

# Analytical solution for the polydisperse random close packing problem in 2D

Mathias Casiulis

Center for Soft Matter Research, Department of Physics,  
New York University, New York 10003, USA and  
Simons Center for Computational Physical Chemistry,  
Department of Chemistry, New York University, New York 10003, USA

Alessio Zaccone

Department of Physics “A. Pontremoli”, University of Milan, via Celoria 16, 20133 Milan, Italy.

An analytical theory for the random close packing density,  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$ , of polydisperse hard disks is provided using a theoretical approach based on the equilibrium model of crowding [A. Zaccone, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128, 028002 (2022)], which was recently justified based on extensive numerical analysis of the maximally random jammed (MRJ) line in the hard-sphere phase diagram [Anzivino et al., J. Chem. Phys. 158, 044901 (2023)]. The solution relies on the underlying equations of state for the hard disk fluid and provides predictions of  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  as a function of the ratio of the standard deviation of the disk diameter distribution to its mean  $s$ . For the power-law size distribution evaluated at  $s = 0.246$ , the theory yields  $\phi_{\text{RCP}} = 0.892$ , which compares well with the most recent numerical estimate  $\phi_{\text{RCP}} = 0.905$  based on the Monte-Carlo swap algorithms [Ghimenti, Berthier, van Wijland, Phys. Rev. Lett. 133, 028202 (2024)].

The hard-sphere (HS) system is a standard paradigm in statistical physics, and has proved invaluable in understanding the microscopic structure of condensed matter, in particular liquids and crystals. The absence of interactions apart from a hard-core repulsion makes it amenable to analytical treatments to accurately describe its equation of state, and allows precise numerical calculations of its phase behaviour. The latter is governed only by the filling fraction  $\phi$  and not by a temperature, unlike other standard models of statistical mechanics. An equilibrium compression of the HS fluid leads to an entropy-driven first-order freezing phase transition [1–3], a paradigmatic example that catches the essential features of freezing in most simple liquids [4]. Eventually, compression leads to a close-packed configuration that optimally fills space at close-packing (CP),  $\phi_{\text{CP}}$ . If the compression is applied rapidly to the system, the equilibrium freezing is avoided, and the largest achievable density shifts to a value lower than  $\phi_{\text{CP}}$  as particles randomly “jam” in a disordered configuration, accompanied by the divergence of pressure [5–7]. The maximum packing fraction achieved in this disordered state is known as the random close packing (RCP) volume fraction,  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  [8–10]. All these facts hold for monodisperse spheres in  $d = 3$ .

In  $d = 2$ , the physics of hard disks presents some fundamental differences. While the Mermin-Wagner-Hohenberg argument appears to rule out long-range order in 2D, the first computer simulations showed that the hard disk fluid undergoes crystallization [1]. The work of Berezinskii, Kosterlitz and Thouless (BKT) [11–13] was motivated by this apparent contradiction and conclusively showed the existence of a crystalline phase also in 2D, with quasi-long range order, *i.e.* power-law decay of spatial correlations. The freezing of equilibrium monodisperse hard disks occurs via a two-step mechanism: first a liquid-hexatic transition around  $\phi \approx 0.72$ , closely followed by a transition from the hexatic phase

to a triangular crystal. The original BKT theory predicts that both transitions are continuous, in agreement with the first experimental verification of the BKT scenario using superparamagnetic colloids interacting via a long-range dipolar potential [14, 15]. However, subsequent evidence from numerical simulations suggests that the liquid-hexatic transition is first-order [16–18], while more complex scenarios have been reported for the 2D melting of multi-component mixtures [19].

In  $d = 2$ , a broad range of  $\phi_{\text{RCP}} \approx 0.81 - 0.89$  has been reported using different algorithms and theories [9, 20–25], the upper bound of which is quite close to the CP value,  $\phi_{\text{CP}} = \pi/\sqrt{12} \approx 0.9069$  (for comparison, in 3D,  $\phi_{\text{RCP}} \approx 0.64 - 0.65$  and  $\phi_{\text{CP}} = \pi/\sqrt{18} \approx 0.7404$ ). This proximity between  $\phi_{\text{CP}}$  and  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  makes it harder to avoid crystallization, to the point that some methods to generate disordered packings miss it altogether in 2D [26].

