

On the global minimum of the classical potential energy for clusters bound by many-body forces

MICHAEL K.-H. KIESSLING^{1,*} AND DAVID J. WALES²

¹Department of Mathematics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
110 Frelinghuysen Rd., Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA

email: miki@math.rutgers.edu

²Yusuf Hamied Department of Chemistry, Lensfield Road, Cambridge CB2 1EW, UK

email: dw34@cam.ac.uk

Revised version of November 26, 2023

Abstract

This note establishes, first of all, the monotonic increase with N of the average K -body energy of classical N -body ground state configurations with $N \geq K$ monomers that interact solely through a permutation-symmetric K -body potential, for any fixed integer $K \geq 2$. For the special case $K = 2$ this result had previously been proved, and used successfully as a test criterion for optimality of computer-generated lists of putative ground states of N -body clusters for various types of pairwise interactions. Second, related monotonicity results are established for N -monomer ground state configurations whose monomers interact through additive mixtures of certain types of k -meric potentials, $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, with $K \geq 2$ fixed and $N \geq K$. All the monotonicity results furnish simple necessary conditions for optimality that any pertinent list of computer-generated putative global minimum energies for N -monomer clusters has to satisfy. As an application, databases of N -body cluster energies computed with an additive mix of the dimeric Lennard-Jones and trimeric Axilrod–Teller interactions are inspected. We also address how many local minima satisfy the upper bound inferred from the monotonicity conditions, both from a theoretical and from an empirical perspective.

* Corresponding Author.

©(2023) The authors. Reproduction, in its entirety, for non-commercial purposes is permitted.

1 Introduction

The quest for the lowest potential energy configurations of classical N -body clusters is pursued in various branches of physics, chemistry, and biology; see [74, 39, 82, 40] for an introduction to, and survey of, cluster research, and see [87] for databases of putative global minima discovered through computer experiments. The vast majority of these structures will possibly never be known for sure to be optimal, because this problem is classified as NP-hard [92], [1] in the field of computer science. Hence it is very likely, though not yet rigorously established, that there is no deterministic algorithm for finding the global minimum with only polynomially (in N) many steps, for any N . Thus, only for small N can one be confident that the available computer algorithms will find the optimal configuration. In fact, the difficulty in locating the global minimum depends on the organisation of the underlying energy landscape, which can change dramatically when the cluster size differs by a single monomer [20, 88, 90]. A larger cluster that corresponds to a ‘magic number’ size with a single funnel landscape may be a relatively easy target, even though it possesses vastly more local minima than a smaller size cluster with a double-funnel organisation [19].

In this situation it is clearly useful to have necessary conditions for optimality that can be used to test lists of putatively optimal data. For a very large class of models in which the N monomers in a cluster interact in a purely pairwise fashion, a necessary condition for optimality is the monotonic increase with N of the average pair energy for the global minima. This result was established in [45], after noting that earlier arguments of [43] apply under considerably less restrictive assumptions than stipulated in [43]. The test has revealed failures in computer-generated lists of putatively optimal data; see [43] for the generalized Thomson problem, and [45] for the Lennard-Jones cluster problem. In [45] data for clusters of water molecules were also tested, and no failures were detected.

While this monotonicity test applies to the numerous cluster models described by purely pairwise interactions, it cannot be used to test putative global minima that involve irreducible K -body interactions with $K > 2$, beginning with $K = 3$, where the Axilrod–Teller trimer interaction provides a physically relevant example [4]. Such interactions are usually termed ‘many-body’, as opposed to two-body. In this paper we explore whether similar necessary conditions for optimality exist for N -monomer cluster models involving such many-body interactions. We begin with clusters whose monomers interact through k -body interactions with a single $k = K$, then generalize to mixtures with several $k \leq K$.

In §2 we prove the monotonic increase with N of the optimal average K -body energy for clusters of $N \geq K$ monomers with irreducible k -body interactions for a

single $k = K \geq 2$; when $K = 2$, the proof reduces to the one in [45]. The number of local minima that may satisfy the implied test is also addressed in §2, providing some indication of how restrictive the bound can be in practice. In §3 we generalize our discussion to cluster models for N monomers that interact with a mix of different k -meric interactions, $k \leq K$, for K fixed. In §4 we report the outcome of our test run on a family of putative global minima for N -body clusters that interact with two-body Lennard-Jones plus three-body Axilrod–Teller potentials. We conclude in §5.

2 N -body clusters with a single K -body potential

Our notation, and model assumptions, largely follows [45]. Thus, by $S \in \mathfrak{S}$ we denote a *state* of a monomer, a point in a *monomer state space* \mathfrak{S} . The position vector of component coordinates for a monomer is always part of the state, but there may be other variables, e.g. a unit vector for a polarized monomer’s orientation in space, or some more complicated set of variables.

By $\mathcal{C}^{(N)} := (S_1, \dots, S_N) \in \mathfrak{S}^N$ we denote the *ordered configuration* of an N -monomer cluster. The ordering is for notational convenience only and not of any intrinsic significance. It is implicitly understood that, if $N \geq 2$, then no two of the N state variables in $\mathcal{C}^{(N)}$ coincide.

For $K \geq 2$ fixed, by V we denote a real-valued, permutation-symmetric, irreducible K -state potential energy, also called “ K -body potential.” By “permutation-symmetric” we mean that $V(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_K})$ is invariant under all permutations of the K state variables in the argument of V ; this definition takes care of the remark that the labeling of state variables in the configuration has no intrinsic significance. By “irreducible” we mean that V cannot be written as a sum of k -body potentials with $k < K$.

For $N \geq K$ the potential energy of what we call an “ N -body cluster with monomers bound by a single K -body interaction” is given by

$$W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) := \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_K \leq N} \dots \sum V(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_K}). \quad (1)$$

It is assumed that for any $N \geq K$ there exists a globally minimizing N -monomer configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of W . Note that $K \geq 2$ is necessary for cluster formation, though not sufficient. Further assumptions are needed to guarantee that minimizers $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of W are genuine N -body clusters, but we do not need those assumptions to prove our monotonicity results for the optimizers $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of W .

Next we define the average K -body energy of an N -monomer configuration by

$$\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) := \frac{1}{\binom{N}{K}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_K \leq N} V(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_K}), \quad (2)$$

and the optimal average K -body energy as

$$v(N) := \min_{\mathcal{C}^{(N)}} \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}). \quad (3)$$

Since by assumption a minimizing configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ exists, (3) can be written as

$$v(N) = \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}). \quad (4)$$

This ends our list of definitions and assumptions. We next list some examples for the important special case $K = 2$ in §2.1.1 to §2.1.3, and then two examples for $K = 3$ in §2.1.4 and §2.1.5.

2.1 Examples of models with a single K -body potential

2.1.1 The generalized Thomson problem

For the generalized Thomson problem in $d + 1$ dimensions $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{S}^d \subset \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, where $S = \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \cap \{|\mathbf{r}| = 1\}$ is a unit-length position vector in $d + 1$ -dimensional Euclidean space, representing the location of a generalized point charge on the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} , with $d \geq 1$. The pair interaction of two charges can be written as (in reduced units of length and energy)

$$V(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) := \frac{1}{s} \left(\frac{1}{r_{ij}^s} - 1 \right), \quad s \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (5)$$

with $r_{ij} := |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \in (0, 2]$ the $d + 1$ -dimensional Euclidean distance between the position vectors of the two charges. The parameter s is known as the Riesz parameter. Although the force for the pair potential $V(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j)$ is repulsive for all $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| > 0$, the restriction that the position vectors are unit vectors guarantees that a minimum of W as defined in (1) exists on \mathfrak{S}^N for all $N \geq 2$ and all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ — provided one extends the interaction continuously to $r = 0$ if $s < -2$. It should be noted that only when $s \geq -2$ do minimizers exist that are genuine N -point configurations. For $s < -2$ the minimizers with even N are antipodal two-point configurations over which the N position vectors are evenly distributed, while those with odd N have their position vectors distributed over not more than three points on a great circle [10], but the solution when N is odd is rigorously known only when $N = 3$ [46].

Since the interaction (5) is invariant under the orthogonal group $\mathcal{O}(d+1)$ that acts on \mathbb{S}^d , the N -body minimizers are obviously non-unique. When listing (putative) optimizers $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ for the generalized Thomson problem it is tacitly understood that they represent a whole group orbit of $\mathcal{O}(d+1)$.

We highlight some special cases. The Thomson problem (so named originally in [91]) corresponds to the parameter choices $s = 1$ and $d = 2$, i.e. point charges that interact with repulsive Coulomb forces in \mathbb{R}^3 but are confined to $\mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Of separate interest is the case $s \rightarrow 0$ in (5), which gives $V(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) = \ln \frac{1}{r_{ij}}$. This case, combined with $d = 2$, features prominently in the original formulation of Smale’s 7th problem [71]. Another important example is $s = -1$. Both of these cases, $s \rightarrow 0$ and $s = -1$, are equivalent to the problem of maximizing a mean distance among N points on the unit d -sphere in \mathbb{R}^{d+1} : the geometric mean distance when $s = 0$ and the arithmetic mean distance when $s = -1$. When $d = 1$, the optimal solutions coincide. Interestingly, even for $d = 2$ the answers do not always agree — they differ for the first time at $N = 7$; see [61], formula (29) and the corresponding text.

These examples are three noteworthy cases of interesting and related problems collected into a continuous single-parameter family known as the generalized Thomson problem. Introduced before the advent of quantum mechanics by J. J. Thomson [76] to analyse the structures caused by electron-electron repulsion in atoms, the Thomson problem and its variations continue to furnish insights into questions of interest in condensed matter physics [2], [11], [12].

2.1.2 Baxter’s sticky hard sphere model

Our second $K = 2$ example is known as *Baxter’s sticky hard sphere model*. In this case $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{R}^d$, with $d \geq 1$, and $S = \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the position vector of the center of a hard sphere of radius $1/2$. The pair potential $V_2(S_i, S_j) := V_{\text{shc}}(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|)$ is given by

$$V_{\text{shs}}(r) := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } r < 1 \\ -1 & \text{if } r = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } r > 1 \end{cases} . \quad (6)$$

This potential corresponds to the following set-theoretical / point set topological narrative. The monomers are closed spheres of radius $1/2$ in Euclidean topology, with a pair energy that vanishes when the two spheres have empty intersection, while it is -1 if the intersection of the two spheres is a single point (a “contact point”), and it is ∞ if their intersection is a closed set with non-empty interior. Thus, the globally energy-minimizing clusters of N sticky spheres are identical with

the configurations of N spheres that feature the maximal number $c(N, d)$ of contact points. Finding the global minimum for general d and N is a difficult open problem, yet only $d \leq 3$ would seem to be of direct relevance to chemical physics; see below.

Of course, the $d = 1$ -dimensional version is quite trivial. The spheres can be identified with closed intervals (rods) of length 1, and any N -body minimizer of the energy functional W is trivially given by concatenating N closed unit length intervals to form a single closed interval of length N .

The $d = 2$ dimensional version is not quite so trivial, yet all global minimizers have been determined [32]. The spheres can be identified with closed disks of radius $1/2$. Any global N -body minimizer $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of the energy functional is a “spiral array” of such disks, and the optimal energy is given by

$$W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) = -\lfloor 3N - \sqrt{12N - 3} \rfloor, \quad (7)$$

where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ is the floor function. When N is large, every sphere in the interior of the configuration is in contact with six neighbors, giving the packing the hexagonal appearance of a honeycomb lattice.

