

# The Tammes problem for $N=14$

Oleg R. Musin\* and Alexey S. Tarasov

## Abstract

The Tammes problem is to find the arrangement of  $N$  points on a unit sphere which maximizes the minimum distance between any two points. This problem is presently solved for several values of  $N$ , namely for  $N = 3, 4, 6, 12$  by L. Fejes Tóth (1943); for  $N = 5, 7, 8, 9$  by Schütte and van der Waerden (1951); for  $N = 10, 11$  by Danzer (1963) and for  $N = 24$  by Robinson (1961). Recently, we solved the Tammes problem for  $N = 13$ .

The optimal configuration of 14 points was conjectured more than 60 years ago. In the paper, we give a solution of this long-standing open problem in geometry. Our computer-assisted proof relies on an enumeration of the irreducible contact graphs.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 The kissing number and thirteen spheres problem

The *kissing number*  $k(n)$  is the highest number of equal non-overlapping spheres in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  that touch another sphere of the same size. In three dimensions the kissing number problem asks how many white billiard balls can *kiss* (i.e. touch) a black ball.

The most symmetrical configuration, 12 balls around another, is achieved if the 12 balls are placed at positions corresponding to the vertices of a regular icosahedron concentric with the central ball. However, these 12 outer balls do not kiss one another and each may be moved freely. This space between the balls prompts the question: *If you moved all of them to one side, would a 13th ball fit?*

This problem was the subject of the famous discussion between Isaac Newton and David Gregory in 1694. Most reports say that Newton believed the answer was 12 balls, while Gregory thought that 13 might be possible.

This problem is often called the *thirteen spheres problem*. The problem was finally solved by Schütte and van der Waerden in 1953 [29]. A subsequent two-page sketch of an elegant proof was given by Leech [16] in 1956. Leech's proof was presented in the first edition of the well-known book by Aigner and Ziegler [1]; the authors removed this chapter from the second edition because a complete proof would have to include too much spherical trigonometry.

---

\*This research is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-1400876 and the RFBR grant 15-01-99563.

The thirteen spheres problem continues to be of interest, and new proofs have been published in the last several years by Hsiang [15], Maehara [18, 19] (this proof is based on Leech’s proof), Böröczky [5], Anstreicher [2], and Musin [20].

Note that for  $n > 3$ , the kissing number problem is currently solved only for  $n = 8, 24$  [17, 24], and for  $n = 4$  [21] (see [26] for a beautiful exposition of this problem).

## 1.2 The Tammes problem

If  $N$  unit spheres kiss the unit sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , then the set of kissing points is an arrangement on the central sphere such that the (Euclidean) distance between any two points is at least 1. This observation allows us to state the kissing number problem in another way: *How many points can be placed on the surface of  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  so that the angular separation between any two points be at least  $60^\circ$ ?*

It leads to an important generalization. A finite subset  $X$  of  $\mathbb{S}^{n-1}$  is called a *spherical  $\psi$ -code* if for every pair  $(x, y)$  of  $X$  with  $x \neq y$  its angular distance  $\text{dist}(x, y)$  is at least  $\psi$ . Let  $X$  be a finite subset of  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . Denote

$$\psi(X) := \min_{x, y \in X} \{\text{dist}(x, y)\}, \text{ where } x \neq y.$$

The set  $X$  is then a spherical  $\psi(X)$ -code.

Denote by  $d_N$  the largest angular separation  $\psi(X)$  with  $|X| = N$  that can be attained in  $\mathbb{S}^2$ , i.e.

$$d_N := \max_{X \subset \mathbb{S}^2} \{\psi(X)\}, \text{ where } |X| = N.$$

In other words, *how are  $N$  congruent, non-overlapping circles distributed on the sphere when the common radius of the circles has to be as large as possible?*

This question is also known as the problem of the “inimical dictators”, namely *Where should  $N$  dictators build their palaces on a planet so as to be as far away from each other as possible?* The problem was first asked by the Dutch botanist Tammes [30] (see [9, Section 1.6: Problem 6]), while examining the distribution of openings on the pollen grains of different flowers.

The Tammes problem is presently solved for several values of  $N$ , namely for  $N = 3, 4, 6, 12$  by L. Fejes Tóth [13]; for  $N = 5, 7, 8, 9$  by Schütte and van der Waerden [28]; for  $N = 10, 11$  by Danzer [12] (for  $N = 11$  see also Böröczky [4]); and for  $N = 24$  by Robinson [27].

