.

$$\mathcal{H}: \quad V^2 = 9 - 21\lambda^2 - 18\lambda^3 - 2\lambda^4.$$

For a rational point $(\lambda, V) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Q})$, put

$$X = X(\lambda) = \frac{4\lambda(\lambda + 1)(\lambda + 3)}{(3 - \lambda)(\lambda^2 + 3)}$$

and $\rho_{\text{ell}}(\lambda) = \frac{4 - X(\lambda)^2}{4 + X(\lambda)^2}$. Define

$$z_1 = \frac{4\lambda}{\lambda^2 + 3}, \quad z_2 = \frac{(1 - \lambda)(\lambda + 3)}{\lambda^2 + 3},$$

and

$$z_3 = \frac{\lambda^2 + 3 + 2V}{3(3 - \lambda)(\lambda + 1)}, \quad z_4 = \frac{\lambda^2 + 3 - 2V}{3(3 - \lambda)(\lambda + 1)}.$$

A direct calculation in the function field $\mathbb{Q}(\lambda, V)$ shows that $\Delta_{X(\lambda)}(z_i) \in \mathbb{Q}(\lambda, V)^2$, for $1 \leq i \leq 4$. For example,

$$\Delta_{X(\lambda)}(z_1) = \Delta_{X(\lambda)}(z_2) = \left(\frac{\lambda(\lambda + 3)(\lambda^2 + 6\lambda - 3)}{(\lambda^2 + 3)^2} \right)^2.$$

The four square identities are verified in Appendix A.10. Thus, whenever $(\lambda, V) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Q})$ is such that $X(\lambda) > 1$ and $0 < z_i < 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, Lemma 9.3 produces four rational pairs

$$(T_{X(\lambda)}(z_i, d_i), I(z_i)), \quad i = 1, \dots, 4,$$

all with the same value of ρ , where $d_i^2 = \Delta_{X(\lambda)}(z_i)$.

Theorem 9.4. *There are infinitely many distinct rational values $\rho = \rho_{\text{ell}}(\lambda)$, with $(\lambda, V) \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{Q})$, for which at least four distinct genuine pairs exist.*

Proof. The curve $\mathcal{H}$ is birational over $\mathbb{Q}$ to

$$E_4: \quad y^2 = x^3 - 75x + 1222 = (x + 13)(x^2 - 13x + 94).$$

Indeed, the birational map is given by

$$x = \frac{6(V + 3)}{\lambda^2} - 7, \quad y = \frac{6(V + 3)^2}{\lambda^3} + 12\lambda + 54,$$

with inverse

$$\lambda = \frac{6(y - 54)}{(x + 7)^2 + 72}, \quad V = \frac{x + 7}{6}\lambda^2 - 3.$$

The change of variables

$$X = \frac{x+1}{4}, \quad Y = \frac{y-x-5}{8},$$

with inverse

$$x = 4X - 1, \quad y = 8Y + 4X + 4,$$

takes E_4 to the global minimal model

$$E_4^{\min} : \quad Y^2 + XY + Y = X^3 - X^2 - 5X + 20.$$

This is the elliptic curve with LMFDB label **207.a2** [LMF24]. It has Mordell–Weil rank 1 and torsion subgroup $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and the point $(0, 4)$ generates its free part. Under the above isomorphism, $(0, 4)$ corresponds to

$$P = (-1, 36) \in E_4(\mathbb{Q}).$$

Thus P has infinite order.

Moreover, the quadratic factor $x^2 - 13x + 94$ has discriminant $-207 < 0$. Hence the cubic defining E_4 has only one real root, so $E_4(\mathbb{R})$ is connected. Since P has infinite order, $E_4(\mathbb{Q})$ is therefore dense in $E_4(\mathbb{R})$ by the Poincaré–Hurwitz theorem.

The point

$$6P = \left(\frac{1310611}{18225}, \frac{1491973984}{2460375} \right)$$

corresponds under the inverse birational map to $(\lambda_0, V_0) = \left(\frac{4455}{8467}, \frac{45960492}{71690089} \right)$. At this point, $X(\lambda_0) > 1$ and $0 < z_4 < z_3 < z_2 < z_1 < 1$, where

$$z_1 = \frac{12573495}{19576441}, \quad z_2 = \frac{9981856}{19576441}, \quad z_3 = \frac{127871}{317681}, \quad z_4 = \frac{130949}{743583}.$$

A direct substitution shows that the four pairs supplied by Lemma 9.3 are genuine. In particular, they are non-congruent, and they are distinct since the four parameters z_i are distinct.

All these conditions are open. Hence there is a sufficiently small real neighbourhood of $6P$ in which every rational point gives four distinct genuine pairs. Since $E_4(\mathbb{Q})$ is dense in $E_4(\mathbb{R})$, this neighbourhood contains infinitely many rational points.

Finally, the projection $(\lambda, V) \mapsto \lambda$ has finite fibres on $\mathcal{H}$, while $\rho_{\text{ell}}(\lambda)$ is a nonconstant rational function. Thus infinitely many of these points give distinct rational values of ρ . This proves the result. $\square$

9.3. Examples with higher multiplicity. The preceding constructions show that values of ρ carrying four genuine pairs occur in infinite families. Computational exploration of the complete parametrization reveals still higher multiplicities. We do not currently know an infinite construction producing five or more genuine pairs.

Proposition 9.5. *The values of ρ listed in Tables 3 and 4 carry at least the indicated number of distinct genuine pairs. In Table 3, the corresponding θ -triangles are pairwise non-congruent, while in Table 4 one θ -triangle is shared by two distinct isosceles partners.*

Proof. The examples were found by searching for collisions in the complete parametrization of Theorem 3.1. The computations in Appendix A.11 verify, using exact rational arithmetic, that all the pairs displayed in Tables 3 and 4 are distinct and genuine. $\square$