In $d \geq 3$ dimensions the solutions are more elusive. As noted in [9], the global minimum $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ in \mathbb{R}^3 is known for $N \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 13\}$. Yet, while for $N \in \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$ (sometimes called the “trivial cases”) the problem is straightforward to solve, it is worthy of note that for $N = 13$ the solution is obtained from Newton’s answer “12” to the famous “kissing problem” in \mathbb{R}^3 (*What is the maximum number of congruent spheres in \mathbb{R}^3 that can simultaneously touch (viz. “kiss”) a given sphere?*), where the rigorous proof required about 250 years of additional thought [68].

A good overview of the state of the art of rigorous results is [9].

In addition to the global minima, the growth in the number of distinct local minima for the $d = 3$ sticky hard sphere model has been investigated in several studies [37, 36, 35]. Furthermore, the correspondence between these local or global minima and those of Lennard-Jones-type clusters with different distance exponents has been analysed [77]. The structures can also be modelled using a Morse potential [59] with a very short range parameter [83], which reflects the large pair equilibrium distance that results from the excluded volume of the colloids.

In chemistry, the sticky hard sphere model is of interest in providing a simple potential for investigation of complicated phenomena, such as phase changes, nucleation and growth [75, 34, 33, 42, 38]. Clusters of colloidal particles formed from polystyrene microspheres [57, 16] provide an experimental realisation, and have been proposed as building blocks for the design of structures with higher order organisation [28, 66, 27, 93].

2.1.3 Water Clusters

The third $K = 2$ example we mention is the TIP5P *water cluster model* [56], for which $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2 \times \mathbb{S}^1$, where the first factor accounts for the position vector \mathbf{r} of the oxygen atom and the remaining two factors account for the three Euler angles (Θ, Ψ, Φ) that fix the orientation of the rigid tetrahedral charge distribution of the H_2O monomer w.r.t. a convenient Cartesian reference frame. The TIP5P pair interaction is an additive mix of Lennard–Jones and Coulomb pair potentials, conveniently written (in reduced units of charge, length and energy) as

$$V(S, \tilde{S}) := \frac{1}{r^{12}} - \frac{1}{r^6} + \sum_{a \in \{1, \dots, 4\}} \sum_{b \in \{1, \dots, 4\}} \frac{q_a q_b}{r_{ab}}, \quad (8)$$

where $r := |\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}| \in \mathbb{R}_+$ is the 3-dimensional Euclidean distance between the position vectors of the two oxygen atoms, $r_{ab} \in (0, \infty)$ is the distance between the a -th charge on one H_2O monomer and the b -th charge on the other, with q_a and q_b the respective charges on the corresponding monomers. The charges of a monomer satisfy $|q_a| = q$ and $\sum_a q_a = 0$. We remark that once the states S and \tilde{S} are given, the distances r and r_{ab} are determined. At small separations r of the monomers the pair interaction is dominated by the $1/r^{12}$ term, while for large separations the pair interaction is asymptotic to $V_{\text{dip}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j; \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \boldsymbol{\omega}_j)$, where

$$V_{\text{dip}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j; \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \boldsymbol{\omega}_j) := \wp^2 \frac{\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_j - 3 \cos \gamma_i \cos \gamma_j}{r_{ij}^3} \quad (9)$$

is the familiar permanent dipole-dipole interaction potential, with r_{ij} the Euclidean distance between the two H_2O monomers, with $\gamma_i \in [0, \pi]$ defined by $(\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_k =: r_{ij} \cos \gamma_k$ for $k \in \{i, j\}$, and with $\wp \boldsymbol{\omega}$ the permanent electric dipole moment of H_2O , where $\boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{S}^2$ represents a unit vector associated with the dipole. Clearly, $V_{\text{dip}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j; \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \boldsymbol{\omega}_j)$ is negative for suitable orientations of the two monomers, increasing to zero at infinite separation. This result guarantees the existence of a global minimum cluster configuration for (1) and each $N \geq 2$, with $W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) < 0$.

If $q_a = 0$, $a \in \{1, \dots, 4\}$, then the Euler angles are rendered irrelevant and the state space can be taken as $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{R}^3$, with $S = \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ the position vector of an atom. The TIP5P interaction then reduces to the Lennard-Jones pair potential,

$$V_{\text{LJ}}(r) := \frac{1}{r^{12}} - \frac{1}{r^6}, \quad (10)$$

with $r = |\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}| \in (0, \infty)$ as defined earlier.

2.1.4 An area analogue of the maximal average distance problem on \mathbb{S}^2

Our first $K = 3$ example is a trimeric variation on the theme of the problem to maximize the arithmetic mean of all dimer lengths; cf. §2.1.1 with $s = -1$. Our state space is $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, and $S = \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{|\mathbf{r}| = 1\}$ is a unit-length position vector of a point particle on $\mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. The trimeric interaction reads

$$V(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) := -\frac{1}{2} |(\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_j) \times (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)|, \quad (11)$$

i.e. $-V(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k)$ is simply the area of the triangle in \mathbb{R}^3 with corners at \mathbf{r}_i , \mathbf{r}_j , \mathbf{r}_k . The potential favors area-enhancement, but the compact configuration space \mathfrak{S}^N guarantees non-trivial minimizers of W as given in (1) for each $N \geq 3$.

We are unaware of any studies of this area analogue of the maximal-pairwise-distance problem on \mathbb{S}^2 [7]. However, we note that maximizing the area of the smallest triangle among those spanned by the three-point subsets of $N \geq 3$ points in a convex two-dimensional set features in the celebrated Heilbronn problem [65], [29], [47].

2.1.5 A trimerically stabilized Axilrod–Teller interaction

Our second $K = 3$ example is a stabilized Axilrod–Teller interaction. In this case $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{R}^3$, and $S = \mathbf{r}$ represents the position of the center of mass of a polarizable monomer. A monomer interacts irreducibly with two other monomers of the same kind through the trimeric potential

$$V(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) := \frac{1}{r_{ij}^6 r_{jk}^6 r_{ki}^6} + \frac{1 + 3 \cos \gamma_i \cos \gamma_j \cos \gamma_k}{r_{ij}^3 r_{jk}^3 r_{ki}^3}. \quad (12)$$

Here, $r_{jk} := |\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k|$ is the Euclidean distance between the position vectors of monomers j and k , and $\gamma_j \in [0, \pi]$ is defined by $(\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) =: r_{kj} r_{ji} \cos \gamma_j$.

The second term in (12), usually referred to as the Axilrod–Teller potential, or triple-dipole term, dominates at large distances and is obtained from third order quantum-mechanical perturbation theory [4]. The first term is not usually considered, but is needed here to stabilize the interaction at short range using only irreducible trimer potentials. The interaction (12) may be viewed as a three-body analog of the pairwise Lennard-Jones potential (10), where the $-1/r^6$ term that dominates at large distances can also be obtained from quantum-mechanical perturbation theory, while the stabilizing $1/r^{12}$ term is a convenient form for the repulsive short-range part of the potential.

Since the three angles sum to π , the interaction is negative for large $r_{ij} r_{jk} r_{ki}$ whenever one of the angles is $\approx \pi$, positive for small $r_{ij} r_{jk} r_{ki}$ or when all three

angles are $\leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, and vanishes when $r_{ij}r_{jk}r_{ki} \rightarrow \infty$. This result guarantees clustering minimizers of W for each $N \geq 3$.

2.2 Monotonicity of the optimal average K -body energy

In Appendix A we establish a family of hypergraph-theoretical identities (44). For the N -body cluster models discussed below, this formalism yields, when $N > K \geq 2$, that the average K -body interaction of an N -body cluster configuration $\mathcal{C}^{(N)}$ can be written as the arithmetic mean over the N monomers, labeled by ℓ , of the average K -body interaction of the pertinent $N - 1$ -body cluster configurations $\mathcal{C}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}$,

$$\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}); \quad (13)$$

when $K = 2$ this is identity (9) in [45].

Using (13), the reasoning of [45] for $K = 2$ generalizes essentially unchanged to integers $K \geq 2$. Specifically, since identity (13) holds for all cluster configurations $\mathcal{C}^{(N)}$, it holds in particular for the global energy-minimizing configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$. But then, since each $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}$ is an $N - 1$ -monomer configuration that is not necessarily an energy-minimizing $N - 1$ -monomer configuration, by replacing each $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}$ with the global minimum $N - 1$ -monomer configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N-1)}$, for all $N > K$ we obtain

$$\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}) \geq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\ell=1}^N \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N-1)}) = \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N-1)}) \quad (14)$$

(cf. [45] for when monomers interact solely pairwise). In short, for all $N \geq K$,

$$\boxed{v(N+1) \geq v(N)}. \quad (15)$$

This a-priori inequality is satisfied by any list $N \mapsto v(N)$ of average K -body energies for the global minima of N -monomer clusters formed with a single type of K -body interaction.

2.3 Inequality (15) as a necessary condition for optimality

To keep this article self-contained (for the convenience of the reader), we include this subsection from [45] largely verbatim.

Since there is no known algorithm that finds the global minimum of an N -monomer cluster configuration in polynomial time, even sophisticated modern day computer experiments may fail to locate it, and instead return a local minimum. Testing computer-generated lists of putative global minima for whether they are compatible with (15) may reveal N -body cluster energies that are not optimal.

To fail this monotonicity test means the following. Suppose in some computer-experimentally determined list of putatively optimal N -body configurations one finds for a certain N_* that $\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*-1)}) > \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*)})$. In that case, and provided that there is no error in the transcription of the data, one can conclude that the $N_* - 1$ -monomer cluster is certainly not optimal. As a consequence of the $N_* - 1$ -monomer cluster failing the monotonicity test against the N_* cluster, even if the $N_* - 2$ -monomer cluster passed the test against the $N_* - 1$ cluster, i.e. if $\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*-2)}) \leq \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*-1)})$, the $N_* - 2$ cluster may still fail the monotonicity test against the N_* cluster. More generally, each $N_* - n$ -monomer configuration for which $\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*-n)}) > \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*)})$, with $n \geq 1$, is not optimal.

Note that for each non-optimal configuration with $N = N_* - n$, the difference $\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*-n)}) - \langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N_*)})$ is a lower estimate for the amount by which the average K -body energy of $\mathcal{C}^{(N_*-n)}$ overshoots the optimal value.

2.4 Using (15) to bound missing energy data from above

This subsection also carries over from [45] essentially verbatim, to provide a complete account.

The monotonicity (15) of the map $N \mapsto v(N)$ for optimal average pair energies implies that any value $\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)})$ computed with a putatively optimal $\mathcal{C}^{(N)}$ is an upper bound on all $v(\tilde{N})$ with $\tilde{N} < N$. Hence, even if no putatively optimizing configurations $\mathcal{C}^{(\tilde{N})}$ have yet been computed for certain $\tilde{N} < N$, (15) yields some information about the pertinent missing optimal energies in such lists of putative global minimum energies that have gaps.