## 1.3 The Tammes problem for $N = 13$

The Tammes problem for  $N = 13$  is of particular interest due to its relation to both the kissing problem and the Kepler conjecture [6, 14]. Actually, this problem is equivalent to *the strong thirteen spheres problem*, which asks to find the maximum radius of and an arrangement for 13 equal size non-overlapping spheres in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  touching the unit sphere.

It is clear that the equality  $k(3) = 12$  implies  $d_{13} < 60^\circ$ . Böröczky and Szabó [6] proved that  $d_{13} < 58.7^\circ$ . Bachoc and Vallentin [8] have shown that  $d_{13} < 58.5^\circ$ .

We solved the Tammes' problem for  $N = 13$  in 2012 [22]. We proved that *the arrangement  $P_{13}$  of 13 points in  $\mathbb{S}^2$  is the best possible, the maximal arrangement is unique up to isometry, and  $d_{13} = \psi(P_{13}) \approx 57.1367^\circ$ .*

In this paper, using very similar method we present a solution to the Tammes' problem for  $N = 14$ .

## 1.4 The Tammes problem for $N = 14$

We note that there is an arrangement of 14 points on  $\mathbb{S}^2$  such that the distance between any two points of the arrangement is at least  $55.67057^\circ$  (see [14, Ch. VI, Sec. 4] and <http://neilsloane.com/packings/dim3/pack.3.14.txt>). This arrangement is shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1:  $P_{14}$  and its contact graph  $\Gamma_{14}$ .  $\psi(P_{14}) \approx 55.67057^\circ$ .

The first upper bound  $d_{14} < 58.6809^\circ$  was found in [13, 14]. Actually, this value is the famous Fejes Tóth bound

$$d_N \leq \arccos\left(\frac{c_N}{1 - c_N}\right), \text{ where } c_N := \cos\left(\frac{\pi N}{3N - 6}\right),$$

for  $N = 14$ .

Böröczky and Szabó [7] improved the Fejes Tóth bound and proved that  $d_{14} < 58^\circ$ . Bachoc and Vallentin [8] using the SDP method have shown that  $d_{14} < 56.58^\circ$ .

## 2 Main theorem

**Theorem 1.** *The arrangement  $P_{14}$  of 14 points in  $\mathbb{S}^2$  gives a solution of the Tammes problem, moreover the maximal arrangement for  $N = 14$  is unique up to isometry and  $d_{14} = \psi(P_{14}) \approx 55.67057^\circ$ .*

## 2.1 Basic definitions

**Contact graphs.** Let  $X$  be a finite set in  $\mathbb{S}^2$ . The *contact graph*  $\text{CG}(X)$  is the graph with vertices in  $X$  and edges  $(x, y)$ ,  $x, y \in X$  such that  $\text{dist}(x, y) = \psi(X)$ .

**Shift of a single vertex.** We say that a vertex  $x \in X$  *can be shifted*, if, in any open neighbourhood of  $x$  there is a point  $x' \in \mathbb{S}^2$  such that

$$\text{dist}(x', X \setminus \{x\}) > \text{dist}(x, X \setminus \{x\}),$$

where for a point  $p \in \mathbb{S}^2$  and a finite set  $Y \subset \mathbb{S}^2$  by  $\text{dist}(p, Y)$  we denote the minimum distance between  $p$  and points in  $Y$ .

**Danzer's flip.** Danzer [12, Sec. 1] defined the following flip. Let  $x, y, z$  be vertices of  $\text{CG}(X)$  with  $\text{dist}(x, y) = \text{dist}(x, z) = \psi(X)$ . We say that  $x$  is flipped over  $yz$  if  $x$  is replaced by its mirror image  $x'$  relative to the great circle  $yz$  (see Fig. 2). We say that this flip is *Danzer's flip* if  $\text{dist}(x', X \setminus \{x, y, z\}) > \psi(X)$ .




Figure 2: Danzer's flip

**Irreducible contact graphs.** We say that a graph  $\text{CG}(X)$  is *irreducible* provided it does not allow Danzer's flip and no vertex in  $X$  can be shifted.

The concept of irreducible contact graphs was invented by Schütte - van der Waerden [28, 29], Fejes Tóth [14], and Danzer [12]. Actually, in these papers as well as in our paper [22] this concept has been used for solutions of the Tammes problem with  $N = 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13$ . Recently, we enumerated all of the irreducible contact graphs (with and without Danzer's flip) for  $N \leq 11$  [23].