As importantly pointed out in [27], while  $\phi_{\text{CP}}$  is unambiguously defined as the largest achievable filling fraction,  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  is not. In particular, slight changes to the compression procedure may change the observed range of values [28]. Yet, one may introduce well-defined special packings, that are most disordered for a given choice of order metric, *e.g.* the bond-orientational order parameter [27], which leads to the well-defined concept of maximally random jammed (MRJ) states [29].

Alternatively, in fast compressions, RCP is the lowest volume fraction at which the static (low-frequency) shear modulus rises from zero. For the jamming of soft repulsive particles, the non-affine analytical theory of the shear modulus value shows that this is tantamount to requiring that RCP is isostatic, meaning that the average number of contacts  $z$  of a particle at RCP verifies  $z = 2d$  [30], in agreement with numerical observations with various dynamics [28, 31, 32]. Defining RCP as the densest isostatic packing, an analytical estimate for  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  can be obtained for monodisperse hard spheres in both 2D and 3D, using

an approximate description of crowding along the line linking RCP to CP [9, 33]. The underlying assumption is that crowding along the family of least coordinated packings can be approximated by a rescaled equilibrium HS theory, as justified through numerical simulations in Ref. [33]. This analytical theory was also extended to predict the  $\phi_{RCP}$  for bidisperse and polydisperse hard spheres, as a function of the mean, standard deviation, and skewness of the particle size distribution, again using the available equilibrium models for bidisperse and polydisperse hard spheres as input [33]. This estimate for polydisperse random close packing has found widespread application [34–37] because it allows one to estimate the density of a granular medium or powder based on the first 3 moments of the particle size distribution (PSD). For example, it has been used to estimate the density of the lunar regolith based on the standard deviation of the PSD measured on the samples brought back by the Apollo mission [38, 39]. Furthermore, understanding the maximum packing density of polydisperse particles is of vital importance for tailoring the properties of a number of materials, from reinforced polymer nano-composites [40] to the microstructure and properties of polycrystalline and amorphous materials [41, 42].

Following the same approach, here we present the analytical solution for the random close packing of polydisperse particle monolayers or random close packing of disks in 2D [43]. For this problem, currently no analytical solution is available in the literature. The 2D polydisperse close packing also presents important connections with various applications, from particle monolayers at interfaces [44–48], to the molecular packing of 2D polymer films [49, 50], to self-assembled microelectronic materials [51, 52], and 2D cellular and organelles assemblies in biology [53–57].

For a 2D system of polydisperse particles, the mean number of contacts,  $z_{ij}$ , between particles of species (size)  $i$  and those of species (size)  $j$  is linked to the partial radial distribution function (rdf),  $g_{ij}(r)$ , restricted to  $ij$  pairs, via the following general relation

$$z_{ij} = 2\pi\rho \int_0^{\sigma_{ij}^+} dr r g_{ij}(r), \quad (1)$$

where only the metric factor in the integration differs from the 3D case [33]. Here,  $\sigma_{ij}^+ \equiv \sigma_{ij} + \epsilon$ , with  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ .

By taking an average over all  $ij$  contacts, this becomes:

$$z = 2\pi\rho \int_0^{\sigma^+} dr r g(r), \quad (2)$$

where  $z$  is the mean contact number across the entire system,  $\sigma$  the mean diameter,  $\rho = N/A$  the number of disks per unit area, and  $g(r)$  the total rdf averaged over all  $ij$  contacts.

In the polydisperse case [33], like in the monodisperse case [9], the rdf can be described as a partially-continuous distribution, with a discrete-like contact part  $g_c(r)$  and

a continuous "beyond contact" (BC) part  $g_{BC}(r)$  [58]:

$$g(r) = g_c(r) + g_{BC}(r) \quad (3)$$

where  $g_c(r) = g_0 g(\sigma; \phi) \delta(r - \sigma)$  [9, 58], with  $g(\sigma; \phi)$  the contact value of the averaged rdf, and  $g_0$  is a dimensionful constant (with dimension  $1/\text{length}$ ) to be determined via a suitable boundary condition. Plugging this form of  $g_c(r)$  into Eq. 2, we get

$$z = 8\phi \frac{g_0}{\sigma} g(\sigma; \phi) \quad (4)$$

where the filling fraction  $\phi$  is defined as  $\phi = \frac{\pi N \sigma^2}{4S}$ , where  $S$  is the total surface.