2.5 On the tightness of the monotonicity law (15)

The monotonicity law (15) furnishes a necessary but not sufficient condition for optimality. Thus, a list of putatively optimal configurations that satisfies the monotonicity law (15) does not necessarily feature true global minima configurations. The more likely a sub-optimal minimum is to fail the test, the “tighter” and more useful the test is. Here we consider how many local minima may pass the test, in addition to the true global minimum. This is a difficult question for which we have obtained

some preliminary empirical insight for the special but important $K = 2$ case of Lennard-Jones clusters, where some relatively large databases have been harvested at particular sizes N to address global thermodynamic and kinetic properties [84]. For these examples, only the set of local minima for $N = 13$ is likely to be complete. For the other sizes, the sampling is most extensive for the low-lying local energy minima, which enables us to provide a lower bound on the number of local minimizers (each simply denoted $\mathcal{C}_{\text{loc}}^{(N)}$) that satisfy the inequality

$$\langle V \rangle(\mathcal{C}_{\text{loc}}^{(N)}) \leq v(N + 1). \quad (16)$$

Note that even if $v(N + 1)$ is not rigorously known, we may replace it by $v^x(N + 1)$, its best upper approximation found in the list of computer-experimental locally optimal configurations. The result surprised us: already for moderately large N there are many non-optimal local minimizers that satisfy (16), as shown in Table 1, where we list the absolute numbers of minima that pass the monotonicity test for each N .

N	$v_{\text{LJ}}^x(N)$	$v_{\text{LJ}}^x(N + 1)$	$\#\{\langle V_{\text{LJ}} \rangle(\mathcal{C}_{\text{loc}}^{(N)}) \leq v_{\text{LJ}}^x(N + 1)\}$
13	-0.5682923205	-0.5257709487	4
31	-0.2872826280	-0.2815232341	4,331
38	-0.2474088578	-0.2429597624	395
55	-0.1880461077	-0.1841838343	349
75	-0.1432404796	-0.1413666195	74,030

Table 1: The number of local minima that satisfy the monotonicity test in databases of Lennard-Jones clusters obtained in previous work. These values are lower bounds, aside from $N = 13$. The greater values for $N = 31$ and $N = 75$ result from more extensive sampling compared to $N = 38$ and $N = 55$, since larger databases were created to converge thermodynamic properties in previous work [84].

Table 1 includes results for two of the magic sizes where complete Mackay icosahedra are possible, i.e. $N = 13$ and 55. In contrast, the landscapes for $N = 31$, 38, and 75 are of interest because they exhibit double-funnel organisation [19], with competing low-energy structures separated by high barriers. The results in Table 1 partly reflect much more extensive sampling for sizes $N = 31$ and $N = 75$, where we aimed to converge the calculated thermodynamic properties accurately [84].

Another factor that contributes to the large value for $N = 75$ is the trend for $\Delta(N)$ to increase with N overall, where $\Delta(N) := \frac{N-1}{N+1}W(\mathcal{C}_{\text{min}}^{(N+1)}) - W(\mathcal{C}_{\text{min}}^{(N)})$ is the difference between the upper bound $\frac{N-1}{N+1}W(\mathcal{C}_{\text{min}}^{(N+1)})$ on the actual global minimum energy $W(\mathcal{C}_{\text{min}}^{(N)})$ and the actual global minimum energy itself, as obtained from the

$K = 2$ monotonicity test. This trend results from the increasing average coordination number for these clusters, where many atoms lie in a surface environment. In Figure 1 we plot $\Delta^x(N)$, the computer-experimental counterpart of $\Delta(N)$, for LJ_N , including magnifications of the regions containing magic number clusters based on Mackay icosahedra [55] at $N = 13, 55$ and 147 . These sizes correspond to particularly favourable geometric packings with special stability [82], and we see that in each case there is a significant step up in $\Delta^x(N)$ followed by a progressive overall decrease towards the trend. The overall trend for $\Delta^x(N)$ to increase with N , and the large step-ups, are evident in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Plots of $\Delta^x(N)$ for LJ_N clusters, showing the difference between the empirical upper bound imposed by the monotonicity condition on the actual global minimum energy and the empirical global minimum energy as a function of N . Here we qualify the data as empirical because we are using the lowest known minima reported from existing searches. The three panels that follow the full plot magnify regions around the Mackay icosahedra at $N = 13, 55$ and 147 . In each case $\Delta^x(N)$ exhibits a clear step up. The pentagonal bipyramid at $N = 7$ and the double icosahedron at $N = 19$ also exhibit clear steps up corresponding to enhanced local stability.

Figure 1 exhibits another interesting feature: each value of $\Delta^x(N)$ appears to lie in the vicinity of one of several distinct concave sequences $N \mapsto D_i(N)$, $i \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$, with bifurcations among them. This pattern probably reflects competition between alternative structural families. In future work it would be interesting to connect such features with previous analysis of how structural competition reflects geometrical effects, which can be convoluted with entropic contributions and quantum behaviour [22, 18, 15].

Judged by the absolute number counts, the monotonicity test appears not to be very tight already when $N = 31$. A more informative assessment would require accurate relative frequencies. Unfortunately, so far no meaningful relative frequencies can be computed for the displayed N values, with the exception of $N = 13$. Despite having millions of local LJ $_N$ minima in the available databases, we only have a small fraction of the total. From the potential energy density of local minima calculated in [84] we can see that the total number will be over e^{35} and e^{50} for LJ $_{31}$ and LJ $_{75}$, respectively. This of course is a manifestation of the NP-hardness of the problem, for which more generally the number of local minimizers has been estimated (non-rigorously) to grow exponentially with N , see [72], [73], [23], [86]. In this vein, we wonder whether more exhaustive studies of the energy landscape will reveal that the number of local minimizers passing the monotonicity test also grows exponentially with N . Extensive empirical studies, combined with more rigorous analysis, will be needed to test this hypothesis.

It certainly is desirable to tighten the bound (15) somehow, but it does not appear to be straightforward. Recalling the definition (3), and the ensuing equivalent version (4), of the optimal average K -body energy of a pertinent N -body cluster, we see that the monotonicity law (15) states that

$$\frac{1}{\binom{N+1}{K}} W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N+1)}) \geq \frac{1}{\binom{N}{K}} W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}). \quad (17)$$

Multiplying (17) by $\binom{N}{K}$, then cancelling many terms in the resulting ratio of the two combinatorial brackets, and after a minor algebraic rewriting, one obtains an upper bound for $W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)})$ in terms of $W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N+1)})$, N , and K , viz.

$$W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) \leq \left(1 - \frac{K}{N+1}\right) W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N+1)}). \quad (18)$$

Note that $0 < 1 - \frac{K}{N+1} < 1$ because $0 < K \leq N$. Since $1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right) \approx 1$ for large N , one may be tempted to speculate that the $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$ term in the parenthetical factor at r.h.s.(18) can be neglected. (With K fixed and typically small, say $K = 2$ or $K = 3$, for $N > 100$ one has less than 3% relative error in the upper bound of

$W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)})$.) However, this conclusion would be *false* at least for all known chemical models of clusters in nature — in particular, those in §2.1.2, including the special case of the Lennard-Jones clusters, and all the familiar variations on their theme for which $W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) < 0$ and

$$W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) \geq W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N+1)}). \quad (19)$$

Thus the term $\frac{K}{N+1}$, though tiny for large N , is decisive for the inequality (18) to be true. Hence there does not seem to be much room to improve on (15).

This result does not mean there are no avenues left to explore. For instance, the equivalent inequality (18) is the special case $p = 1$ of the family of inequalities

$$W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) \leq \left(1 - \left[\frac{K}{N+1}\right]^p\right) W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N+1)}); \quad p \in [1, p^*], \quad (20)$$

where p^* is the largest p -value for which (20) is true for all $N \geq K$. When $p = 1$ the inequality in (20) is true, but when $p \rightarrow \infty$ it is certainly false for cluster models of interest in chemical physics, where $1 \leq p^* < \infty$, as explained above. The problem is to find p^* , which may of course depend on K . If $p^* > 1$, then (20) with $p = p^*$ furnishes a tighter test than our (15), yet if $p^* = 1$ then our monotonicity law (15) is optimal within the family of laws of the type (20).

Determining p^* remains a problem for future work.

3 On optimal clustering for additive mixtures of irreducible k -body potentials with different k

For this extension the definitions and assumptions of §2 need only minor adjustments.

We maintain the notation for the *state* of a monomer, denoted by $S \in \mathfrak{S}$, with \mathfrak{S} the *monomer state space*. Also $\mathcal{C}^{(N)} := \{S_1, \dots, S_N\}$ will continue to denote the *configuration* of an N -monomer cluster, with no two of the N state variables in $\mathcal{C}^{(N)}$ coinciding.

Since we here allow the monomers in a cluster to interact with an additive mix of various different k -body potentials, we add a suffix k to V . Thus, for a fixed integer $K \geq 2$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, by V_k we denote a real-valued, permutation-symmetric k -state potential energy. For the sake of notational convenience we allow the degenerate case $V_k \equiv 0$ for some $k < K$, yet V_K will always be irreducible, hence non-trivial. In particular, setting $V_k \equiv 0$ for all $k < K$ reduces this section to §2. Whenever $V_k \not\equiv 0$ we again stipulate it to be irreducible. Here, “permutation-symmetric” and “irreducible” have the same meanings as in §2; note that permutation invariance and irreducibility are nontrivial conditions on V_k only when $k > 1$.

For $N \geq K$, with $K \geq 2$, the total potential energy of an N -monomer cluster considered here is now given by

$$W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} V_1(S_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} V_2(S_i, S_j) + \cdots + \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_K \leq N} \cdots V_K(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_K}). \quad (21)$$

In analogy to §2 it is assumed that for each $N \geq K \geq 2$ there exists a globally minimizing N -monomer configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of W defined in (21); note that $K \geq 2$ is still needed for cluster formation. Note also that, in contrast to §2, the expression (21) for W now may include internal single-monomer energy V_1 (accounting for internal distortions such as bending, twisting and stretching).

Next we define the average k -body energy of an N -monomer configuration by

$$\langle V_k \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) := \frac{1}{\binom{N}{k}} \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_k \leq N} \cdots V_k(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_k}); \quad k \in \{1, \dots, K\}. \quad (22)$$

In terms of (22), the total energy (21) of a configuration $\mathcal{C}^{(N)}$ can be recast as

$$W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} \binom{N}{k} \langle V_k \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}). \quad (23)$$

In this format it is clear that when irreducible k -body potentials with different k are involved, then typically none of the average k -body energies is optimized by the optimizer $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of W .

This ends our list of general definitions and assumptions for this section. When only a single $k = K$ interaction is involved in the model (in which case $V_1 \equiv 0$), these assumptions are all that is needed to establish the monotonicity result (15). However, when at least one $V_k \neq 0$ with $k < K$, then additional cluster model assumptions are needed. We next will establish a family of monotonicity results for cluster global minima, valid only for certain models.

3.1 Monotonicity when subcluster energies are non-positive for $k < \kappa$ and non-negative for $k > \kappa$, with $1 < \kappa \leq K$

Our many- k monotonicity result is valid under the following additional assumption.

- (A): There is a fixed $\kappa \in \{2, \dots, K\}$ such that for all $N \geq K + 1$, all nontrivial k -body energies of each $N - 1$ -body subcluster of the N -body ground state $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ are non-positive if $k < \kappa$ and non-negative if $k > \kappa$.