$P_{14}$  and  $\Gamma_{14}$ . Denote by  $P_{14}$  the arrangement of 14 points in Fig. 1. Let  $\Gamma_{14} := \text{CG}(P_{14})$ . It is not hard to see that the graph  $\Gamma_{14}$  is irreducible.

**Maximal graphs  $G_{14}$ .** Let  $X$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{S}^2$  with  $|X| = 14$  and  $\psi(X) = d_{14}$ . Denote by  $G_{14}$  the graph  $\text{CG}(X)$ . Actually, this definition does not assume that  $G_{14}$  is unique. We use this designation for some  $\text{CG}(X)$  with  $\psi(X) = d_{14}$ .

**Graphs  $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ .** Let us define five planar graphs  $\Gamma_{13}^{(i)}$  (see Fig. 3), where  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ , and  $\Gamma_{14}^{(0)} := \Gamma_{14}$ . Note that  $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ ,  $i > 0$ , is obtained from  $\Gamma_{14}$  by removing certain edges.




Figure 3: Graphs  $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ .

## 2.2 Main lemmas

**Lemma 1.**  $G_{14}$  is isomorphic to  $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$  with  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ , or  $4$ .

**Lemma 2.**  $G_{14}$  is isomorphic to  $\Gamma_{14}^{(0)}$  and  $d_{14} = \psi(P_{14})$ .

It is clear that Lemma 2 yields Theorem 1. Now our goal is to prove these lemmas.

## 3 Proof of Lemma 1

Here we give a sketch of our computer assisted proof. For more details see <http://dcs.isa.ru/taras/tammes14/~>.

### 3.1 Combinatorial and geometric properties of $G_{14}$

The combinatorial properties of  $G_N$  have previously been considered [ [12], [14, Chap. VI], [6, 7] and [22, 23] ]. In particular, for  $N = 14$  we have:

**Proposition 3.1.**

1.  $G_{14}$  is a planar graph with 14 vertices;
2. Any vertex of  $G_{14}$  is of degree 0, 3, 4, or 5;
3. Any face of  $G_{14}$  is a polygon with 3, 4, 5 or 6 vertices;

4. If  $G_{14}$  contains an isolated vertex  $v$ , then  $v$  lies in a hexagonal face. Moreover, a hexagonal face of  $G_{14}$  cannot contain two or more isolated vertices.

In our papers [22, 23] the main relations between these parameters were considered ([22, Propositions 3.6–3.11], [23, Proposition 4.11]). Let us list those results here.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $G = \text{CG}(X)$  be an irreducible contact graph in  $\mathbb{S}^2$  with faces  $F_k$ . Let  $d = \psi(X)$ . Denote by  $u_{ki}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m_k$  the set of its angles. Here  $m_k$  denotes the number of vertices of  $F_k$ .*

1.  $u_{ki} < \pi$  for all  $i$  and  $k$ .
2.  $u_{ki} \geq \alpha(d)$  for all  $i$  and  $k$ , where

$$\alpha(d) := \arccos\left(\frac{\cos d}{1 + \cos d}\right)$$

is the angle of the equilateral spherical triangle with side length  $d$ .

3.  $\sum_{\tau \in I(v)} u_\tau = 2\pi$  for all vertices  $v$  of  $G$ . Here  $I(v)$  denotes the set of angles with the vertex in  $v$ .
4. If  $m_k = 3$  then  $F_k$  is an equilateral triangle with angles

$$u_{k1} = u_{k2} = u_{k3} = \alpha(d).$$

5. In the case  $m_k = 4$ ,  $F_k$  is a spherical rhombus and  $u_{k1} = u_{k3}$ ,  $u_{k2} = u_{k4}$ . Moreover, we have the equality:

$$\cot \frac{u_{k1}}{2} \cot \frac{u_{k2}}{2} = \cos d.$$

6. In the case  $m_k > 3$ ,  $F_k$  is a convex equilateral spherical polygon with angles  $u_{k1}, \dots, u_{m_k}$ . Denote by  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_{m_k}$  vertices of  $F_k$ . The polygon  $F_k$  is uniquely defined (up to isometry) by its  $s := m_k - 3$  angles and  $d$ . Then functions  $g_i$  and  $\zeta_{ij}$ , where  $u_{ki} = g_i(u_{k1}, \dots, u_{ks}, d)$  and  $\text{dist}(A_i, A_j) = \zeta_{i,j}(u_{k1}, \dots, u_{ks}, d)$  are also uniquely defined. It follows that

- (a)  $u_{ki} = g_i(u_{k1}, \dots, u_{ks}, d)$  for  $i = m_k - 2, m_k - 1, m_k$ ; and
- (b)  $\zeta_{i,j}(u_{k1}, \dots, u_{ks}, d) \geq d$  for all  $i \neq j$ .