In an equilibrium fluid the compressibility  $Z(\phi)$ , as given by an equation of state (EOS), is related to the contact value,  $g_{eq}(\sigma; \phi)$  of the rdf by means of the virial theorem [59]

$$Z(\phi) \equiv P/\rho k_B T = 1 + B_2 \rho g_{eq}(\sigma; \phi) \quad (5)$$

where  $P$  is the pressure and  $B_2 = \pi\sigma^2/2$  the second virial coefficient. This relation can be simplified as

$$Z(\phi) = 1 + 2\phi g_{eq}(\sigma; \phi). \quad (6)$$

By analogy with this equilibrium result, and as justified via numerical simulations in Ref. [33] for the 3D case, we thus introduce the approximation

$$g(\sigma; \phi) \propto \frac{Z(\phi) - 1}{2\phi}. \quad (7)$$

By combining Eq. (4) with Eq. (7), our fundamental relation which will be pivotal to estimate the  $\phi_{RCP}$ , becomes:

$$z = 4C_0 [Z(\phi) - 1], \quad (8)$$

where we introduced a dimensionless proportionality constant  $C_0$ . As explained in previous work [9, 33, 60], this constant  $C_0$  can be evaluated by pinning the  $z(\phi)$  curve to the CP values for a monodisperse packing, which for 2D disks corresponds to triangular close-packing  $\phi_{CP} = \pi/\sqrt{12} \approx 0.9069$  and  $z_{ref} = 6$ .

The predicted values depend on the choice of an EOS  $Z(\phi)$  to describe mono- and polydisperse disks. Many expressions were proposed over the years for the monodisperse EOS, with varying degrees of analytical and numerical groundings [61]. In this paper, we use as examples 3 common choices due to their relative simplicity, namely the scaled-particle theory EOS ( $Z_{SPT}$ ), its modified version proposed by Henderson ( $Z_H$ ), and the 2D version of the Carnahan-Starling expression ( $Z_{CS}$ ). Using these examples yields essentially similar values for  $C_0$  when substituting in Eq. (8) with the relevant  $Z(\phi_{ref})$ ,

$$C_0 = \frac{z_{ref}}{4(Z(\phi_{ref}) - 1)}, \quad (9)$$

as shown in table I.

EOS	$C_0$	$\phi_{\text{RCP}}$
$Z_{\text{SPT}}(\phi) = 1/(1 - \phi)^2$	0.0131152	0.886222
$Z_{\text{H}}(\phi) = (1 + \phi^2/8)/(1 - \phi)^2$	0.0118828	0.886436
$Z_{\text{CS}}(\phi) \approx (1 - 0.43599\phi)/(1 - \phi)^2$	0.0218171	0.885509

TABLE I. **Effect of monodisperse EOS.** We report the expression of the EOS, and the corresponding numerical values of  $C_0$  and the estimate of the monodisperse  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$ .

To extend the EOS to polydisperse cases, we follow the approach of Ref. [62], which is valid in the high-density regime of equilibrium disks. This methodology is based on a fundamental-measure-theory (FMT) approach to link the EOS of a monodisperse HS fluid to the EOS of a polydisperse HS mixture [63], and viceversa. In simple words, this approach proposes that the surplus free energy of the polydisperse mixture at a given packing fraction  $\phi$  can be mapped to that of a single-component fluid at a different effective packing fraction,  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$ . As derived by Santos and co-workers [62–64], the relation between  $\phi_{\text{eff}}$  and  $\phi$  reads as follows:

$$\phi_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda \frac{(1-\phi)}{\phi}}. \quad (10)$$

Here,  $\lambda$  is a number which depends on the PSD, through its third and second moments:

$$\lambda = \frac{m_3}{m_2^2} \quad (11)$$

where  $m_q \equiv M_q/M_1^q$  is the  $q$ th dimensionless moment of the PSD, and  $M_q = \int_0^\infty \sigma^q p(\sigma) d\sigma$  is the  $q$ th moment, with  $p(\sigma)$  the normalized PSD.

The compressibility of the polydisperse mixture as derived by Santos and co-workers [62] reads as:

$$Z(\phi) = \frac{1}{1 - \phi} + \frac{\alpha}{\phi} \left[ \phi_{\text{eff}} Z_s(\phi_{\text{eff}}) - \frac{\phi_{\text{eff}}}{1 - \phi_{\text{eff}}} \right] \quad (12)$$

where  $Z_s(\phi_{\text{eff}})$  is the compressibility of the monodisperse system, and  $\alpha = \lambda/m_2$ .