Notice that assumption (A) leaves open the sign of the κ -body energies. Notice furthermore that identically vanishing interactions are both non-negative and non-positive. In particular, when $\kappa = K$, then the k -body energies with $k > \kappa$ simply vanish, compatible with assumption (A).

Assumption (A) in concert with our general assumptions yields the following monotonicity result. Define

$$w(N) := \frac{1}{\binom{N}{\kappa}} W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}). \quad (24)$$

Then for all $N > K$ we have

$$\boxed{w(N+1) \geq w(N)}. \quad (25)$$

Proof of (25): By the hypergraph-theoretical identity (43) we have

$$W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} \frac{1}{N-k} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq N \\ \ell \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}}} V_k(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_k}). \quad (26)$$

We now multiply (26) with $N - \kappa$. Since $k \leq K < N$, for $k < \kappa$ we have $0 < \frac{N-\kappa}{N-k} < 1$, and for $\kappa < k \leq K$ we have $1 < \frac{N-\kappa}{N-k} < \infty$. Thus, assumption (A) now implies that

$$(N - \kappa)W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) \geq \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq K} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq N \\ \ell \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}}} \dots V_k(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_k}) = \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}). \quad (27)$$

We now can argue as in the proof of (15). Since each $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}$ is an $N - 1$ -monomer configuration that is not necessarily an energy-minimizing $N - 1$ -monomer configuration, by replacing each $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}$ with the ℓ -independent energy-minimizing $N - 1$ -monomer configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N-1)}$, for all $N > K$ we obtain

$$(N - \kappa)W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) \geq NW(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N-1)}). \quad (28)$$

Dividing left- and right-hand sides of (28) by $(N - \kappa)\binom{N}{\kappa}$ yields (25). *End of proof.*

We now list some examples.

3.2 Examples of models with multiple k -body interactions

3.2.1 Optimal distancing (and related issues) on a sphere

Our first example is a generalization of the problem to maximize the arithmetic mean of the Euclidean distance between N points on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 .

We take $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{S}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^3$, so $S = \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{|\mathbf{r}| = 1\}$ is a unit-length position vector in three-dimensional Euclidean space, representing the location of a point particle on the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^3 . For $N \geq 4 = K$, the N -body cluster energy is taken to be

$$W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} V_2(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq N} V_3(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) + \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_4 \leq N} V_4(\mathbf{r}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{i_4}), \quad (29)$$

where

$$V_2(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) = -|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \quad (30)$$

is the negative of the Euclidean distance of points i and j ,

$$V_3(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) := -\alpha |(\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_j) \times (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)| \quad (31)$$

with $\alpha \geq 0$ is a non-positive multiple of the area of the parallelogram in \mathbb{R}^3 spanned by $\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j$ and $\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_j$, while

$$V_4(\mathbf{r}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{r}_{i_4}) := -\beta |((\mathbf{r}_{i_2} - \mathbf{r}_{i_1}) \times (\mathbf{r}_{i_3} - \mathbf{r}_{i_1})) \cdot (\mathbf{r}_{i_4} - \mathbf{r}_{i_1})| \quad (32)$$

with $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ is a real multiple of the volume of the parallel-epiped spanned by the three $\mathbf{r}_{i_\ell} - \mathbf{r}_{i_1}$, $\ell \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. In this example all nontrivial k -body interactions with $k \leq 3$ are ≤ 0 for any k -body subset, while those with $k = 4$ may be non-positive, non-negative, or vanish identically. Hence, for $\beta > 0$ assumption (A) is satisfied with $\kappa = 4$; for $\beta = 0 < \alpha$ it is satisfied with $\kappa = 3$; when $\beta < 0$ assumption (A) is also satisfied with $\kappa = 3$.

Since in the special case $\alpha = 0 = \beta$ the model reduces to the well-known problem of maximizing the arithmetic mean distance among N points on the sphere \mathbb{S}^2 [7], when α or β are non-zero but small in magnitude, the problem may thus be treated as a small perturbation of the optimal distancing problem on \mathbb{S}^2 .

The non-perturbative regime is much more complicated, and more interesting. For instance, setting $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta < 0$ with $|\beta| \gg 1$ the volume term penalizes any configuration whose points are not all on the equator $\mathbb{S}^1 \subset \mathbb{S}^2$. In the limit $\beta \rightarrow -\infty$ the optimizers are forced to be concentrated on \mathbb{S}^1 , thus are N -point configurations that maximize the arithmetic mean distance on \mathbb{S}^1 , and these are all known, namely

regular N -gons. The interesting open question is how for β large negative, but not too large, the competition between the distance and the volume terms will play out.

Final remark: The three-point and four-point interaction terms, here invoked as geometrically natural many-body analogues of the prominent two-point interaction term, feature on their own in the Heilbronn problem (cf. §2.1.4), respectively in a three-dimensional analog of the Heilbronn problem [51].

3.2.2 Clustering with induced dipole-dipole interactions

Our second example is a $K = 2$ model motivated by the fact that the attractive $-1/r^6$ term of the Lennard-Jones potential is the result of an induced dipole-dipole interaction of polarizable monomers. This interaction is implemented here in a toy version, which employs the interplay of a dipole-dipole with a single-monomer potential.

We take $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{S}^2 \times [0, 1]$, with $S = (\mathbf{r}, \boldsymbol{\omega}, \wp)$, where \mathbf{r} represents the position of a polarizable monomer, \wp the strength of its polar moment, and $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is a unit vector representing the orientation of the polar moment. For $N \geq 2$, the N -body cluster energy is taken to be

$$W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} V_1(S_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} V_2(S_i, S_j), \quad (33)$$

where the single-monomer potential is chosen to be

$$V_1(S) := -1 + \wp^4, \quad (34)$$

and the pair potential $V_2(S_i, S_j) := V_{\text{hs}}(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|) + V_{\text{dip}}^{\text{tr}}(|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|; \boldsymbol{\omega}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_j; \wp_i \wp_j)$, with

$$V_{\text{hs}}(r) := \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } r < 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } r \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (35)$$

the (non-sticky) hard sphere interaction for spheres of radius $\frac{1}{2}$ and

$$V_{\text{dip}}^{\text{tr}}(r; \cos \gamma; \lambda) := -4\alpha\lambda \frac{\cos \gamma}{r^3} \quad (36)$$

a truncated dipole-dipole interaction [cf. (9)]. The coupling constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ is a small parameter (but considered fixed). To have clustering we need $\alpha \neq 0$. Yet it is instructive to first discuss the non-clustering case $\alpha = 0$, which gives a system of N polarizable (but not sticky) hard spheres.

3.2.2.a *The case $\alpha = 0$.* The energy functional (33) in this case has a minimum $-N$, which is achieved by *any* configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of non-polarized monomers with pairwise distances $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_k| \geq 1$ for $i \neq j$; note that the single-monomer potential takes its minimum value -1 when $\wp = 0$. Thus the general model assumptions and assumption (A) are satisfied with $\kappa = 2 = K$. Yet the vast majority of local minimum configurations do not qualify as clusters, and those that have the appearance of a cluster appear so only incidentally.

The set of all such configurations of N non-polarized hard spheres is a “critical plateau region” of the energy functional (33) when $\alpha \neq 0$, but none of these configurations is then energy-minimizing. Instead, the energy-minimizing N -monomer configurations when $\alpha \neq 0$ are genuine N -body clusters, shown next.

3.2.2.b *The case $\alpha \neq 0$.* Assumption (A) is manifestly satisfied with $\kappa = 2$ for any minimizer $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ — provided that the infimum of $W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)})$ is in fact achieved by some $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$. We now show that this is the case, and that the minima are genuine clusters.

The dimer problem $N = 2$ deserves special attention, for it reveals the relation of this model to the Lennard-Jones cluster problem. Namely, with $\boldsymbol{\omega}_1 = \text{sign}(\alpha)\boldsymbol{\omega}_2 := \boldsymbol{\omega} \in \mathbb{S}^2$ chosen freely, and with $\wp_1 = \wp_2 := \wp > 0$ to be determined, for given \mathbf{r}_1 and \mathbf{r}_2 satisfying $|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| := r \geq 1$ the minimization of the energy functional yields $\wp^2 = |\alpha| \frac{1}{r^3}$, which for the conditionally minimal energy (conditioned on $|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| := r \geq 1$) gives $W(\mathcal{C}^{(2)}) = -2 - 2\alpha^2 \frac{1}{r^6}$. Except for the trivial shift by -2 this model captures the attractive long range behavior of the Lennard-Jones pair potential; its repulsive short range term is replaced by the restriction that $r \geq 1$.

The situation is more subtle when $N \geq 3$. We distinguish $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha < 0$.

3.2.2.b.i *The case $\alpha > 0$.* N non-overlapping spheres of radius $\frac{1}{2}$ can always be placed inside a spherical domain of sufficiently large radius R , say $R = N/2$. Hence the maximal distance between the position vectors of any two spheres is bounded by N . Take any such N -sphere configuration and set all the polar moment vectors parallel, so $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_j = 1$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq N$, and set all moment strengths equal, viz. $\wp_i = \wp$. Then for such a trial configuration the energy is bounded above by $W(\mathcal{C}_{\text{trial}}^{(N)}) \leq -N + N\wp^4 - 2\alpha \frac{N-1}{N^2} \wp^2$, which is minimized by $\wp_*^2 = \frac{N-1}{N^3} \alpha$, yielding the upper bound $\inf W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) \leq -N \left(1 + \frac{(N-1)^2}{N^6} \alpha^2 \right)$. Thus we have $\inf W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) < -N$, which establishes that no configuration of all unpolarized hard spheres can be a N -body minimizer when $\alpha > 0$. Moreover, by a straightforward variation of this argument we can relax the conditions that all $\wp_i = \wp$ and that all $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_j = 1$, and prove that a minimizing configuration must have all its $\wp_i > 0$, and all its $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \boldsymbol{\omega}$, with $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ any fixed unit vector. As to clustering, consider any admissible configuration with all $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_k| \geq 1$ for $i \neq j$, all $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \boldsymbol{\omega}$, and all $\wp_i > 0$ fixed, and

now replace all \mathbf{r}_i by $\lambda\mathbf{r}_i$, with $\lambda > 1$. This construction yields another admissible configuration with the same $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ and \wp_i , but all pair interactions (which are negative) have increased, while all single monomer contributions have remained the same. Thus the interactions favor clustering, i.e. it is only necessary to ask whether a minimizing N -body configuration exists in $B_{N/2}(0)$, the closed spherical domain of radius $N/2$ centered at the origin. The answer is positive because $W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)})$ is continuous on the pertinent set of admissible configurations, which form the bounded and closed subset $\{\mathcal{C}^{(N)} : |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_k| \geq 1 \text{ for } i \neq j, \text{ and } \mathbf{r}_i \in B_{N/2}(0) \text{ and } \wp_i \in [0, 1] \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \boldsymbol{\omega} \text{ for all } i\}$ of configuration space. This derivation establishes the existence of a minimizing cluster configuration $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ for each $N \geq 2$.