7. Now consider the case when there is an isolated vertex inside  $F_k$ . (It is only if  $m_k > 5$ .) Define

$$\lambda(u_{k1}, \dots, u_{ks}, d) := \max_{p \in F_k} \min_i \{\text{dist}(p, A_i)\}.$$

Then  $\lambda(u_{k1}, \dots, u_{ks}, d) > d$ .

### 3.2 Sketch of a proof

Our proof of Lemma 1 consists of two parts:

- (I) Create the list  $L_{14}$  of all graphs with 14 vertices that satisfy Proposition 3.1;
- (II) Using linear approximations and linear programming remove from the list  $L_{14}$  all graphs that do not satisfy the known geometric properties of  $G_{14}$  (Proposition 3.2).

(I). To create  $L_{14}$  we use the program *plantri* (see [25]).<sup>1</sup> This program is the isomorph-free generator of planar graphs, including triangulations, quadrangulations, and convex polytopes. (Brinkmann and McKay's paper [10] describes *plantri*'s principles of operation, the basis for its efficiency, and recursive algorithms behind many of its capabilities.)

The program generates about 1.5 billion graphs in  $L_{14}$ , i.e. graphs that satisfy Proposition 3.1. Namely,  $L_{14}$  contains 409 771 114 graphs with triangular and quadrilateral faces; 797 728 634 with at least one pentagonal face and with triangular and quadrilaterals; 242 401 773 with at least one hexagonal face which do not contain isolated vertices.

The list of graphs with one and more isolated vertices relies on graphs in  $L_N$  with  $N < 14$  that contain at least  $14 - N$  hexagons. For instance, the list of graphs in  $L_{14}$  with exactly one isolated vertex consists of 2 083 967 graphs. However, this list may contain isomorphic graphs.

(II). Let  $X \subset \mathbb{S}^2$  be a finite point set such that its contact graph  $\text{CG}(X)$  is irreducible. Properties (i)-(iv) are combinatorial properties of  $\text{CG}(X)$ . There are several geometric properties.

Note that all faces of  $\text{CG}(X)$  are convex. Since all edges of  $\text{CG}(X)$  have the same length,  $\psi(X)$ , all its faces are spherical equilateral convex polygon with number of vertices at most  $\lfloor 2\pi/\psi(X) \rfloor$ .

Consider now a planar graph  $G$  with given faces  $\{F_k\}$  that satisfy Corollary 2.1. We are going consider embeddings of this graph into  $\mathbb{S}^2$  as an irreducible contact graph  $\text{CG}(X)$  for some  $X \subset \mathbb{S}^2$ .

Any embedding of  $G$  in  $\mathbb{S}^2$  is uniquely defined by the following list of parameters (variables):

- (i) The edge length  $d$ ;
- (ii) The set of all angles  $u_{ki}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m_k$  of faces  $F_k$ . Here by  $m_k$  we denote the number of vertices of  $F_k$ .

Let us consider a graph  $G$  from  $L_{14}$ . We start from the level of approximation  $\ell = 1$ . Now using Proposition 3.2 we write the linear equalities and inequalities below.

- (a) From Proposition 3.2(3) we have 14 linear equalities

$$\sum_{\tau \in I(v)} u_\tau = 2\pi.$$

- (b) Since  $55.67057^\circ = 0.9716 \leq d_{14} < 0.9875 = 56.58^\circ$ , from Proposition 3.2(2) we have

$$1.2019 \leq \alpha_{14} < 1.2077,$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The authors of this program are Gunnar Brinkmann and Brendan McKay.

where  $\alpha_{14} := \alpha(d_{14})$ .