We thus obtain the random close packing fraction  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  of disks by imposing that the RCP occurs at the rigidity onset, *i.e.* at the isostatic point  $z_c = 4$  in Eq. (4) [30], which leads to:

$$C_0[Z(\phi_{\text{RCP}}) - 1] = 1, \quad (13)$$

with  $Z(\phi)$  given by Eq. (12) and  $C_0$  given by Eq. (9).

Both  $\lambda$  and  $\alpha$  depend on the first three moments  $m_{1,2,3}$  of the PSD only through the rescaled standard deviation  $s = \sqrt{m_2 - 1}$  and the reduced skewness  $t = \sqrt[3]{m_3 - 3m_2 + 2}$ , so that the above Eq. (13) can be solved to obtain  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  as a function of the parameters of an arbitrary size distribution. In practice, the moments are usually not independent and are functions of simpler parameters that tune the distribution of sizes. For instance,

for a log-normal PSD,

$$p(x) = \frac{1}{x\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2}} e^{-(\ln x - \mu)^2/(2\sigma^2)}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$  are the mean and standard deviation of the underlying normal distribution, and implementing the Santos EOS for  $Z(\phi)$  the RCP density only depends on a single free parameter,  $\sigma$ . We report our prediction  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  against  $\sigma$  in Fig. 1.




FIG. 1. **Estimate for a lognormal size distribution.**  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  of hard disks computed according to Eq. (13) using the  $Z_{\text{H}}$  (blue),  $Z_{\text{SPT}}$  (orange), and  $Z_{\text{CS}}$  (green) EOS, and a log-normal particle size distribution.

We show that our estimate predicts a growth of  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  with the width of the particle size distribution, until a saturation at  $1/(1 + C_0) \approx 0.97 - 0.98$  [33], a value that is, reassuringly, always below 1. The main difference between choices of EOS is the value of the saturating density at large  $\sigma$ , but all expressions yield similar outputs at moderate polydispersity.

The predictions of this analytical theory can be compared with the most recent numerical estimates of the RCP packing fraction for random close packing of polydisperse hard disks obtained by irreversible Swap-Monte Carlo algorithms [65]. In that work, the authors use a size distribution generated by a gradient descent in the space of particle positions and (constrained) radii, starting from a log-normal distribution [66, 67], which remains nearly unchanged. The goal of the technique is to achieve the highest packing densities possible by maximizing the disorder. In particular, irreversible Monte Carlo algorithms have been shown to successfully accelerate the sampling by breaking detailed balance [68], thus outperforming previous algorithms in preparing very dense jammed packings of disks [65]. In Ref. [65], the largest density  $\phi_{\text{RCP}}$  achievable was estimated for a polydisperse

system with fixed reduced standard deviation  $s = 0.25$ , corresponding to a log-normal  $\sigma \approx 0.2462$ , leading to  $\phi_{\text{swapMC}} \approx 0.905$ . This value can be compared with the analytically predicted value  $\phi_{\text{RCP}} = 0.8924$  using the above theory implementing the Santos et al. [62] EOS for polydisperse disks (with the Henderson EOS [69] for  $Z_s(\phi_{\text{eff}})$ ). Note that there is no guarantee that the packing obtained in Ref. [65] verifies  $z = 4$ : one may instead expect a larger number of contacts, which would mean that our prediction would be an underestimate for their final packing fraction, which is consistent with the value we report.

In conclusion, we have presented an analytical solution for the random close packing of polydisperse hard disks. The solution is based on identifying the RCP with the onset of rigidity in a crowding HS fluid [9, 33], whereby the contact value of the rdf is assumed to be proportional to the equilibrium value predicted, for hard disks, by the approach of Santos and co-workers [62]. The theory predicts a monotonically increasing RCP volume fraction

as a function of the standard deviation,  $s$ , of the particle size distribution, which eventually saturates to a plateau  $\phi_{\text{RCP}} \approx 0.97 - 0.98$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ . At finite polydispersity,  $s = 0.25$ , the analytical theory provides a value of RCP density, which is in good agreement with the most recent irreversible Monte Carlo algorithms achieving extremely dense jammed packings via collective swaps [65].