In general, the minimizing configurations are not easy to determine, but our preceding arguments demonstrate that a minimizing configuration is a cluster with all $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = \boldsymbol{\omega}$ and all $\wp_i > 0$, and of course all $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_k| \geq 1$ for $i \neq j$. We suspect that the minimizer $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ is always a hard sphere configuration with the maximal number $c(N, 3)$ of contact points, and suitably chosen $\wp_i > 0$. For $N \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ this suggestion is readily verified (viz., the position vectors \mathbf{r}_i mark an interval for $N = 2$, an equilateral triangle for $N = 3$, and a regular tetrahedron for $N = 4$), with $\wp_i = \wp(N)$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, where $\wp(N)$ is the minimizing \wp -value of the quartic $N\wp^4 - 4\binom{N}{2}\alpha\wp^2$ for $\wp \in [0, 1]$. One easily finds that $\wp(N)^2 = (N - 1)\alpha$ (here we need $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{3}$), which gives for the minimum energy $W(\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}) = -N(1 + (N - 1)^2\alpha^2)$, with $N \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. The case $N = 5$, while also counted among the ‘‘trivial’’ cases of the optimal sticky hard sphere problem (see §2.1.2), is already much more complicated here because of the additional degree of freedom involving the \wp_i .

3.2.2.b.ii *The case $\alpha < 0$.* With $\alpha < 0$ the arrangement $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i \cdot \boldsymbol{\omega}_j = -1$ is impossible to achieve for all pairs $i < j$ when $N > 2$. In other words, the $\alpha < 0$ problem exhibits the phenomenon of *frustration*, where no given set of $N > 2$ pairwise distinct positions of the monomers can energetically optimize all the pair interactions at the same time. Examples of systems with dimeric interactions that exhibit frustration include water clusters (e.g. [56]), and Ising spins on a triangular lattice with anti-ferromagnetic nearest-neighbor coupling (e.g. [58]).

Thus the problem of determining the global minima is more challenging than when $\alpha > 0$. The only trivial case is the optimal arrangement of $(\mathbf{r}_i, \boldsymbol{\omega}_i, \wp_i), i \in \{1, 2\}$ when $N = 2$. However, one can demonstrate the existence of a minimal energy configuration that is a cluster, with all $\wp_i > 0$, by noting that $\inf W(\mathcal{C}^{(N+1)}) < \inf W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) < -N$ for all $N \geq 2$, with all \mathbf{r}_i in a ball of sufficiently large radius $R(N)$. The existence of a minimizer then follows from the continuity of W on the compact subset of configuration space having energy $W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) \leq -N - \epsilon$.

3.2.3 Clusters with Lennard-Jones plus Axilrod–Teller interactions

Our next example is more tentative, in the sense that assumption (A) is *presumably satisfied*, although this is not manifestly obvious. We will argue that it is satisfied in a perturbative regime. This model has already been discussed in the chemical physics literature, in terms of the favoured structures and rearrangement mechanisms [80, 21, 89], and as a benchmark for visualisation and comparison of alternative geometry optimisation algorithms [81, 3]. Some tests of monotonicity will be considered in §4.

We take $\mathfrak{S} = \mathbb{R}^3$, and $S = \mathbf{r}$ represents the position of the center of mass of a polarizable monomer. For $N \geq 3$, the N -body cluster energy is taken to be

$$W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) = \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq N} \sum V_2(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i < j < k \leq N} \sum \sum V_3(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k), \quad (37)$$

where $V_2(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j) := V_{\text{LJ}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j)$ is the Lennard-Jones pair interaction (10), and where $V_3(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) := ZV_{\text{AT}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k)$ is a multiple of the Axilrod–Teller trimer interaction

$$V_{\text{AT}}(\mathbf{r}_i, \mathbf{r}_j, \mathbf{r}_k) := \frac{1 + 3 \cos \gamma_i \cos \gamma_j \cos \gamma_k}{r_{ij}^3 r_{jk}^3 r_{ki}^3}. \quad (38)$$

As in example §2.1.3, $r_{jk} := |\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k|$ is the Euclidean distance between the position vectors of monomers j and k , but $\gamma_j \in [0, \pi]$ is defined by $(\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_j) \cdot (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) =: r_{kj} r_{ji} \cos \gamma_j$. The trimeric interaction V_{AT} favors alignment of the trimer when $Z > 0$ (the expected sign from quantum mechanics) and triangulation when $Z < 0$ (a hypothetical case).

Since the Lennard-Jones pair interaction is < 0 for $r > 1$, vanishing for infinite separation, and since the Axilrod–Teller trimer interaction is < 0 whenever one of the angles is $\approx \pi$, and > 0 when all three angles are $\leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, and vanishes when $r_{ij} r_{jk} r_{ki} \rightarrow \infty$, and since, furthermore, the Lennard-Jones pair interaction tends to $+\infty$ faster than the Axilrod–Teller trimer interaction can go to $-\infty$ when two monomer positions of a trimer approach each other arbitrarily closely, the existence of a minimizer $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ of W for each $N \geq 3$ is guaranteed for any real Z .

We expect that assumption (A) holds with $\kappa = 3$ and sufficiently small $|Z| \ll 1$. The reason is that for $Z = 0$ the problem reduces to the Lennard-Jones cluster problem, which is expected to be very similar to the more extreme case with the $1/r^{12}$ term replaced by the hard spheres interaction of example §3.2.2, in which case all subclusters of $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ — not only the $N - 1$ -body subclusters — do have non-positive pair energy. More precisely, if we replace the repulsive $1/r^{12}$ term in (10) by the repulsive $1/r^p$ with $p \geq 12$, then for each $N \geq 2$ the ground states and their energies for this p -family of Lennard-Jones-like cluster problems converge to the pertinent

ground states and their energies of the hard sphere model with attractive $-1/r^6$ pair interactions if one sends $p \rightarrow \infty$. By continuity there is a left neighborhood of $p = \infty$ in which all subclusters of $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ do have non-positive pair energy for the pertinent members of the p -family of Lennard-Jones-like cluster problems. We expect that this neighborhood contains $p = 12$, but we are not aware of a proof. If our expectation is correct and all subclusters of $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ have non-positive pair energy for the two-body Lennard-Jones cluster problem, then by continuity this will be the case for the mixed dimeric / trimeric $Z \neq 0$ problem, at least with small $|Z| \ll 1$, and then assumption (A) will be satisfied with $\kappa = 3$.

4 Testing lists of N -monomer cluster energies with Lennard-Jones plus Axilrod–Teller interactions

In this section we report the outcomes of our monotonicity test (25) run on databases of minima for LJAT $_N$ clusters of N monomers that interact via both the pairwise Lennard-Jones potential and the three-body Axilrod–Teller potential, i.e. the model explained in §3.2.2.

The data lists were generated as follows. We started with the putatively optimal Lennard-Jones clusters for $N \in \{3, \dots, 150\}$, available at [87]; cf. [70] and [6]. For the range of N values used in our study the optimal Lennard-Jones cluster problem has been investigated so thoroughly (see [63], [50], [19], [31], [54], [48], [26], [5], [60], [94], [96], [17]) that we confidently assume the clusters listed at [87] are the correct global LJ $_N$ minimizers. We remark that all these (putatively) optimal LJ $_N$ data of [87] satisfy (15).

We then “switched on” the Axilrod–Teller interaction of model §3.2.2 by setting $Z > 0$ in incremental steps and minimising using the custom limited-memory [53, 62] quasi-Newton Broyden [13], Fletcher [25], Goldfarb [30], Shanno [69] (L-BFGS) routine in the OPTIM program [79]. We also checked two values of $Z < 0$. With a reasonably small maximum step size (we used a maximum of 0.2 in terms of the Euclidean distance) we expect this relaxation to produce the local minimum for the LJAT $_N$ cluster nearest to the putatively optimal LJ $_N$ cluster. For small enough $|Z|$ one may treat the AT interaction perturbatively, so that the putative LJAT $_N$ minimum can be expected to be a slight deformation of the pertinent LJ $_N$ minimum, and hence the relaxation algorithm should produce this putative LJAT $_N$ optimizer. Assuming it does, the question then becomes: How small must $|Z|$ be to be small enough? Our monotonicity test (25) cannot answer this question, but it can yield information about which $|Z|$ are *not* small enough whenever the test is applicable.

We begin by noting that the optimizers of the dimeric limiting case $Z = 0$, i.e. the optimal LJ $_N$ energy data, obey (25) *a fortiori*, because these ground state energies are < 0 and they satisfy (15). Also the putatively optimal LJ $_N$ energy data at [87] do satisfy (15), and are < 0 , so they do satisfy (25) as well.

For all the cases $Z \neq 0$ we need to verify that assumption (A) is satisfied to be able to use (25) as a monotonicity test. A sufficient condition for all $N - 1$ -monomer subclusters of $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ to have non-positive average Lennard-Jones pair energy is that for all $i \neq j$ one has $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \geq 1$; note, however, that this is not a necessary condition unless $N = 3$. This condition is easily checked for putatively optimal clusters found through computer experiments.

We first inspected the pairwise distances in the putatively optimal LJ $_N$ clusters with $N \in \{3, \dots, 150\}$ at [87], which revealed that they all are ≥ 1 , and this result implies that assumption (A) is satisfied for all putatively optimal LJ $_N$ clusters in this range of N values. This observation implies furthermore that assumption (A) is satisfied for lists of local LJAT $_N$ minimizers generated in the manner described above when $|Z|$ is sufficiently small. How small is “sufficiently small”? Inspection of the pairwise distances in these LJAT $_N$ clusters with $N \in \{3, \dots, 150\}$ revealed that for the physically normal regime $Z \in \{\frac{n}{10}\}_{n=1, \dots, 20}$ one has $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \geq 1$ when $i \neq j$. Interestingly, for the hypothetical regime of negative Z we found that $\min_{i \neq j} |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| < 1$ when $Z = -1$, although $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \geq 1$ when $i \neq j$ if $Z = -0.1$. This result does not mean that (A) is not satisfied if $Z = -1$, but that further checking is required. In the following analysis we only consider lists with $Z > 0$.

Since the local LJAT $_N$ energy minimizers with our selection of Z values in the interval $0 < Z \leq 2$ satisfy (A), if indeed they are global optimizers they must display the monotonicity compatible with (25). We have verified that (25) does hold (in the sense of discrete forward derivative) for the local LJAT $_N$ energy minimizers with $N \in \{3, \dots, 149\}$ when $Z \in \{\frac{n}{10}\}_{n=1, \dots, 10}$.

However, for $Z \in \{\frac{n}{10}\}_{n=11, \dots, 20}$ the energies of the locally energy-minimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters failed the monotonicity test (25) for certain N -values, which means that the local LJAT $_N$ minimizers found in the neighborhood of the putatively optimal (i.e. global) LJ $_N$ minimizers that violate (25) when $Z \in \{\frac{n}{10}\}_{n=11, \dots, 20}$ are not themselves globally minimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters. We suspect that for these Z values also some of our locally energy-minimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters that do satisfy the monotonicity test (25) are not globally energy-minimizing. The true LJAT $_N$ optimizers for these N -values are not in the algorithm’s basin of attraction that includes the pertinent LJ $_N$ optimizer. Thus a search via basin-hopping [52, 85] is indicated, and we hope to report on the results in future work.