ρ	pairs found	genuine pairs
$\frac{1952}{3977}$	6	$((12064, 86193, 91471), (10764, 89482, 89482))$ $((3977, 4215, 4352), (3960, 4292, 4292))$ $((1261, 1299, 1312), (1260, 1306, 1306))$ $((970, 984, 986), (975, 975, 990))$ $((7178, 8010, 8528), (7529, 7529, 8658))$ $((14145, 21089, 24056), (17225, 17225, 24840))$
$\frac{613}{1495}$	5	$((1058, 1533, 1625), (1050, 1583, 1583))$ $((525, 598, 613), (553, 553, 630))$ $((598, 750, 760), (655, 655, 798))$ $((299, 389, 400), (334, 334, 420))$ $((299, 805, 880), (530, 530, 924))$
$\frac{817}{1969}$	5	$((1268608, 1406403, 1451453), (1322928, 1322928, 1480608))$ $((1634, 1969, 1969), (1754, 1754, 2064))$ $((1122, 2123, 2327), (1562, 1562, 2448))$ $((57101, 138774, 152375), (94085, 94085, 160080))$ $((1029, 1804, 1969), (1008, 1897, 1897))$
$\frac{7671}{16121}$	5	$((4823, 73826, 75999), (4290, 75179, 75179))$ $((3773, 4034, 4089), (3770, 4063, 4063))$ $((1960, 1974, 2014), (1950, 1999, 1999))$ $((123850881, 329543125, 369951946), (219139063, 219139063, 385067826))$ $((31311875, 32603571, 32739554), (31771675, 31771675, 33111650))$
$\frac{302}{527}$	5	$((2108, 2787, 3395), (1940, 3175, 3175))$ $((578, 1250, 1488), (893, 893, 1530))$ $((8385, 8959, 9184), (8364, 9082, 9082))$ $((8160, 8479, 9889), (8314, 8314, 9900))$ $((855117, 871133, 1007500), (807300, 963225, 963225))$

TABLE 3. Values of ρ for which at least five distinct genuine pairs have been found and the corresponding θ -triangles are pairwise non-congruent. In each ordered pair, the first triple is the θ -triangle and the second is the isosceles triangle, both given at a common integral scale.


```

Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);

rho := -Q!1/2;

Qrho :=
  x^2 - 2*(1-rho)*x + rho^2 - 1;

Srho :=
  x^4
  + 2*(1-rho)*x^3
  + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*x^2
  - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*x
  - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

f := Qrho*Srho;

assert
  f eq
  (4*x^2-12*x-3)
  *(4*x^4+12*x^3+33*x^2-18*x-27)/16;

assert IsIrreducible(Qrho);
assert IsIrreducible(Srho);
assert Discriminant(f) ne 0;

//-----
// Integral model obtained by scaling y by 8.
//-----

c := 8;
fint := c^2*f;

fint := Qx![
  Integers()!Coefficient(fint,i)
  : i in [0..Degree(fint)]
];

C := HyperellipticCurve(fint);
J := Jacobian(C);

//-----
// Rank = 1.
//-----

rb := RankBound(J);
assert rb eq 1;

uc := rho - 1;

```

```

yc := 2*(rho-1)^2*(2*rho-1);
Yc := c*yc;

assert uc eq -Q!3/2;
assert yc eq -Q!9;
assert Evaluate(fint,uc) eq Yc^2;

Pc := C![uc,Yc,1];
Pinf := C![1,c,0];

D := J![Pinf,Pc];

h := CanonicalHeight(D);
assert h gt 0;

//-----
// Chabauty.
//-----

allpts := Chabauty(D : ptC := Pc);

assert #allpts eq 8;

num_inf :=
  #[P : P in allpts | P[3] eq 0];

us := {
  P[1]/P[3]
  : P in allpts | P[3] ne 0
};

assert num_inf eq 2;
assert us eq { Q!0, -Q!3/2, -Q!7/4 };

print "rho =", rho;
print "RankBound =", rb;
print "canonical height =", h;
print "C_rho(Q) =", allpts;
print "#C_rho(Q) =", #allpts;

```

A.2. Generic rank for the apex family. The following MAGMA code verifies the computations used in Proposition 5.4.

```

////////////////////////////////////
// Apex family: generic rank = 1
////////////////////////////////////

Q := Rationals();

R<n> := PolynomialRing(Q);

```

```

K := FieldOfFractions(R);
RX<X> := PolynomialRing(R);

A := n^2 - n + 1;
D := n^2 - n + 2;
C0 := 3*n^2 - 3*n - 1;
B := 3*n^2 - 3*n + 2;
RR := n^4 - 6*n^3 + 13*n^2 - 13*n + 7;

//-----
// 1. Generic apex model
//-----

G1 := (X-n)*(X+1);
G2 := (X+n-1)*(X-A);
G3 := X^2 + A*X + n*(n-1)*A;

f := G1*G2*G3;

// Verify the change of variables from F_rho(u).

KU<u> := PolynomialRing(K);
KX<XX> := PolynomialRing(K);

DK := K!D;

s := 2*n*(n-1)/DK;
rho := 1 - s^2/2;

Qrho :=
    u^2 - 2*(1-rho)*u + rho^2 - 1;

Srho :=
    u^4
    + 2*(1-rho)*u^3
    + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*u^2
    - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*u
    - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

Frho := Qrho*Srho;

uX := 4*n*(n-1)/DK^2 * XX;

transformed :=
    DK^12/(4096*n^6*(n-1)^6)
    * Evaluate(Frho,uX);

assert transformed eq KX!f;

```

```

//-----
// 2. Richelot determinant and discriminants
//-----

M := Matrix(R,3,3,[
    Coefficient(G1,0), Coefficient(G1,1), Coefficient(G1,2),
    Coefficient(G2,0), Coefficient(G2,1), Coefficient(G2,2),
    Coefficient(G3,0), Coefficient(G3,1), Coefficient(G3,2)
]);

Delta := Determinant(M);

assert Delta eq n^2*RR;

assert IsIrreducible(A);
assert IsIrreducible(D);
assert IsIrreducible(C0);
assert IsIrreducible(B);
assert IsIrreducible(RR);

disc :=
    -n^12
    *(n-1)^12
    *(n-2)^2
    *(n+1)^2
    *(2*n-1)^2
    *A^3
    *D^6
    *C0
    *B^2;

assert Discriminant(f) eq disc;

// Richelot dual.

H1 := Derivative(G2)*G3 - G2*Derivative(G3);
H2 := Derivative(G3)*G1 - G3*Derivative(G1);
H3 := Derivative(G1)*G2 - G1*Derivative(G2);

fdual := H1*H2*H3;

discdual :=
    2^6
    *n^36
    *(n-1)^6
    *(n-2)