(c) For a quadrilateral  $F$  with angles  $u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4$  we have the equalities

$$u_3 = u_1, \quad u_4 = u_2,$$

and inequalities

$$\alpha_{14} \leq u_i \leq 2\alpha_{13}, \quad i = 1, 2.$$

(d) For a quadrilateral  $F$  we also have the linear inequalities

$$3.6057 \leq u_1 + u_2 \leq 3.7294.$$

These inequalities follow from Proposition 3.2(5). We have

$$u_2 = \rho(u_1, d) := 2 \cot^{-1}(\tan(u_1/2) \cos d).$$

If we consider the maximum and minimum of  $u_1 + u_2 = u_1 + \rho(u_1, d)$  with  $u_1 \in [\alpha(d), 2\alpha(d)]$  and  $d \geq 0.9716$ , then we obtain these inequalities.

So from these linear equalities and inequalities we can obtain maximum and minimum values for each variable. It gives us a domain  $D_1$  which contains all solutions of this system if they there exist. If  $D_1$  is empty, then we can remove  $G$  from the list  $L_{14}$ .

The first step,  $\ell = 1$ , “kills” almost all graphs. After this first step all that remained were 173207 graphs without isolated vertices, 2822 graphs with one isolated vertex, and no graphs with two and more isolated vertices.

Next we consider  $\ell = 2$ . In this step  $D_1$  is divided into two domains and for both we can add the same linear constraints as we did when  $\ell = 1$ . Moreover, for this step we add new linear constraints for polygons with five and higher vertices.

In this level we obtain the parameterdomain  $D_2$ . If this domain is empty, then  $G$  cannot be embedded to  $\mathbb{S}^2$  and it can be removed from  $L_{14}$ .

Actually, for  $\ell = 3$  we can repeat the previous step, divide  $D_2$  into two domains and obtain additional constraints as we did when  $\ell = 2$  for both parts independently.

We can repeat this procedure again and again. In fact, by increasing  $\ell$  we increase the number of sub-cases. However, in practically every step some sub-cases vanish.

We repeat this process for  $\ell = 1, 2, \dots, m$  and obtain a chain of embedded domains:

$$D_m \subset \dots \subset D_2 \subset D_1.$$

If this chain is ended by the empty set, then  $G$  can be removed from  $L_{14}$ .

In the case that a graph  $G$  after  $m$  steps still “survives”, i. e.  $D_m \neq \emptyset$ , then it is checked by numerical methods, namely by the so called nonlinear “solvers”. (We used, in particular, ipopt.) If a solution there exists, then  $G$  is declared as a graph that can be embedded, and if not, then  $G$  is then removed from  $L_{14}$ .

In [23] are given some numerical details for this algorithm.

## 4 Proof of Lemma 2

In this section we present a proof of Lemma 2. Actually, two approaches are considered here - geometric and analytic. Both methods rely on the geometric properties of  $G_{14}$ . The first method we already applied to prove Lemma 2 in our solution of the Tammes problem for  $N = 13$  [22]. In this method by using the symmetries of a graph  $G = G_N$  we find certain relations between the variables and using them we prove that  $\delta_N := \psi(P_N) = d_N$ .

The geometric method is elementary, but it is not trivial and is relatively tricky. For  $G = \Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , we found a proof that is based on the geometric approach. However, for the cases  $G = \Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 3, 4$ , we could not find a simple geometric proof. For those cases we apply the analytic approach.

The idea of the analytic approach is very similar to the Connelly's "stress matrix" method [11]. Perhaps, this method is not as elementary and explicit as the geometric approach, however it works for all cases and can be applied with a computer assistant.

*Proof.* In Section 3 we substitute all nonlinear equations by certain linear inequalities. Note that a statement  $d_{14} \approx \delta_{14}$  is a by-product of this approximation. Our goal is to prove that  $d_{14} = \psi(P_{14}) = d(\Gamma_{14})$ .

Lemma 1 says that  $G_{14} = \Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ , where  $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$ , or 4. We are going to prove that if  $\text{CG}(X) = \Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$  with  $i > 0$ , then  $\psi(X) < \delta_{14}$ .




Figure 4:  $\Gamma_{14}^{(2)}$

**4.1. Geometric approach: the case  $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ .** Let  $G = G_N$ . Proposition 3.2(3,4,5) allows us to prove some equalities for variables  $u_i$ . Namely, assume that two vertices, A and B, of  $G$  are adjacent to two triangles and two quadrilaterals. Then  $\deg(A) = \deg(B) = 4$ . We denote the correspondent angles by  $u_i, u_j, u_0, u_0$  and  $u_k, u_\ell, u_0, u_0$  respectively. (Here, as above,  $u_0$  denote the angle of the equilateral triangle.) We have

$$u_i + u_j + 2u_0 = 2\pi, \quad u_k + u_\ell + 2u_0 = 2\pi, \quad \text{i. e. } u_i + u_j = u_k + u_\ell.$$

If additionally, A and B are the opposite vertices of a quadrilateral  $F$  in  $G$ , then the equality  $u_i = u_k$  (see Proposition 3.2.5) implies the equality  $u_j = u_\ell$ .