Curiously, the sets of “failing N -values” do not seem to hint at any system-

atic pattern. For example, increasing Z from 1 (no failures) to 1.5 in steps of 0.1, the locally energy-minimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters produced by our method violate the monotonicity law (25) at the following N -values: $N \in \{136, 144, 147\}$ when $Z = 1.1$, $N \in \{144, 147\}$ when $Z = 1.2$, $N = 135$ when $Z = 1.3$, $N \in \{38, 77, 147\}$ when $Z = 1.4$, $N \in \{38, 41, 67, 84\}$ when $Z = 1.5$. When Z is further increased in steps of 0.1, the number of failures jumps up but then varies slowly at first: 9 failures for $Z = 0.6$, 10 for $Z = 0.7$, 11 for $Z = 0.8$, 13 for $Z = 0.9$. By the time one reaches $Z = 2$ there are already 21 N -values at which (25) fails; we refrain from listing all those, yet we find it worthy to note that of the “failing N -values” in the five sets labeled with $Z \in \{1.1, \dots, 1.5\}$ only $N = 135$ is in the set of failing N values at $Z = 2$.

Since the trimeric Axilrod–Teller interaction competes with the dimeric Lennard-Jones interaction, the locally energy-minimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters that we found in the neighborhood of the (putatively) optimal LJ $_N$ clusters cannot themselves also be LJ $_N$ local minima. For “sufficiently large” $|Z|$ the LJAT $_N$ clusters should therefore fail the dimeric monotonicity law (15); recall that for “sufficiently small” $|Z|$ the dimeric monotonicity law (15) will be satisfied, by continuity. And so, once again, how “large” is “sufficiently large”? Interestingly, we found that the first failure to obey (15) happens for $Z = 0.8$, when the discrete forward derivative of the $N = 74$ cluster is just barely negative. When $Z = 0.9$ there are already nine values of N for which (15) is violated, namely when $N \in \{68, 74, 81, 85, 97, 113, 122, 130, 134\}$. For $Z \in \{\frac{n}{10}\}_{n=1, \dots, 7}$ the average Lennard-Jones pair energy of the LJAT $_N$ clusters satisfies the monotonicity law (15), although this law has been derived for the true LJ $_N$ optimizers. Apparently their distortions from optimality are so small that none of the configurations fail the average pair-energy monotonicity test for optimal Lennard-Jones clusters. These findings may be seen as complementary to our results reported in §2.5, where we inquired into the number of non-global local minimizers that pass the monotonicity law (15).

The fact that the first violations of (15) by the dimeric Lennard-Jones contribution to the total energy of the locally energy-minimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters occur already for $Z = 0.8$, while the first violations of (25) by the total energy of these LJAT $_N$ clusters occur when $Z = 1.1$ suggests that one should not expect any noticeable correlations between the N values of the pertinent failures. Indeed, the sets of N -values for which (15) is violated by the Lennard-Jones contribution to the LJAT $_N$ cluster energy do not foreshadow the sets of N -values at which the monotonicity (25) is going to be violated.

5 Conclusions

Our monotonicity law (15) applies to the optimal average K -body energy of N -body clusters that interact exclusively through permutation-invariant K -body potentials that admit a global minimizer for each $N \geq K$. When $K = 2$ it reduces to the monotonicity law previously established in [45]. Our monotonicity law (25) generalizes (15) to a family of cluster models with an additive mix of such k -body potentials, $1 \leq k \leq K$ with $K \geq 2$ fixed, that satisfy the additional assumption:

- (A): There is a fixed $\kappa \in \{2, \dots, K\}$ such that for all $N \geq K + 1$, all nontrivial k -body energies of each $N - 1$ -body subcluster of the N -body ground state $\mathcal{C}_{\min}^{(N)}$ are non-positive if $k < \kappa$ and non-negative if $k > \kappa$.

We have listed several examples, some old and some new, of cluster models that must satisfy our monotonicity inequalities, some directly relevant to studies of molecular clusters, others inspired by them, and yet others inspired by the Thomson problem. The main message of our paper is that our monotonicity inequalities furnish useful necessary conditions for optimality that can be used to test lists of putatively optimal cluster data.

We have complemented our mathematical analysis with some empirical studies. In one of these empirical studies we inquired into how sharp our test criterion (15) is by counting the number of local minima for Lennard-Jones clusters that pass the monotonicity test (15). We found that as N increases numerous local minima exist that pass the test, yet the test does not seem easy to improve — which we also showed. This finding may be seen as another illustration for why these optimization problems fall in the category NP-hard.

Incidentally, our tightness study reflects the existence of several competing sequences of local energy minimizers, with bifurcations among them, that reveal some interesting patterns in the energy landscape of low-lying energy configurations. This observation may help to guide further investigations of the competition between structural families.

In another empirical study we considered N -body clusters, with $N \in \{3, \dots, 150\}$, whose monomers interact with an additive mix of a dimeric Lennard-Jones and a trimeric Axilrod–Teller potential, with the AT amplitude Z as parameter. For $Z = 0$ the problem reduces to the problem of finding the optimal Lennard-Jones clusters, which we confidently assume have been found and listed at [87]. We then computed the local energy minimizers of the LJAT problem in the vicinity of the $Z = 0$ optimizers as a function of Z , using steps of $\Delta Z = 0.1$. By continuity arguments one may expect that for small $|Z|$ this procedure will find the truly energy-optimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters, which therefore should satisfy the monotonicity law (25). We found

that (25) is obeyed for when $0 < Z \leq 1.0$, but for $1.1 \leq Z \leq 2$ we found that some of the locally energy-minimizing LJAT $_N$ clusters violated (25), demonstrating that the true global minima are not in the basin of attraction that contains the $Z = 0$ optimizers. We verified numerically that assumption (A) is satisfied to guarantee that our inequality (25) furnishes a valid test.

We just mentioned that we empirically verified assumption (A) for all our LJAT $_N$ data. This analysis sufficed for us to vindicate the test of our LJAT $_N$ data against the monotonicity law (25). However, no check of empirical lists of putatively optimal configurations proves for sure that the true LJAT $_N$ optimizers satisfy assumption (A), and this for *all* $N \geq 3$. A rigorous proof that all $|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \geq 1$ in the optimal LJAT $_N$ clusters for all $N \geq 3$ would take care of this open issue, yet we don't expect to see a rigorous proof anytime soon.

It is not even rigorously known whether $\min_{i \neq j} |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \geq 1$ in the optimal LJ $_N$ clusters for all $N \geq 2$. Yet there is strong empirical and theoretical evidence that this is a lower bound on the minimal distance in LJ $_N$, independently of N ; in fact, we expect that “ \geq ” can be replaced with “ $>$.”

First of all, with the help of the virial theorem it can be shown that for all $N \geq 2$ one has $r_{\min}(N) \leq 2^{\frac{1}{6}}$, the minimizing separation for the dimer potential in our units. Since $N = 2$ is included, this upper bound is sharp; in fact, it is easily seen that

$$r_{\min}(N) = 2^{\frac{1}{6}} \approx 1.122462048; \quad N \in \{2, 3, 4\}. \quad (39)$$

Second, there is also some theoretical evidence from studies of crystal structures in the thermodynamic limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. In [41] the minimal pairwise distance was computed for spatially unbounded simple cubic, bcc and fcc Lennard-Jones crystals, by minimizing their energy per monomer. They found that the fcc crystal has the lowest energy per particle among these three regular lattices, and for a long time it was thought that fcc is the optimal crystal structure in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$. Now we know that fcc is the optimal *standard lattice* structure, with a minimal pairwise distance that can then be computed from the results in [41] as

$$r_{\min}^{\text{fcc}} \approx 1.090172. \quad (40)$$

However, recently it was found empirically [98], and then proved rigorously [8], that the hcp crystal structure is the true crystalline ground state configuration in the thermodynamics limit. Note that the hcp crystal is not a regular lattice in the same sense as fcc, bcc, and simple cubic crystals. Using the results of [14], the minimal pairwise distance in the optimal crystal structure can be computed as

$$r_{\min}^{\text{hcp}} \approx 1.090167, \quad (41)$$

which is slightly smaller than r_{\min}^{fcc} .

Third, we inspected the putatively optimal Lennard-Jones clusters LJ_N at [87] for $N \leq 150$ and found that the smallest minimal distance $r_{\min}(N)$ occurs for $N = 71$,

$$r_{\min}(71) \approx 1.028758632. \quad (42)$$

So far there are no decisive theoretical results for the vast intermediate regime between these values at the extreme ends of the N scale. In [95] it has been shown that there is an N -independent lower bound on the smallest pairwise distance in any globally energy-minimizing Lennard-Jones cluster, and the following lower bound was given (rescaled into our units): $r_{\min}(N) \geq 1/2^{\frac{5}{6}} \approx 0.561231$. Subsequent papers by [78], then [67], and more recently [97] have improved the theoretical lower bound on this quantity to currently $r_{\min}(N) \geq 0.767764$. Clearly, this best known bound is still far away from the suspected bound $r_{\min}(N) \geq 1$.

A semi-final remark: Our empirical studies are meant not only to illustrate the usefulness of the test criteria obtained in this paper; they are also meant to inspire readers to apply them to their own lists of data, and to try to find alternative or better criteria for optimality. In particular, as noted by the anonymous referee, it is reasonable to ask whether the N -dependence of the variance over all the K -body energies in an N -body cluster with pure K -body interactions furnishes a useful test criterion for optimality. We don't know the answer, but this question certainly merits further analysis.

Our final remark highlights the fact that the monotonicity of the ground state energy is useful for other purposes. About 100 years ago, and thus long before powerful computers became available that could produce lists of putatively optimal clusters, special cases of the $K = 2$ version of (15) have been proved [24], [64], in a very different context; see Appendix B for some of the history of the $K = 2$ version of (15). In this vein we expect that the monotonicity laws derived in this paper will be useful also in contexts other than testing computer-generated lists of putatively optimal energies.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT: We thank Bhargav Narayanan for clarifying conversations about hypergraphs, and Neil Sloane for pointing out [75]. We also thank the anonymous referee for the interesting comments.

Appendix A Hypergraph-theoretical input

A.1 Hypergraph terminology

A *non-directed hypergraph* is a pair $(\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ where \mathcal{V} is an unordered set of points called *vertices* and \mathcal{E} is a set of unordered subsets of \mathcal{V} , called *hyperedges*. Any unordered subset of $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ vertices of such a hypergraph with N vertices can be “joined into a hyperedge,” here called a k -hyperedge, for short. Special names are available for the 1-hyperedge (just a vertex) and the 2-hyperedge (the usual edge of a non-empty graph). The number k of vertices in a k -hyperedge suggests to give \mathcal{E} an ordering, or a grading, but we won’t need it.

In the following we are only interested in non-directed hypergraphs, and so the adjective “non-directed” will henceforth be dropped. Also, if we speak of “subsets of vertices,” we tacitly mean “unordered subsets.”

Typically not all possible subsets of \mathcal{V} occur in \mathcal{E} , but if they do (i.e. if \mathcal{E} is the powerset of \mathcal{V}), the hypergraph is called *complete*. For each $k \leq N$ there are $\binom{N}{k}$ different k -hyperedges in such a hypergraph. If \mathcal{E} consists entirely of k -hyperedges with a fixed $k = K$, the hypergraph is called *k -uniform*, and such a k -uniform hypergraph is *complete* if \mathcal{E} contains all subsets with $k = K$ vertices.

A hypergraph is *weighted* if all hyperedges are assigned a weight. Usually a weight is non-negative, but we allow real weights (perhaps a better terminology would be “charged”). Including vanishing weights allows one to work with complete hypergraphs by default.