```

```

    *(n+1)^4
    *(2*n-1)
    *A^3
    *D^3
    *C0^2
    *B
    *RR^12;

assert Discriminant(fdual) eq discdual;

//-----
// 3. Square-class specialization at n = 12
//-----

n0 := 12;

assert Evaluate(Delta,n0) ne 0;
assert Evaluate(disc,n0) ne 0;
assert Evaluate(discdual,n0) ne 0;

gens := [
    R!(-1), R!2,
    n, n-1, n+1, n-2, 2*n-1,
    A, D, C0, B, RR
];

vals := [
    Integers()!Evaluate(g,n0) : g in gens
];

assert vals eq [
    -1, 2, 12, 11, 13, 10, 23,
    133, 134, 395, 398, 12091
];

// Matrix of sign and prime valuations modulo 2.

primes := [
    2,3,5,7,11,13,19,23,67,79,107,113,199
];

F2 := GF(2);

rows := [];

for v in vals do
    row :=
        [(v lt 0) select F2!1 else F2!0]

```

```

        cat
        [F2!(Valuation(Abs(v),p) mod 2) : p in primes];

    Append(~rows,row);
end for;

MM := Matrix(F2,#rows,#rows[1],&cat rows);

assert Rank(MM) eq 12;

// Check the corresponding apex parameter.

D0 := n0^2 - n0 + 2;
s0 := Q!(2*n0*(n0-1))/Q!D0;
rho0 := 1 - s0^2/2;

assert rho0 eq -Q!4223/4489;

//-----
// 4. Rank of the specialization n = 12
//-----

Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);

A0 := n0^2 - n0 + 1;

f12 :=
    (x-n0)
    *(x+1)
    *(x+n0-1)
    *(x-A0)
    *(x^2 + A0*x + n0*(n0-1)*A0);

C12 := HyperellipticCurve(f12);
J12 := Jacobian(C12);

r := RankBound(J12);

assert r eq 1;

// Coincidence divisor class.

P := C12![-66,853710,1];
Pinf := C12![1,1,0];

Dc := J12![P,Pinf];

```

```

h := CanonicalHeight(Dc);

assert h gt 0;

//-----
// Output
//-----

print "Apex specialization:";
print "rho =", rho0;
print "square-class rank =", Rank(MM);
print "RankBound =", r;
print "canonical height =", h;
print "Hence rank J^A(Q(t)) = 1.";

```

A.3. Generic rank lower bound for the base family. The following MAGMA code verifies the computations used in Proposition 5.6.

```

////////////////////////////////////
// Base family: generic rank >= 2
//
// We specialize the coincidence section and the genuine base section
// at m = 7/3 and verify that their Neron--Tate height matrix has
// positive determinant.
////////////////////////////////////

Q := Rationals();
Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);

m := Q!7/3;
rho := (6 - 2*m)/(m^2 + 7);

assert rho eq Q!3/28;

//-----
// Curve C_rho : y^2 = F_rho(x)
//-----

Qrho :=
    x^2 - 2*(1-rho)*x + rho^2 - 1;

Srho :=
    x^4
    + 2*(1-rho)*x^3
    + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*x^2
    - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*x
    - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

f := Qrho*Srho;

```

```

assert Discriminant(f) ne 0;

//-----
// Integral model: Y = 10976 y
//-----

c := 10976;

fint := c^2*f;

fint := Qx![
    Integers()!Coefficient(fint,i)
    : i in [0..Degree(fint)]
];

C := HyperellipticCurve(fint);
J := Jacobian(C);

//-----
// Coincidence point
//-----

uc := rho - 1;
yc := 2*(rho-1)^2*(2*rho-1);
Yc := c*yc;

assert uc eq -Q!25/28;
assert yc eq -Q!6875/5488;
assert Yc eq -13750;
assert Evaluate(fint,uc) eq Yc^2;

Pc := C![uc,Yc,1];

//-----
// Genuine base point
//-----

uB := (m+1)*(m-3)/(m^2+7);

yB :=
    2*(m-1)*(m+1)^4*(m+5)/(m^2+7)^3;

YB := c*yB;

assert uB eq -Q!5/28;
assert yB eq Q!6875/5488;

```

```

assert YB eq 13750;
assert Evaluate(fint,uB) eq YB^2;

PB := C![uB,YB,1];

//-----
// Jacobian classes
//-----

Pinf := C![1,c,0];

Dc := J![Pc,Pinf];
DB := J![PB,Pinf];

//-----
// Neron--Tate height matrix
//-----

prec := 100;

hc := CanonicalHeight(Dc : Precision := prec);
hB := CanonicalHeight(DB : Precision := prec);
hp := HeightPairing(Dc,DB : Precision := prec);

detH := hc*hB - hp^2;

assert detH gt 0;

print "Base specialization m = 7/3:";
print "rho =", rho;
print "height coincidence class =", hc;
print "height base class          =", hB;
print "height pairing              =", hp;
print "height determinant         =", detH;
print "Hence rank J^B(Q(m)) >= 2.";

```

A.4. The square-condition elliptic surface. The following MAGMA code verifies the fibre types of the elliptic surface in Proposition 7.1 using Tate's algorithm, as well as the specialization calculation used in Lemma 7.3.

```

////////////////////////////////////
// The square-condition elliptic surface
////////////////////////////////////

Q := Rationals();
K<t> := FunctionField(Q);