It is not hard to see that for the case  $G = \Gamma_{14}^{(2)}$  we have the equalities that we show in Fig. 4. For this graph, we have the following list of equations:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
u_0 = \alpha(d) \text{ (i)} & & \\
u_1 + u_2 + 2u_0 = 2\pi \text{ (ii)} & u_3 = \rho(u_1, d) \text{ (iii)} & u_4 = \rho(u_2, d) \text{ (iv)} \\
u_5 + u_3 + 2u_0 = 2\pi \text{ (v)} & u_6 + u_4 + 2u_0 = 2\pi \text{ (vi)} & u_7 = \rho(u_5, d) \text{ (vii)} \\
u_8 = \rho(u_6, d) \text{ (viii)} & u_1 + u_{13} + 2u_7 = 2\pi \text{ (ix)} & u_2 + u_{12} + 2u_8 = 2\pi \text{ (x)} \\
u_{15} = \rho(u_{13}, d) \text{ (xi)} & u_{14} = \rho(u_{12}, d) \text{ (xii)} & u_5 + u_{15} + u_{11} = 2\pi \text{ (xiii)} \\
u_6 + u_{14} + u_{11} = 2\pi \text{ (xiv)} & u_0 + u_{10} + u_7 + u_8 = 2\pi \text{ (xv)} & u_{12} + u_{13} + 2u_{10} = 2\pi \text{ (xvi)}
\end{array}$$

Let us consider two variables:  $d$  and  $x$ , where  $x := (u_2 - u_1)/2$ . The equations (i–xvi) show that all angles  $u_i$  are uniquely defined by  $x$  and  $d$ .

From (i–viii) we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
u_7 &= f_7(x, d) := \rho(2\pi - 2\alpha(d) - \rho(\pi - \alpha(d) - x, d), d), \\
u_8 &= f_8(x, d) := \rho(2\pi - 2\alpha(d) - \rho(\pi - \alpha(d) + x, d), d).
\end{aligned}$$

Equations (ii), (ix), (x) and (xvi) yield

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= -(u_1 + u_2 + 2u_0 - 2\pi) + (u_1 + u_{13} + 2u_7 - 2\pi) + (u_2 + u_{12} + 2u_8 - 2\pi) - (u_{13} + u_{12} + 2u_{10} - 2\pi) \\
&= 2u_7 + 2u_8 - 2u_0 - 2u_{10}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $u_7 + u_8 = u_0 + u_{10}$  and (xv) implies that  $u_7 + u_8 = \pi$ . We obtain the equation:

$$f_7(x, d) + f_8(x, d) = \pi. \quad (4.1)$$

It is not hard to prove that if  $x \in [-a, a]$ , where  $a > 0$  is sufficiently small, then  $d$  is uniquely defined, i.e. there is a continuous function  $\theta(x)$  on  $[-a, a]$  such that  $d = \theta(x)$ . Since  $f_7(-x, d) = f_8(x, d)$ , if  $(x, d)$  is a solution of (4.1), then  $(-x, d)$  is also a solution. It implies that the function  $\theta(x)$  is even, i. e.  $\theta(-x) = \theta(x)$ . We present this function in Fig. 4.

Now we show that if  $u_0 \geq \delta_{14}$ , then  $u_{13} = u_{12} = u_0$ .

From (ii) we have  $u_0 + u_1 + x = \pi$ . Then  $u_1 = \pi - x - \alpha(d)$ . Therefore, (ix) yields

$$u_{13} = f_{13}(x) := 2\pi - u_1 - 2u_7 = \pi + x + \alpha(\theta(x)) - 2f_7(x, \theta(x)).$$

Note that  $f_{13}(0) = \delta_{14}$ . From Fig. 6 we can see that  $f_{13}(x) < f_{13}(0)$  for  $x > 0$ . Therefore,  $u_{13} < \delta_{14} \leq u_0$ . It can be rigorously proved. Indeed,  $f'_{13}(0) \approx -2.4587$  which means that the function  $f_{13}(x)$  is monotonically decreasing. Since all  $u_i \geq u_0$ , we obtain  $x \leq 0$ .