A.2 Clusters as hypergraphs

In [45] we identified clusters whose monomers interact solely pairwise with complete weighted graphs. More generally, any cluster of $N \geq K \geq 2$ monomers that properly interact through permutation-invariant irreducible k -body potentials V_k for some (or all) k satisfying $2 \leq k \leq K$, and whose individual monomer states in addition may be assigned nontrivial one-body potentials V_1 , can be identified with a complete weighted hypergraph — provided one stipulates that for any $k \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ for which no nontrivial V_k appears in the model, in particular for all $k \in \{K + 1, \dots, N\}$, the trivial k -body interaction $V_k \equiv 0$ is assigned as the weight to all those k -hyperedges.

More to the point, the states of the N monomers in a cluster are identified with the N vertices of a hypergraph. For our cluster models the permutation-invariant, irreducible k -body interactions V_k , and the single-monomer potential V_1 , if nonvanishing, define the relevant weighted k -hyperedges of the hypergraph together with their nontrivial weights V_k , while all other k -hyperedges are assigned trivial weights

and are, therefore, irrelevant — they are included merely for later notational convenience. This setup includes all cluster models covered in the main part of this work, whether the monomers interact through an additive mixture of permutation-symmetric many-body potentials V_k for various different $k \leq K$, and are additionally equipped with a nontrivial one-monomer potential V_1 , or whether only k -body interactions for a single value $k = K \geq 2$ feature. In the latter case all $V_{k \neq K} \equiv 0$, and the complete weighted hypergraph is equivalent to a K -uniform complete weighted hypergraph.

With these stipulations we may simply replace K by N in (23). The total energy (23) of an N -monomer cluster is thus seen to be the sum of all the hyperedge weights (trivial and nontrivial) over all the hyperedges of a weighted complete hypergraph.

A.3 A family of hypergraph-theoretical identities

Let $N > K \geq 2$. Consider the contribution of the k -body potential with $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ to W given in (23). Without loss of generality we may assume that $V_k \neq 0$ (when $V_k \equiv 0$ the following is trivially true). Define the ℓ -th sub-hypergraph obtained from the complete hypergraph with N vertices by removing the ℓ -th vertex and, hence, with it all k -hyperedges containing the ℓ -th vertex. If we now sum the hyperedge-weighting function over all k -hyperedges of that ℓ -th sub-hypergraph, and then sum the generally ℓ -dependent result of this summation over ℓ , i.e. over all vertices of the hypergraph with N -vertices, then all k -hyperedges appear in the final result $(N - k)$ times. Thus we overcount the k -th contribution to the total energy $W(\mathcal{C}^{(N)})$ by a factor $(N - k)$, i.e. we get the family of hypergraph-theoretical identities

$$\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq N \\ \ell \notin \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}}} \dots \sum V_k(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_k}) = (N - k) \sum_{1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq N} \dots \sum V_k(S_{i_1}, \dots, S_{i_k}) \quad (43)$$

valid for all $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$.

Identity (43) can be written more elegantly as follows. Dividing both sides of (43) by $\binom{N}{k}(N - k)$, viz. by $N \binom{N-1}{k}$, and recalling the definition (22) of the average k -body energy of an N -monomer configuration, (43) becomes

$$\forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\}: \langle V_k \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq N} \langle V_k \rangle(\mathcal{C}^{(N)} \setminus \{S_\ell\}). \quad (44)$$

We note that the special case $k = K = 2$ of (44) is identity (9) in [45].

Appendix B On the history of the monotonicity of the optimal average pair energy

The first publication to advocate the use of the monotonicity of the optimal average pair energy of N -body clusters whose monomers interact solely with a certain class of permutation-symmetric pair potentials, as a necessary condition for optimality to test putative global minima, seems to be [43]. The most general class so far of N -body systems with pair interactions for which the monotonicity has been established is the subsequent article [45]. These monotonicity results are included as special case of our K -body result (15), which in turn is included in (25).

We find it worthy of note that the monotonic increase of the average pair energy of N -body ground states was first proved in a completely different context, though, and this about 100 years ago! For the special case of logarithmic pair interactions between points in a compact infinite subset $D \subset \mathbb{C}$, Fekete (see [24], §1, Thm. I*) established the corresponding $K = 2$ special case of (15). He didn't express his results in this terminology, though. Fekete was interested in the distribution of the zeros of complex polynomials with integer coefficients, and used his monotonicity theorem to establish the existence of the so-called "transfinite diameter of D ," a limit of the *geometric mean distance* between the zeros of the order- N polynomials when $N \rightarrow \infty$. Taking a logarithm of Fekete's formulas converts this narrative into one of clusters with logarithmic pair interactions.

Fekete's result was subsequently generalized by Polya and Szegő [64] to points that interact pairwise with the fundamental solution of the Laplacian in \mathbb{R}^3 . Their monotonicity results have in turn been generalized to the family of Riesz kernels of potential theory in \mathbb{R}^d , $d > 2$, for the parameter interval $s \in (0, d)$; see Landkof's book [49], Ch.II, §3, No.12, p.160; and see §4, No.15, p. 169 for Fekete's result.

The monotonicity of the optimal average pair energy of clusters with a larger class of pair interactions, yet still expressible as functions of the particle positions only, was subsequently rediscovered in [44] (see App.A, Proof of Prop.7, p.1189). More precisely, the proof is stated for point particle systems with symmetric and lower semi-continuous pair interactions in compact subsets $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$.

In all the works [24], [64], [44], the monotonicity of the optimal average pair energy, together with a uniform bound on the average pair energy, was employed to establish its limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

By analogy, our monotonicity results (15), in concert with corresponding uniform bounds on the average K -body energy, will establish the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ of the pertinent average K -body energy.

Conflict-of-Interest Statement: The authors have no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] A. B. Adip. NP-hardness of the cluster minimization problem revisited. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **38**:8487–8492, (2005).
- [2] E.L. Altschuler, T.J. Williams, E.R. Ratner, R. Tipton, R. Stong, F. Dowla, and F. Wooten. Possible global minimum lattice configurations for Thomson’s problem of charges on the sphere. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **78**:2681–2685, (1997).
- [3] D. Asenjo, J. D. Stevenson, D. J. Wales, and D. Frenkel. Visualizing basins of attraction for different minimization algorithms. *J. Phys. Chem. B*, **117**:12717–12723, (2013).
- [4] B. M. Axilrod and E. Teller. Interaction of the van der Waals type between three atoms. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **11**:299–300, (1943).
- [5] C. Barrón-Romero. Optimal clusters. <https://academicos.azc.uam.mx/cbr/OptClusters/comM>
- [6] C. Barrón-Romero. The olj13_n13ic cluster is the global minimum cluster of Lennard-Jones potential for 13 particles. In *2022 IEEE 3rd International Conference on Electronics, Control, Optimization and Computer Science (ICE-COCS), Dec.01-02, 2022*. IEEE, (2022).
- [7] J. Beck. Sums of distances between points on a sphere — an application of the theory of irregularities of distribution to discrete geometry. *Mathematica*, **31**:33–41, (1984).
- [8] L. Bétermin, L. Šamaj, and Travěnek. Three-dimensional lattice ground states for Riesz and Lennard-Jones–type energies. *Stud. Appl. Math.*, **150**:69–91, (2023).
- [9] K. Bezdek and M. A. Khan. Contact numbers for sphere packings. In G. Ambrus, I. Bárány, J. K. Böröczky, G. Fejes Tóth, and J. Pach, editors, *New Trends in Intuitive Geometry*, volume **27** of *Bolyai Society Mathematical Studies*, pages 25–48. Springer Verlag, New York, (2018).
- [10] G. Björck. Distributions of positive mass, which maximize a certain generalized energy integral. *Ark. Mat.*, **3**:255–269, (1956).
- [11] M. Bowick, A. Cacciuto, D. R. Nelson, and A. Travesset. Crystalline order on a sphere and the generalized Thomson problem. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **89**:185502,1–4, (2002).
- [12] M. Bowick, A. Cacciuto, D. R. Nelson, and A. Travesset. Crystalline particle packings on a sphere with long-range power-law potentials. *Phys. Rev. B*, **73**:024115,1–16, (2006).

- [13] C. G. Broyden. The convergence of a class of double-rank minimization algorithms 1. General considerations. *J. Inst. Math. Appl.*, **6**:76–90, (1970).
- [14] A. Burrows, S. Cooper, E. Pahl, and P. Schwerdtfeger. Analytical methods for fast converging lattice sums for cubic and hexagonal close-packed structures. *J. Math. Phys.*, **61**:123503, 1–35, (2020).
- [15] F. Calvo, J. P. K. Doye, and D. J. Wales. Quantum partition functions from classical distributions: Application to rare-gas clusters. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 114:7312–7329, 2001.
- [16] J. C. Crocker. Turning away from high symmetry. *Science*, 327:535–536, (2010).
- [17] J. P. K. Doye. Lennard-Jones clusters. <http://doye.chem.ox.ac.uk/jon/structures/LJ.html>.
- [18] J. P. K. Doye and F. Calvo. Entropic effects on the structure of lennard-jones clusters. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 116:8307–8317, 2002.
- [19] J. P. K. Doye, M. A. Miller, and D. J. Wales. The double-funnel energy landscape of the 38-atom Lennard-Jones cluster. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **110**:6896–6906, (1999).
- [20] J. P. K. Doye, M. A. Miller, and D. J. Wales. Evolution of the potential energy surface with size for Lennard-Jones clusters. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **111**:8417–8428, (1999).
- [21] J. P. K. Doye and D. J. Wales. Systematic investigation of the structures and rearrangements of 6-atom clusters bound by a model anisotropic potential. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.*, **88**:3295–3304, (1992).
- [22] J. P. K. Doye and D. J. Wales. The effect of the range of the potential on the structure and stability of simple liquids - from clusters to bulk, from sodium to c-60. *J. Phys. B*, 29:4859–4894, 1996.
- [23] J. P. K. Doye and D. J. Wales. Saddle points and dynamics of Lennard-Jones clusters, solids, and supercooled liquids. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **116**:3777–3788, (2002).
- [24] M. Fekete. Über die Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten. *Math. Z.*, **17**:228–249, (1923).
- [25] R. Fletcher. A new approach to variable metric algorithms. *Comput. J.*, **13**:317–322, (1970).
- [26] Y. Forman and M. K. Cameron. Modeling aggregation processes of Lennard-Jones particles via stochastic networks. *J. Statist. Phys.*, **168**:408–433, (2017).