```

```

c := 2*t*(t^3 - 2*t^2 - 3*t - 2);
d := t^3*(t-4)*(t-1)^2*(t+1)^2;

// y^2 = (x-c)(x^2-4d)
//      = x^3 - c*x^2 - 4*d*x + 4*c*d

E := EllipticCurve([
    K!0,
    -c,
    K!0,
    -4*d,
    4*c*d
]);

////////////////////////////////////
// 1. Discriminant
////////////////////////////////////

Delta :=
    2^16*t^7*(t-4)*(t-1)^2*(t+1)^2*(2*t+1)^4;

assert Discriminant(E) eq Delta;

////////////////////////////////////
// 2. Tate's algorithm at the bad fibres
////////////////////////////////////

// LocalInformation returns
// <place, valuation of minimal discriminant, conductor exponent,
// Tamagawa number, Kodaira symbol, split>.

places := [
    t,
    t-4,
    t-1,
    t+1,
    t+1/2,
    1/t
];

for p in places do
    info, Emin := LocalInformation(E,p);
    print "place =", p;
    print "local information =", info;
end for;

// The output gives:
//
// t = 0          : I_1^*
```

```

// t = 4      : I_1
// t = 1      : I_2
// t = -1     : I_2
// t = -1/2   : I_4
// t = infinity: I_8

////////////////////////////////////
// 3. The sections P and P_4
////////////////////////////////////

P := E![
    2*t^2*(t+1)*(t+5),
    8*t^2*(t+1)*(2*t+1)^2,
    1
];

P4 := E![
    2*t^2*(t-1)^2,
    8*t^2*(t-1)*(2*t+1),
    1
];

T2 := E![c,0,1];

assert 2*P4 eq T2;
assert 4*P4 eq E!0;

////////////////////////////////////
// 4. Specialization at t = 2
////////////////////////////////////

E2 := EllipticCurve([
    Q!0,
    Q!32,
    Q!0,
    Q!576,
    Q!18432
]);

P2 := E2![168,2400,1];

assert 2*P2 eq E2![32,320,1];

// Good reduction at 7 and 13.

ZZ := Integers();
disc2 := ZZ!Discriminant(E2);

assert GCD(disc2,7) eq 1;
assert GCD(disc2,13) eq 1;

```

```
// Count points over the two residue fields.
```

```
F7 := GF(7);
E7 := EllipticCurve([
    F7!0, F7!32, F7!0, F7!576, F7!18432
]);

F13 := GF(13);
E13 := EllipticCurve([
    F13!0, F13!32, F13!0, F13!576, F13!18432
]);
```

```
assert #E7 eq 12;
assert #E13 eq 16;
```

```
print "#E_2(F_7) =", #E7;
print "#E_2(F_13) =", #E13;
print "2P(2)      =", 2*P2;
```

A.5. A 2-descent census in the apex family. The following MAGMA code computes the 2-descent rank bound for every reduced rational parameter considered in equation (14). The rank computation is the expensive part of the search. The code below is written so that the denominator range may be divided into smaller batches when using the online MAGMA calculator. For the largest denominators it may also be necessary to split the inner numerator range into smaller pieces.

```
////////////////////////////////////
// 2-descent census in the apex family
////////////////////////////////////
```

```
Q := Rationals();
Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);
```

```
////////////////////////////////////
// Search range
//
// For the full search use Dmin = 2 and Dmax = 25.
// On the online calculator this may be run in smaller batches.
////////////////////////////////////
```

```
Dmin := 2;
Dmax := 7;
```

```
////////////////////////////////////
// Counters
////////////////////////////////////
```

```
tested := 0;
```

```

counts := [0 : r in [1..5]];

bound1 := [* *];
bound4 := [* *];
bound5 := [* *];

////////////////////////////////////
// Search
////////////////////////////////////

for den in [Dmin..Dmax] do

  print "=====";
  print "denominator =", den;
  print "=====";

  for num in [1..den-1] do

    if GCD(num,den) eq 1 then

      t := -(Q!num)/den;

      // Exclude the equilateral coincidence.
      if t ne -Q!1/2 then

        //-----
        // Apex parametrization.
        //-----

        s := 2*(t+1)/(2*t^2+t+1);
        rho := 1 - s^2/2;

        //-----
        // Curve C_rho : y^2 = F_rho(x).
        //-----

        Qrho :=
          x^2
          - 2*(1-rho)*x
          + rho^2 - 1;

        Srho :=
          x^4
          + 2*(1-rho)*x^3
          + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*x^2
          - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*x
          - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

        f := Qrho*Srho;

```

```

    assert Discriminant(f) ne 0;

    //-----
    // Integral model obtained by scaling y.
    //-----

    drho := Denominator(rho);
    c := drho^3;

    fint := c^2*f;

    fint := Qx![
        Integers()!Coefficient(fint,i)
        : i in [0..Degree(fint)]
    ];

    C := HyperellipticCurve(fint);
    J := Jacobian(C);

    //-----
    // 2-descent rank upper bound.
    //-----

    rb := RankBound(J);

    assert 1 le rb and rb le 5;

    tested += 1;
    counts[rb] += 1;

    if rb eq 1 then
        Append(~bound1,<t,rho>);
    elif rb eq 4 then
        Append(~bound4,<t,rho>);
    elif rb eq 5 then
        Append(~bound5,<t,rho>);
    end if;

    print "";
    print "t =", t;
    print "rho =", rho;
    print "RankBound =", rb;

end if;

end if;

end for;

```

```

end for;

////////////////////////////////////
// Summary for this batch
////////////////////////////////////

print "";
print "=====";
print "SEARCH SUMMARY";
print "=====";

print "denominator range =", Dmin, "..", Dmax;
print "number of t-values tested =", tested;

for r in [1..5] do
  print "RankBound =", r, ":", counts[r];
end for;

assert &+counts eq tested;

print "";
print "RANK-BOUND-1 SPECIALIZATIONS:";

for z in bound1 do
  print "t =", z[1], "rho =", z[2];
end for;

print "";
print "RANK-BOUND-4 SPECIALIZATIONS:";

for z in bound4 do
  print "t =", z[1], "rho =", z[2];
end for;

print "";
print "RANK-BOUND-5 SPECIALIZATIONS:";

for z in bound5 do
  print "t =", z[1], "rho =", z[2];
end for;

////////////////////////////////////
// If the complete range 2,...,25 is run in a single computation,
// these are the resulting totals.
////////////////////////////////////

if Dmin eq 2 and Dmax eq 25 then
  assert tested eq 198;
  assert counts eq [35,91,48,18,6];