Using the same reasoning, we can prove that the function  $f_{12}(x)$  is monotonically increasing. Therefore, if  $x < 0$ , then  $u_{12} < u_0$ . Thus,  $u_{13} = u_{12} = u_0 = \delta_{14}$ .

Note that the graph  $\Gamma_{14}^{(2)}$  is a subgraph of  $\Gamma_{14}^{(1)}$ . Then  $\Gamma_{14}^{(1)}$  also can not be a maximal graph of  $G_{14}$ .

#### 4.2. Analytic approach: the case $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ , $i = 3, 4$ .




Figure 5: The graph of the function  $d = \theta(x)$ .

Suppose that  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_N\}$  is a configuration of  $N$  points in the sphere  $\mathbb{S}^2$  such that  $\text{CG}(X)$  is the maximal graph. Then points in  $X$  cannot get closer together. So any slight motion of points in  $X$  cannot increase the minimal distance  $\psi(X)$ . Therefore,  $X$  is an infinitesimally rigid configuration [11].

We say that an  $N \times N$  symmetric matrix  $(\omega_{ij})$  is the *equilibrium stress* matrix if to each pair of distinct vertices  $\{i, j\}$  of  $G_N := \text{CG}(X)$  we have  $\omega_{ij} \geq 0$ ,  $\omega_{ij} = 0$  when  $\{i, j\}$  is not an edge of  $G_N$ , and for each  $i$ , the equilibrium equation

$$F_i := \sum_{j, j \neq i} \omega_{ij} e_{ij} = 0 \quad (4.2)$$

holds. Here  $e_{ij}$  is the unit tangent vector at the point  $x_i$  to the great circle that passes through the points  $x_i$  and  $x_j$ .

Actually, these conditions for the equilibrium stress matrix can be derived from the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions [8, p. 244], where stresses  $\omega_{ij}$  correspond to Lagrange multipliers and the equilibrium equation corresponds to the stationary condition. Note that, the inequality  $\omega_{ij} \geq 0$  holds because  $\text{dist}(x_i, x_j) = \psi(X)$  cannot be increased.

Now using conditions (4.2) we set up a system of linear inequalities. Since the linear programming shows that this system has no solution, we obtain that  $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ ,  $i = 3, 4$ , cannot be maximal graphs.




Figure 6: The graph of the function  $u_{13} = f_{13}(x)$ .

Denote by  $J(i)$  the set of all indexes  $j : \omega_{ij} \neq 0$ , i. e.  $\omega_{ij} > 0$ . We have

$$\sum_{j \in J(i)} \omega_{ij} e_{ij} = 0. \quad (4.3)$$

In fact, after computations we have approximation intervals for all parameters of  $\Gamma_{14}^{(i)}$ . Therefore, we can compute intervals also for all  $c_{ij}$  and  $s_{ij}$ , where

$$e_{ij} = (c_{ij}, s_{ij}) \text{ and } c_{ij}^2 + s_{ij}^2 = 1.$$

Let  $c_{ij} \in [p_{ij}, q_{ij}]$  and  $s_{ij} \in [u_{ij}, v_{ij}]$ . Here  $q_{ij} - p_{ij}$  and  $v_{ij} - u_{ij}$  are sufficiently small numbers. Thus, (4.3) implies

$$\sum_{j \in J(i)} \omega_{ij} p_{ij} \leq 0, \quad \sum_{j \in J(i)} \omega_{ij} u_{ij} \leq 0, \quad \sum_{j \in J(i)} \omega_{ij} q_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j \in J(i)} \omega_{ij} v_{ij} \geq 0. \quad (4.4)$$

Now let us add to (4.4) the normalization condition:

$$\sum_{i,j} \omega_{ij} = 1.$$

As we mentioned above this system has no solution. Thus,  $\Gamma_{14}^{(3)}$  and  $\Gamma_{14}^{(4)}$  cannot be maximal graphs.