- [27] S. C. Glotzer and M. Engel. Complex order in soft matter. *Nature*, **471**:309–310, (2011).
- [28] S. C. Glotzer and M. J. Solomon. Anisotropy of building blocks and their assembly into complex structures. *Nature Mater.*, **6**:557–562, (2007).
- [29] M. Goldberg. Maximizing the smallest triangle made by N points in a square. *Math. Mag.*, **45**:135–144, (1972).
- [30] D. Goldfarb. A family of variable-metric methods derived by variational means. *Math. Comput.*, **24**:23–26, (1970).
- [31] T. Gregor and R. Car. Minimization of the potential energy surface of Lennard-Jones clusters by quantum optimization. *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **412**:125–130, (2005).
- [32] H. Harborth. Lösung zu Problem 664A. *Elem. Math.*, **29**:14–15, (1974).
- [33] M. Holmes-Cerfon. Sticky-sphere clusters. *Annual Rev. Cond. Matter Phys.*, **8**:77–98, (2017).
- [34] M. Holmes-Cerfon, S. J. Gortler, and M. P. Brenner. A geometrical approach to computing free-energy landscapes from short-ranged potentials. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, **110**:E5–E10, (2013).
- [35] M. C. Holmes-Cerfon. Enumerating rigid sphere packings. *SIAM Rev.*, **58**:229–244, (2016).
- [36] R. S. Hoy. Structure and dynamics of model colloidal clusters with short-range attractions. *Phys. Rev. E*, **91**:012303, 1–7, (2015).
- [37] R. S. Hoy, J. Harwayne-Gidansky, and C. S. O’Hern. Structure of finite sphere packings via exact enumeration: Implications for colloidal crystal nucleation. *Phys. Rev. E*, **85**:051403,1–15, (2012).
- [38] R. S. Hoy and C. S. O’Hern. Minimal energy packings and collapse of sticky tangent hard-sphere polymers. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **105**:068001,1–4, (2010).
- [39] J. Jellinek, editor. *Theory of atomic and molecular clusters*. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg, 1999.
- [40] R. L. Johnston. *Atomic and molecular clusters*. Taylor and Francis, London and New York, (2002).
- [41] J. E. Jones and A. E. Ingham. On the calculation of certain crystal potential constants, and on the cubic crystal of least potential energy. *Proc. Royal Soc. London, Ser.A*, **107**:636–653, (1925).

- [42] Y. Kallus and M. Holmes-Cerfon. Free energy of singular sticky-sphere clusters. *Phys. Rev. E*, **95**:022130, 1–18, (2017).
- [43] M. K.-H. Kiessling. A note on classical ground state energies. *J. Statist. Phys.*, **136**:275–284, (2009).
- [44] M. K.-H. Kiessling. The Vlasov continuum limit for the classical microcanonical ensemble. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, **21**:1145–1195, (2009).
- [45] M. K.-H. Kiessling. Testing Lennard-Jones clusters for optimality. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **159**:014301, 1–6, (2023).
- [46] M. K.-H. Kiessling and R. Yi. Hilbert’s ‘Monkey Saddle’ and other curiosities in the equilibrium problem of three point particles on a circle for repulsive power law forces. *J. Dyn. Diff. Eq.*, **32**:233–256, (2020).
- [47] J. Komlós, J. Pintz, and E. Szemerédi. On Heilbronn’s triangle problem. *J. London Math. Soc.*, **24**:385–396, (1981).
- [48] X.J. Lai, R.C. Xu, and W.Q. Huang. Prediction of the lowest energy configuration for Lennard-Jones clusters. *Sci. China Chem.*, **54**:985–991, (2011).
- [49] N. S. Landkof. *Foundations of Modern Potential Theory*, volume **180** of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer Verlag, Berlin, (1972).
- [50] R. H. Leary. Global optima of Lennard-Jones clusters. *J. Global Optim.*, **11**:35–53, (1997).
- [51] H. Lefmann. On Heilbronn’s problem in higher dimension. *Combinatorica*, **23**:669–680, (2003).
- [52] Z. Li and H. A. Scheraga. Monte Carlo-minimization approach to the multiple-minima problem in protein folding. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, **84**:6611–6615, (1987).
- [53] D. Liu and J. Nocedal. On the limited memory bfgs method for large scale optimization. *Math. Prog.*, **45**:503–528, (1989).
- [54] M. Locatelli and F. Schoen. Efficient algorithms for large scale global optimization: Lennard-Jones clusters. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, **26**:173–190, (2003).
- [55] A. L. Mackay. A dense non-crystallographic packing of equal spheres. *Acta Cryst.*, **15**:916–918, (1962).
- [56] M. W. Mahoney and W. L. Jorgensen. A five-site model for liquid water and the reproduction of the density anomaly by rigid, nonpolarizable potential functions. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **112**:8910–8922, (2000).

- [57] G. Meng, N. Arkus, M. P. Brenner, and V. N. Manoharan. The free-energy landscape of clusters of attractive hard spheres. *Science*, **327**:560–563, (2010).
- [58] R. Moessner and A. Ramirez. Geometric frustration. *Phys. Today*, **59**:24–29, (2006).
- [59] P. M. Morse. Diatomic molecules according to the wave mechanics. II. Vibrational levels. *Phys. Rev.*, **34**:57–64, (1929).
- [60] C. L. Müller and I. F. Sbalzarini. Energy landscapes of atomic clusters as black box optimization benchmarks. *Evol. Comput.*, **20**:543–573, (2012).
- [61] R. Nerattini, J. S. Brauchart, and M. K.-H. Kiessling. Optimal N -point configurations on the sphere: “Magic” numbers and Smale’s 7th problem. *J. Statist. Phys.*, **157**:1138–1206, (2014).
- [62] J. Nocedal. Updating quasi-Newton matrices with limited storage. *Mathematics of Computation*, **35**:773–782, (1980).
- [63] J. A. Northby. Structure and binding of Lennard-Jones clusters: $13 \leq n \leq 147$. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **87**:6166–6177, (1987).
- [64] G. Pólya and G. Szegő. Über den transfiniten Durchmesser (Kapazitätskonstante) von ebenen und räumlichen Punktmengen. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **165**:4–49, (1931).
- [65] K. F. Roth. On a problem of Heilbronn. *J. London Math. Soc.*, **26**:198–204, (1951).
- [66] S. Sacanna, W. T. M. Irvine, P. M. Chaikin, and D. J. Pine. Lock and key colloids. *Nature*, **464**:575–578, (2010).
- [67] W. Schachinger, B. Addis, I. M. Bomze, and F. Schoen. New results for molecular formation under pairwise potential minimization. *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, **38**:329–349, (2007).
- [68] K. Schütte and B. L. Van der Waerden. Das Problem der dreizehn Kugeln. *Math. Ann.*, **125**:325–334, (1953).
- [69] D. F. Shanno. Conditioning of quasi-Newton methods for function minimization. *Math. Comput.*, **24**:647–656, (1970).
- [70] X. Shao. The structures of the optimized Lennard-Jones clusters. https://chinfo.nankai.edu.cn/labintro_e.html.
- [71] S. Smale. Mathematical problems for the next century. *Math. Intelligencer*, **20**:7–15, (1998).

- [72] F. H. Stillinger and T. A. Weber. Hidden structure in liquids. *Phys. Rev. A*, **25**:978–989, (1982).
- [73] F. H. Stillinger and T. A. Weber. Packing structures and transitions in liquids and solids. *Science*, **225**:983–989, (1984).
- [74] S. Sugano. *Microcluster physics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.
- [75] B. K. Teo and N. J. A. Sloane. Magic numbers in polygonal and polyhedral clusters. *Inorg. Chem.*, **24**:4545–4558, (1985).
- [76] J. J. Thomson. On the structure of the atom: an investigation of the stability and periods of oscillation of a number of corpuscles arranged at equal intervals around the circumference of a circle; with application of the results to the theory of atomic structure. *Phil. Mag., Ser. 6*, **7**:237–265, (1904).
- [77] L. Trombach, R. S. Hoy, D. J. Wales, and P. Schwerdtfeger. From sticky-hard-sphere to Lennard-Jones-type clusters. *Phys. Rev. E*, **97**:043309,1–10, (2018).
- [78] T. Vinkó. Minimal inter-particle distance in atom clusters. *Acta Cybern.*, **17**:105–119, (2005).
- [79] D. J. Wales. OPTIM: A program for geometry optimisation and pathway calculations. <http://www-wales.ch.cam.ac.uk/software.html>.
- [80] D. J. Wales. Structural and topological consequences of anisotropic interactions in clusters. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.*, **86**:3505–3517, (1990).
- [81] D. J. Wales. Locating stationary-points for clusters in cartesian coordinates. *J. Chem. Soc. Faraday Trans.*, **89**:1305–1313, (1993).
- [82] D. J. Wales. *Energy Landscapes: With Applications to Clusters, Biomolecules and Glasses*. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, UK, (2004).
- [83] D. J. Wales. Highlights: Energy landscapes of clusters bound by short-ranged potentials. *ChemPhysChem*, **11**:2491–2494, (2010).
- [84] D. J. Wales. Surveying a complex potential energy landscape: Overcoming broken ergodicity using basin-sampling. *Chem. Phys. Lett.*, **584**:1–9, (2013).
- [85] D. J. Wales and J. P. K. Doye. Global optimization by basin-hopping and the lowest energy structures of Lennard-Jones clusters containing up to 110 atoms. *J. Phys. Chem. A*, **101**:5111–5116, (1997).
- [86] D. J. Wales and J. P. K. Doye. Stationary points and dynamics in high-dimensional systems. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **119**:12409–12416, (2003).

- [87] D. J. Wales, J. P. K. Doye, A. Dullweber, M. P. Hodges, F. Y. Naumkin, F. Calvo, J. Hernández-Rojas, and T. F. Middleton. The Cambridge Cluster Database. <https://www-wales.ch.cam.ac.uk/CCD.html>.
- [88] D. J. Wales, J. P. K. Doye, M. A. Miller, P. N. Mortenson, and T. R. Walsh. Energy landscapes: from clusters to biomolecules. *Adv. Chem. Phys.*, **115**:1–111, (2000).
- [89] D. J. Wales, L. J. Munro, and J. P. K. Doye. What can calculations employing empirical potentials teach us about bare transition-metal clusters. *J. Chem. Soc. Dalton Trans.*, **92**:611–623, (1996).
- [90] D. J. Wales and H. A. Scheraga. Global optimization of clusters, crystals and biomolecules. *Science*, **285**:1368–1372, (1999).
- [91] L. L. Whyte. Unique arrangements of points on a sphere. *Am. Math. Monthly*, **59**:606–611, (1952).
- [92] L. T. Wille and J. Vennik. Computational complexity of the ground-state determination of atomic clusters. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, **18**:L419–422, (1985).
- [93] J. R. Wolters, G. Avvisati, F. Hagemans, T. Vissers, D. J. Kraft, M. Dijkstra, and W. K. Kegel. Self-assembly of “Mickey Mouse” shaped colloids into tube-like structures: Experiments and simulations. *Soft Matter*, **11**:1067–1077, (2015).
- [94] Y. Xiang, H. Jiang, W. Cai, and X. Shao. An effective method based on lattice construction and the genetic algorithm for optimization of large Lennard-Jones clusters. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **108**:3586–3592, (2004).
- [95] G. L. Xue. Minimum inter-particle distance at global minimizers of Lennard-Jones clusters. *J. Global Optim.*, **11**:83–90, (1997).
- [96] K. Yu, X. Wang, L. Chen, and L. Wang. Unbiased fuzzy global optimization of Lennard-Jones clusters for $n \leq 1000$. *J. Chem. Phys.*, **151**:214105, 1–9, (2019).
- [97] S. A. Yuhjtman. A sensible estimate for the stability constant of the Lennard-Jones potential. *J. Statist. Phys.*, **160**:1684–1695, (2015).
- [98] M. Zschornak, T. Leisegang, F. Meutzner, H. Stöcker, T. Lemser, T. Tauscher, C. Funke, C. Cherkouk, and D. C. Meyer. Harmonic principles of elemental crystals — From atomic interaction to fundamental symmetry. *Symmetry*, **10**:228, 1–14, (2018).