```

```
end if;
```

```
print "=====
```

A.6. Verification of the rank-one apex specializations. The following MAGMA code verifies the computations used in Theorem 8.1. For each of the thirty-five specializations, the computation verifies that the 2-descent rank bound is 1, that the coincidence class has positive canonical height, that $C_\rho(\mathbb{Q})$ has exactly ten rational points, and that exactly one of the four rational Weierstrass points gives a genuine pair.

```
////////////////////////////////////
// Thirty-five rank-one apex specializations
////////////////////////////////////
```

```
Q := Rationals();
Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);
```

```
//-----
// Test whether a Weierstrass point gives a genuine pair.
//
// At a Weierstrass point the discriminant of the quadratic
// equation in k vanishes, so k is its unique double root.
//-----
```

```
function IsGenuineWeierstrass(rho,u)
```

```
    A :=
        -2*rho^2 + 4*rho - 2;
```

```
    B :=
        -2*rho^3
        + (-u+10)*rho^2
        - 14*rho
        + (-u^3+u+6);
```

```
    if A eq 0 then
        return false;
    end if;
```

```
    k := -B/(2*A);
```

```
    if k le 0 then
        return false;
    end if;
```

```
    q := 1 - 2*(1-rho)/k;
```

```
    if not (-1 lt q and q lt 1 and q lt rho) then
        return false;
    end if;
```

```

if not (u lt 0 and u^2 lt 1-rho^2) then
  return false;
end if;

T := [
  k*2*(rho-q),
  k*(1-q^2),
  k*(q^2-2*rho*q+1)
];

I := [
  2*(1-rho^2-u^2),
  u^2-rho^2+1,
  u^2-rho^2+1
];

Sort(~T);
Sort(~I);

return T ne I;

end function;

//-----
// <apex parameter t, rho>, ordered by increasing rho
//-----

data := [
  < -Q!1/18,  -Q!11551/11858 >,
  < -Q!1/16,  -Q!14159/14641 >,
  < -Q!1/12,  -Q!4223/4489 >,
  < -Q!2/21,  -Q!152753/165649 >,
  < -Q!1/8,   -Q!727/841 >,
  < -Q!1/7,   -Q!199/242 >,
  < -Q!1/6,   -Q!97/128 >,
  < -Q!3/17,  -Q!5969/8192 >,
  < -Q!3/14,  -Q!2231/3698 >,
  < -Q!5/23,  -Q!15937/26912 >,
  < -Q!3/13,  -Q!1487/2738 >,
  < -Q!1/4,   -Q!23/49 >,
  < -Q!2/7,   -Q!601/1849 >,
  < -Q!7/22,  -Q!4327/22898 >,
  < -Q!2/5,   Q!79/529 >,
  < -Q!4/9,   Q!1879/5929 >,
  < -Q!9/20,  Q!12281/36481 >,
  < -Q!13/25, Q!56761/101761 >,
  < -Q!11/21, Q!14513/25538 >,
  < -Q!11/20, Q!28321/44521 >,

```

```

< -Q!13/23, Q!27103/40328 >,
< -Q!13/22, Q!26111/35912 >,
< -Q!14/23, Q!273103/358801 >,
< -Q!9/14, Q!5503/6728 >,
< -Q!11/17, Q!12191/14792 >,
< -Q!18/25, Q!616079/677329 >,
< -Q!18/23, Q!555719/582169 >,
< -Q!19/24, Q!170041/177241 >,
< -Q!4/5, Q!1319/1369 >,
< -Q!21/25, Q!236081/241081 >,
< -Q!7/8, Q!2777/2809 >,
< -Q!9/10, Q!3673/3698 >,
< -Q!19/21, Q!72521/72962 >,
< -Q!11/12, Q!16057/16129 >,
< -Q!14/15, Q!165199/165649 >
];

//-----
// The online calculator may require verification in batches.
// Change First and Last as needed; together the batches should
// cover all indices 1,...,#data.
//-----

First := 1;
Last  := 5;

for j in [First..Last] do

    item := data[j];

    t := item[1];
    rho := item[2];

    print "===== ";
    print "t =", t;
    print "rho =", rho;

    //-----
    // Verify the apex parametrization.
    //-----

    s := 2*(t+1)/(2*t^2+t+1);

    assert rho eq 1-s^2/2;

    uA := t*s^2;

    //-----

```

```

// Curve C_rho.
//-----

Qrho :=
  x^2 - 2*(1-rho)*x + rho^2 - 1;

Srho :=
  x^4
  + 2*(1-rho)*x^3
  + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*x^2
  - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*x
  - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

f := Qrho*Srho;

assert Discriminant(f) ne 0;
assert Evaluate(f,uA) eq 0;
assert #Roots(f) eq 4;

//-----
// Integral model, obtained by scaling y.
//-----

d := Denominator(rho);
c := d^3;

fint := c^2*f;

fint := Qx![
  Integers()!Coefficient(fint,i)
  : i in [0..Degree(fint)]
];

C := HyperellipticCurve(fint);
J := Jacobian(C);

//-----
// Rank = 1.
//-----

rb := RankBound(J);
assert rb eq 1;

uc := rho - 1;
yc := 2*(rho-1)^2*(2*rho-1);
Yc := c*yc;

assert Evaluate(fint,uc) eq Yc^2;

Pc := C![uc,Yc,1];

```

```

Pinf := C![1,c,0];

// This is minus the coincidence class; the sign is irrelevant.
D := J![Pinf,Pc];

h := CanonicalHeight(D);
assert h gt 0;

//-----
// Chabauty.
//-----

allpts := Chabauty(D : ptC := Pc);

print "rational points =", allpts;
assert #allpts eq 10;

//-----
// Structure of C_rho(Q).
//-----

num_inf :=
  #[P : P in allpts | P[3] eq 0];

num_deg :=
  #[P : P in allpts |
    P[3] ne 0 and P[1] eq 0];

num_coinc :=
  #[P : P in allpts |
    P[3] ne 0 and P[1]/P[3] eq rho-1];

weier :=
  [P : P in allpts |
    P[3] ne 0 and P[2] eq 0];

assert num_inf eq 2;
assert num_deg eq 2;
assert num_coinc eq 2;
assert #weier eq 4;

//-----
// Exactly one Weierstrass point is genuine.
//-----

genuine_count := 0;

for P in weier do

  u := P[1]/P[3];

```

```

        if IsGenuineWeierstrass(rho,u) then
            genuine_count += 1;
        end if;

    end for;

    assert genuine_count eq 1;
    assert IsGenuineWeierstrass(rho,uA);

    print "RankBound =", rb;
    print "canonical height =", h;
    print "#C_rho(Q) =", #allpts;
    print "genuine Weierstrass points =", genuine_count;

end for;

print "=====";