□

**Acknowledgment.** We wish to thank James Maissen for his helpful comments and corrections on this written work.

## References

- [1] M. Aigner and G.M. Ziegler, Proofs from THE BOOK, Springer, 1998 (first ed.) and 2002 (second ed.)
- [2] K. Anstreicher, The thirteen spheres: A new proof, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **31**(2004), 613-625.
- [3] C. Bachoc and F. Vallentin, New upper bounds for kissing numbers from semidefinite programming, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **21** (2008), 909-924.
- [4] K. Böröczky, The problem of Tammes for  $n = 11$ , *Studia. Sci. Math. Hungar.* **18** (1983) 165-171.
- [5] K. Böröczky, The Newton-Gregory problem revisited, In: *Discrete Geometry*, A. Bezdek (ed.), Dekker, 2003, 103-110.
- [6] K. Böröczky and L. Szabó, Arrangements of 13 points on a sphere, In: *Discrete Geometry*, A. Bezdek (ed.), Dekker, 2003, 111-184.
- [7] K. Böröczky and L. Szabó, Arrangements of 14, 15, 16 and 17 points on a sphere, *Studi. Sci. Math. Hung.* **40** (2003), 407-421.
- [8] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [9] P. Brass, W.O.J. Moser, J. Pach, *Research problems in discrete geometry*, Springer-Verlag, 2005.
- [10] G. Brinkmann and B. D. McKay, Fast generation of planar graphs (expanded edition), <http://cs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/papers/plantri-full.pdf>
- [11] R. Connelly, Generic global rigidity, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **33** (2005), no.4, 549-563.
- [12] L. Danzer, Finite point-sets on  $\mathbf{S}^2$  with minimum distance as large as possible, *Discr. Math.*, **60** (1986), 3-66.
- [13] L. Fejes Tóth, Über die Abschätzung des kürzesten Abstandes zweier Punkte eines auf einer Kugelfläche liegenden Punktsystems, *Jber. Deutch. Math. Verein.* **53** (1943), 66-68.
- [14] L. Fejes Tóth, *Lagerungen in der Ebene, auf der Kugel und in Raum*, Springer-Verlag, 1953; Russian translation, Moscow, 1958
- [15] W.-Y. Hsiang, *Least action principle of crystal formation of dense packing type and Kepler's conjecture*, World Scientific, 2001.

- [16] J. Leech, The problem of the thirteen spheres, *Math. Gazette* **41** (1956), 22-23.
- [17] V.I. Levenshtein, On bounds for packing in  $n$ -dimensional Euclidean space, *Sov. Math. Dokl.* **20**(2), 1979, 417-421.
- [18] H. Maehara, Isoperimetric theorem for spherical polygons and the problem of 13 spheres, *Ryukyu Math. J.*, **14** (2001), 41-57.
- [19] H. Maehara, The problem of thirteen spheres - a proof for undergraduates, *European Journal of Combinatorics*, **28** (2007), 1770-1778.
- [20] O. R. Musin, The kissing problem in three dimensions, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, **35** (2006), 375-384.
- [21] O. R. Musin, The kissing number in four dimensions, *Ann. of Math.*, **168** (2008), 1-32.
- [22] O. R. Musin and A. S. Tarasov, The strong thirteen spheres problem, *Discrete Comput. Geom.*, **48** (2012), 128–141.
- [23] O. R. Musin and A. S. Tarasov, Enumeration of irreducible contact graphs on the sphere, *Fundam. Prikl. Mat.*, **18:2** (2013), 125-145 [*J. Math. Sci.* **203** (2014), 837–850].
- [24] A.M. Odlyzko and N.J.A. Sloane, New bounds on the number of unit spheres that can touch a unit sphere in  $n$  dimensions, *J. of Combinatorial Theory A*, **26** (1979), 210-214.
- [25] plantri and fullgen, <http://cs.anu.edu.au/~bdm/plantri/>
- [26] F. Pfender and G.M. Ziegler, Kissing numbers, sphere packings, and some unexpected proofs, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, **51**(2004), 873-883.
- [27] R.M. Robinson, Arrangement of 24 circles on a sphere, *Math. Ann.* **144** (1961), 17-48.
- [28] K. Schütte and B.L. v. d. Waerden, Auf welcher Kugel haben 5,6,7,8 oder 9 Punkte mit Mindestabstand 1 Platz? *Math. Ann.* **123** (1951), 96-124.
- [29] K. Schütte and B.L. van der Waerden, Das Problem der dreizehn Kugeln, *Math. Ann.* **125** (1953), 325-334.
- [30] R.M.L. Tammes, On the Origin Number and Arrangement of the Places of Exits on the Surface of Pollengrains, *Rec. Trv. Bot. Neerl.* **27** (1930), 1-84.

O. R. Musin, University of Texas at Brownsville.

*E-mail:* oleg.musin@utb.edu

A. S. Tarasov, IITP RAS

*E-mail:* tarasov.alexey@gmail.com