```

A.7. Higher-rank apex specializations. The following code verifies the three exact-rank computations in Proposition 8.2. In each case, `RankBound` gives the upper bound, while `MordellWeilGroupGenus2` finds a finite-index subgroup having the same torsion-free rank. Since the latter computation can be time-consuming, the three specializations may be verified separately on the online MAGMA calculator.

```

////////////////////////////////////
// Higher-rank specializations in the apex family
////////////////////////////////////

Q := Rationals();
Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);

data := [
    < -Q!1/3, -Q!1/8,      2 >,
    < -Q!1/5, -Q!79/121,   3 >,
    < -Q!4/7,  Q!1927/2809, 4 >
];

//-----
// The online calculator may require these computations
// to be run separately.
//
// Use First = Last = 1, 2, or 3 to verify one case at a time.
// To run all three at once, use First = 1 and Last = 3.
//-----

First := 1;
Last  := 1;

for j in [First..Last] do

```

```

item := data[j];

t := item[1];
rho := item[2];
expected_rank := item[3];
print "=====";
print "t =", t;
print "rho =", rho;

//-----
// Verify the apex parametrization.
//-----

s := 2*(t+1)/(2*t^2+t+1);

assert rho eq 1-s^2/2;

//-----
// Curve C_rho.
//-----

Qrho :=
    x^2
    - 2*(1-rho)*x
    + rho^2 - 1;

Srho :=
    x^4
    + 2*(1-rho)*x^3
    + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*x^2
    - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*x
    - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

f := Qrho*Srho;

assert Discriminant(f) ne 0;

//-----
// Integral model.
//-----

d := Denominator(rho);
c := d^3;

fint := c^2*f;

fint := Qx![
    Integers()!Coefficient(fint,i)
    : i in [0..Degree(fint)]
];

```

```

C := HyperellipticCurve(fint);
J := Jacobian(C);

//-----
// Upper bound from 2-descent.
//-----

rb := RankBound(J);

assert rb eq expected_rank;

//-----
// Matching lower bound from a Mordell--Weil subgroup.
//-----

SetVerbose("MordellWeilGroup",1);

G, mp, finite_index, proved, upper :=
  MordellWeilGroupGenus2(
    J :
      RankOnly := true,
      Rankbound := rb
  );

assert finite_index;
assert upper eq expected_rank;
assert TorsionFreeRank(G) eq expected_rank;

print "Mordell-Weil subgroup =", G;
print "torsion-free rank =", TorsionFreeRank(G);
print "finite_index =", finite_index;
print "proved =", proved;
print "upper =", upper;

end for;

print "=====";

```

A.8. Rank-two scalene specializations. The following MAGMA code verifies the computations used in Proposition 8.3.

```

////////////////////////////////////
// Four scalene specializations of rank 2
//
// For each rho:
//   (1) RankBound gives rank <= 2;
//   (2) the coincidence class and the class coming from the
//       genuine scalene point have positive height determinant;
//   (3) hence the two classes are independent and rank = 2.
////////////////////////////////////

```

```

Q := Rationals();
Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);

// <rho, u-coordinate of the genuine scalene point>
data := [
    < -Q!3/5,    -Q!2/15 >,
    < -Q!17/32, -Q!35/48 >,
    < Q!2/7,     -Q!9/14 >,
    < Q!4/5,     -Q!17/30 >
];

for item in data do

    rho := item[1];
    us  := item[2];

    print "===== ";
    print "rho =", rho;
    print "scalene u =", us;

    //-----
    // Curve C_rho : y^2 = F_rho(x)
    //-----

    Qrho :=
        x^2 - 2*(1-rho)*x + rho^2 - 1;

    Srho :=
        x^4
        + 2*(1-rho)*x^3
        + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*x^2
        - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*x
        - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

    f := Qrho*Srho;

    assert Discriminant(f) ne 0;

    //-----
    // Multiply by a rational square to obtain an integral model.
    //-----

    d := Denominator(rho);
    c := d^3;

    fint := c^2*f;
    fint := Qx![
        Integers()!Coefficient(fint,i)
        : i in [0..Degree(fint)]

```

```

];

C := HyperellipticCurve(fint);
J := Jacobian(C);

//-----
// Rank upper bound.
//-----

rb := RankBound(J);
assert rb eq 2;

//-----
// Coincidence point.
//-----

uc := rho - 1;
yc := 2*(rho-1)^2*(2*rho-1);
Yc := c*yc;

assert Evaluate(fint,uc) eq Yc^2;

Pc := C![uc,Yc,1];

//-----
// Genuine scalene point.
//-----

flag, ys := IsSquare(Evaluate(fint,us));
assert flag;

Ys := c*ys;
assert Evaluate(fint,us) eq Ys^2;

Ps := C![us,Ys,1];

//-----
// Divisor classes.
//-----

Pinf := C![1,c,0];

Dc := J![Pc,Pinf];
Ds := J![Ps,Pinf];

//-----
// Neron--Tate height pairing.
//-----

```

```

prec := 100;

hc := CanonicalHeight(Dc : Precision := prec);
hs := CanonicalHeight(Ds : Precision := prec);
hp := HeightPairing(Dc,Ds : Precision := prec);

detH := hc*hs - hp^2;

assert detH gt 0;

print "RankBound =", rb;
print "height coincidence class =", hc;
print "height scalene class      =", hs;
print "height pairing            =", hp;
print "height determinant       =", detH;
print "Hence rank J_rho(Q) = 2.";

end for;

print "=====";

```

A.9. Rank-two specializations in the base family. The following MAGMA code verifies the computations stated in Proposition 8.4.

```

Q := Rationals();
Qx<x> := PolynomialRing(Q);

data := [
    < Q!1/3, Q!3/4, 64 >,
    < Q!2, Q!2/11, 1331 >
];

for item in data do

    m := item[1];
    rho := item[2];
    c := item[3];

    assert rho eq (6 - 2*m)/(m^2 + 7);

    Qrho :=
        x^2 - 2*(1-rho)*x + rho^2 - 1;

    Srho :=
        x^4
        + 2*(1-rho)*x^3
        + (1-rho)*(3-5*rho)*x^2
        - 4*(1-rho)^2*(1+rho)*x
        - 4*(1-rho)^3*(1+rho);

```

```

f := Qrho*Srho;

fint := c^2*f;
fint := Qx![
    Integers()!Coefficient(fint,i)
    : i in [0..Degree(fint)]
];

C := HyperellipticCurve(fint);
J := Jacobian(C);

rb := RankBound(J);
assert rb eq 2;

uc := rho - 1;
yc := 2*(rho-1)^2*(2*rho-1);

uB := (m+1)*(m-3)/(m^2+7);
yB := 2*(m-1)*(m+1)^4*(m+5)/(m^2+7)^3;

Pc := C![uc,c*yc,1];
PB := C![uB,c*yB,1];
Pinf := C![1,c,0];

Dc := J![Pc,Pinf];
DB := J![PB,Pinf];

prec := 100;

hc := CanonicalHeight(Dc : Precision := prec);
hB := CanonicalHeight(DB : Precision := prec);
hp := HeightPairing(Dc,DB : Precision := prec);

detH := hc*hB - hp^2;

assert detH gt 0;

print "rho =", rho;
print "RankBound =", rb;
print "height determinant =", detH;
print "Hence rank J_rho(Q) = 2.";

end for;

```

A.10. **The elliptic four-pair family.** The following MAGMA code verifies the square identities used in Theorem 9.4.

```

////////////////////////////////////
// Elliptic four-pair family
////////////////////////////////////

```

```

Q := Rational();
F<la> := FunctionField(Q);
R<T> := PolynomialRing(F);

fH := 9 - 21*la^2 - 18*la^3 - 2*la^4;

// Function field of H : V^2 = fH.
K<V> := ext<F | T^2 - fH>;

l := K!la;

X :=
  4*l*(1+1)*(1+3)
  / ((3-l)*(1^2+3));

function Delta(z)
  H := z*(1-z^2)/X;
  return 1 - (2+X^2)*H + H^2;
end function;

z1 := 4*l/(1^2+3);

z2 :=
  (1-l)*(1+3)/(1^2+3);

z3 :=
  (1^2+3+2*V)
  / (3*(3-l)*(1+1));

z4 :=
  (1^2+3-2*V)
  / (3*(3-l)*(1+1));

////////////////////////////////////
// Square roots for z1 and z2
////////////////////////////////////

d12 :=
  1*(1+3)*(1^2+6*l-3)
  / (1^2+3)^2;

assert Delta(z1) eq d12^2;
assert Delta(z2) eq d12^2;

////////////////////////////////////
// Square roots for z3 and z4
////////////////////////////////////

A :=
  5*l^6

```

A.11. **Verification of the higher-multiplicity examples.** The following computation verifies all the entries of Tables 3 and 4 using exact rational arithmetic. For each listed value of ρ and each listed parameter u , we solve the quadratic equation

$$2(1-\rho)^2(\rho-q)(1+q)+u(1-\rho^2-u^2)(1-q)=0$$

for q . The two rational roots give congruent θ -triangles, as proved in Proposition 6.3. The computation checks the triangle inequalities, the distinguished angle, equality of perimeter and area, non-congruence of the two triangles, and finally the number of distinct geometric pairs.

```

////////////////////////////////////
// Exact verification of the high-multiplicity tables
////////////////////////////////////

```

```
Q := Rationals();
Qq<qq> := PolynomialRing(Q);
```

```
//////////////////////////////////////  
// Basic routines  
//////////////////////////////////////
```

```
function CanTriangle(T)
```

```

    S := T;
    Sort(~S);
    return S;

end function;

function ValidTriangle(T)

    S := CanTriangle(T);

    return
        S[1] gt 0 and
        S[2] gt 0 and
        S[3] gt 0 and
        S[1] + S[2] gt S[3];

end function;

////////////////////////////////////
// Given rho and u, reconstruct the geometric genuine pair.
//
// The quadratic in q has two rational roots. They give the same
// theta-triangle up to permutation of the two sides adjacent to
// theta. We check this explicitly.
////////////////////////////////////

function PairFromRhoU(rho,u)

    if not (-1 lt rho and rho lt 1) then
        return false, [], [];
    end if;

    if not (u lt 0 and u^2 lt 1-rho^2) then
        return false, [], [];
    end if;

    Iso := [
        2*(1-rho^2-u^2),
        u^2-rho^2+1,
        u^2-rho^2+1
    ];

    if not ValidTriangle(Iso) then
        return false, [], [];
    end if;

    IsoCan := CanTriangle(Iso);

```

```

eqn :=
  2*(1-rho)^2*(rho-qq)*(1+qq)
  + u*(1-rho^2-u^2)*(1-qq);

roots := Roots(eqn);

// For all entries in the tables there are two rational q-values.
assert #roots eq 2;

ThetaKeys := [];

for rt in roots do

  q := rt[1];

  if -1 lt q and q lt 1 and q lt rho then

    k := 2*(1-rho)/(1-q);

    Theta := [
      2*k*(rho-q),
      k*(1-q^2),
      k*(q^2-2*rho*q+1)
    ];

    assert ValidTriangle(Theta);

    // Check that the distinguished angle has cosine rho.
    assert
      Theta[3]^2 eq
      Theta[1]^2 + Theta[2]^2
      - 2*rho*Theta[1]*Theta[2];

    // Equal perimeter.
    assert &+Theta eq &+Iso;

    // Equal area after cancelling sqrt(1-rho^2).
    assert
      Theta[1]*Theta[2]/2
      eq
      -2*u*(1-rho^2-u^2);

    ThetaCan := CanTriangle(Theta);

    // Genuine: the two triangles are not congruent.
    assert ThetaCan ne IsoCan;

    if not (ThetaCan in ThetaKeys) then
      Append(~ThetaKeys, ThetaCan);

```

```

        end if;

    end if;

end for;

// The two q-values represent the same geometric theta-triangle.
assert #ThetaKeys eq 1;

PairKey := ThetaKeys[1] cat IsoCan;

return true, PairKey, ThetaKeys[1];

end function;

////////////////////////////////////
// Data
//
// Each entry is
//
// < rho, list of u-values, expected number of pairs,
//     expected number of distinct theta-triangles >.
//
// The first five entries correspond to pairwise non-congruent
// theta-triangles. The last four contain one theta-triangle shared
// by two distinct isosceles partners.
//
// Within each category, the >= 6 example comes first; the >= 5
// examples are then ordered by increasing rho.
////////////////////////////////////

data := [* *];

////////////////////////////////////
// Disjoint theta-triangles
////////////////////////////////////

Append(~data,
    <
        Q!1952/3977,
        [
            -Q!6525/7954,
            -Q!8415/15908,
            -Q!4095/7954,
            -Q!1980/3977,
            -Q!1800/3977,
            -Q!1395/3977
        ],

```

```

        6, 6
    >
);

Append(~data,
    <
        Q!613/1495,
        [
            -Q!42/65,
            -Q!714/1495,
            -Q!672/1495,
            -Q!651/1495,
            -Q!357/1495
        ],
        5, 5
    >
);

Append(~data,
    <
        Q!817/1969,
        [
            -Q!952/1969,
            -Q!912/1969,
            -Q!624/1969,
            -Q!2544/9845,
            -Q!9552/13783
        ],
        5, 5
    >
);

Append(~data,
    <
        Q!7671/16121,
        [
            -Q!13780/16121,
            -Q!8580/16121,
            -Q!8320/16121,
            -Q!39650/177331,
            -Q!7956/16121
        ],
        5, 5
    >
);

Append(~data,
    <
        Q!302/527,
        [

```

```

        -Q!315/527,
        -Q!120/527,
        -Q!525/1054,
        -Q!435/1054,
        -Q!829/1581
    ],
    5, 5
>
);

////////////////////////////////////
// One shared theta-triangle
////////////////////////////////////

Append(~data,
<
    Q!2619/5069,
    [
        -Q!3360/5069,
        -Q!1540/5069,
        -Q!420/5069,
        -Q!5075/10138,
        -Q!980/15207,
        -Q!92225/167277
    ],
    6, 5
>
);

Append(~data,
<
    -Q!327/1241,
    [
        -Q!1008/1241,
        -Q!56/73,
        -Q!392/1241,
        -Q!1064/3723,
        -Q!168/1241
    ],
    5, 4
>
);

Append(~data,
<
    Q!2341/4141,
    [
        -Q!60/101,
        -Q!1440/4141,

```

```

        -Q!2100/4141,
        -Q!900/4141,
        -Q!11112/28987
    ],
    5, 4
>
);

Append(~data,
<
    Q!171/221,
    [
        -Q!100/221,
        -Q!60/221,
        -Q!105/221,
        -Q!665/2431,
        -Q!588/2873
    ],
    5, 4
>
);

////////////////////////////////////
// Verify every entry
////////////////////////////////////

for item in data do

    rho          := item[1];
    us           := item[2];
    expectedPairs := item[3];
    expectedTheta := item[4];

    PairKeys := [];
    ThetaKeys := [];

    for u in us do

        flag, PairKey, ThetaKey := PairFromRhoU(rho,u);

        assert flag;

        // Each listed u gives a new genuine geometric pair.
        assert not (PairKey in PairKeys);
        Append(~PairKeys,PairKey);

        if not (ThetaKey in ThetaKeys) then
            Append(~ThetaKeys,ThetaKey);
        end if;
    end for
end for

```

```

end for;

assert #PairKeys eq expectedPairs;
assert #ThetaKeys eq expectedTheta;

print "=====";
print "rho =", rho;
print "number of distinct genuine pairs =", #PairKeys;
print "number of distinct theta-triangles =", #ThetaKeys;

if expectedPairs eq expectedTheta then
  print "geometry: disjoint";
else
  assert expectedPairs eq expectedTheta + 1;
  print "geometry: one shared theta-triangle";
end if;

end for;

print "=====";
print "All entries of the high-multiplicity tables verified.";

```

REFERENCES

- [AT21] Dorin Andrica and George C. Țurcaș. Pairs of rational triangles with equal symmetric invariants. *J. Number Theory*, 221:496–504, 2021.
- [BD11] Nils Bruin and Kevin Doerksen. The arithmetic of genus two curves with $(4, 4)$ -split Jacobians. *Canad. J. Math.*, 63(5):992–1024, 2011.
- [Bre81] Andrew Bremner. A geometric approach to equal sums of sixth powers. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 43(3):544–581, 1981.
- [Fal83] G. Faltings. Endlichkeitssätze für abelsche Varietäten über Zahlkörpern. *Invent. Math.*, 73(3):349–366, 1983.
- [Fal84] G. Faltings. Erratum: “Finiteness theorems for abelian varieties over number fields”. *Invent. Math.*, 75(2):381, 1984.
- [HM19] Yoshinosuke Hirakawa and Hideki Matsumura. A unique pair of triangles. *J. Number Theory*, 194:297–302, 2019.
- [HM23] Yoshinosuke Hirakawa and Hideki Matsumura. Corrigendum to “A unique pair of triangles” [J. Number Theory 194 (2019) 297–302]. *J. Number Theory*, 242:44–45, 2023.
- [LMF24] LMFDB Collaboration. The L -functions and modular forms database. <https://www.lmfdb.org>, 2024. Elliptic curve 90.b3: <https://www.lmfdb.org/EllipticCurve/Q/90/b/3>; elliptic curve 1260.d4: <https://www.lmfdb.org/EllipticCurve/Q/1260/d/4>; elliptic curve 294.c2: <https://www.lmfdb.org/EllipticCurve/Q/294/c/2>; elliptic curve 480.c4: <https://www.lmfdb.org/EllipticCurve/Q/480/c/4>; elliptic curve 207.a2: <https://www.lmfdb.org/EllipticCurve/Q/207/a/2> 21.a6: 48.3.e.a:
- [Sil83] Joseph H. Silverman. Heights and the specialization map for families of abelian varieties. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 342:197–211, 1983.
- [Sko50] T. Skolem. *Diophantische Gleichungen*. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. New Chelsea Publishing Company, 1950.
- [SS10] Matthias Schütt and Tetsuji Shioda. Elliptic surfaces. In *Algebraic geometry in East Asia—Seoul 2008*, volume 60 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 51–160. Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2010.
- [Sto19] Michael Stoll. Diagonal genus 5 curves, elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}(t)$, and rational Diophantine quintuples. *Acta Arith.*, 190(3):239–261, 2019.

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE STATISTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC,
CANADA

Email address: jesse.allen@umontreal.ca

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE STATISTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC,
CANADA

Email address: olivier.beaudry-ogden@umontreal.ca

ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE DE LYON, LYON, FRANCE

Email address: theophane.bouchard@ens-lyon.fr

ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE DE LYON, LYON, FRANCE

Email address: mateo.frely@ens-lyon.fr

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE STATISTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC,
CANADA

Email address: matilde.lalin@umontreal.ca

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE STATISTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC,
CANADA

Email address: abel-jimmy.oyono-montoki@umontreal.ca

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE STATISTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL, MONTRÉAL, QUÉBEC,
CANADA

Email address: bjringseling@gmail.com