### Acknowledgments

Many useful discussions with Dr. Carmine Anzivino and with Prof. Stefano Martiniani are gratefully acknowledged. A.Z. gratefully acknowledges funding from the European Union through Horizon Europe ERC Grant number: 101043968 “Multimech”, from US Army Research Office through contract nr. W911NF-22-2-0256, and from the Niedersächsische Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen in the frame of the Gauss Professorship program.

- 
- [1] B. J. Alder and T. E. Wainwright, *The Journal of chemical physics* **27**, 1208 (1957).
  - [2] W. W. Wood and J. D. Jacobson, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **27**, 1207 (1957).
  - [3] W. G. Hoover and F. H. Ree, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **49**, 3609 (1968).
  - [4] J.-P. Hansen and I. R. McDonald, *Theory of simple liquids* (Elsevier Academic Press, 2006).
  - [5] A. van Blaaderen and P. Wiltzius, *Science* **270**, 1177 (1995).
  - [6] E. Sanz, C. Valeriani, E. Zaccarelli, W. C. Poon, P. N. Pusey, and M. E. Cates, *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 215701 (2011).
  - [7] E. Zaccarelli, C. Valeriani, E. Sanz, W. Poon, M. Cates, and P. Pusey, *Physical review letters* **103**, 135704 (2009).
  - [8] J. D. Bernal and J. Mason, *Nature* **188**, 910 (1960).
  - [9] A. Zaccone, *Physical Review Letters* **128**, 028002 (2022).
  - [10] A. Zaccone, *Theory of Disordered Solids* (Springer, Cham, 2023).
  - [11] V. L. Berezinskii, *Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics* **32**, 493 (1971).
  - [12] V. L. Berezinskii, *Soviet Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics* **34**, 610 (1972).
  - [13] J. M. Kosterlitz and D. J. Thouless, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **6**, 1181 (1973).
  - [14] U. Gasser, C. Eisenmann, G. Maret, and P. Keim, *ChemPhysChem* **11**, 963 (2010), <https://chemistry-europe.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cphc.200900755>.
  - [15] S. Deutschländer, T. Horn, H. Löwen, G. Maret, and P. Keim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 098301 (2013).
  - [16] E. P. Bernard and W. Krauth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 155704 (2011).
  - [17] W. Qi, A. P. Gantapara, and M. Dijkstra, *Soft Matter* **10**, 5449 (2014).
  - [18] E. Tsiok, Y. Fomin, and V. Ryzhov, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **490**, 819 (2018).
  - [19] Y.-W. Li, Y. Yao, and M. P. Ciamarra, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 258202 (2023).
  - [20] J. Stillinger, F. H., E. A. DiMarzio, and R. L. Kornegay, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **40**, 1564 (1964), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/40/6/1564/18832883/1564.1.online.pdf>.
  - [21] D. Sutherland, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* **60**, 96 (1977).
  - [22] H. J. H. Brouwers, *Soft Matter* **19**, 8465 (2023).
  - [23] M. Sugiyama, *Progress of Theoretical Physics* **63**, 1848 (1980), <https://academic.oup.com/ptp/article-pdf/63/6/1848/5221030/63-6-1848.pdf>.
  - [24] J. G. Berryman, *Phys. Rev. A* **27**, 1053 (1983).
  - [25] S. Meyer, C. Song, Y. Jin, K. Wang, and H. A. Makse, *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* **389**, 5137 (2010).
  - [26] S. Wilken, A. Z. Guo, D. Levine, and P. M. Chaikin, *Physical Review Letters* **131**, 238202 (2023).
  - [27] T. M. Truskett, S. Torquato, and P. G. Debenedetti, *Physical Review E* **62**, 993 (2000).
  - [28] M. Ozawa, L. Berthier, and D. Coslovich, *SciPost Physics* **3**, 027 (2017).
  - [29] S. Torquato and F. H. Stillinger, *Reviews of modern physics* **82**, 2633 (2010).
  - [30] A. Zaccone and E. Scossa-Romano, *Physical Review B—Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **83**, 184205 (2011).
  - [31] C. S. O’Hern, L. E. Silbert, A. J. Liu, and S. R. Nagel, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 011306 (2003).
  - [32] S. Wilken, R. E. Guerra, D. Levine, and P. M. Chaikin, *Physical review letters* **127**, 038002 (2021).
  - [33] C. Anzivino, M. Casiulis, T. Zhang, A. S. Moussa, S. Martiniani, and A. Zaccone, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **158** (2023).
  - [34] O. Lombard and E. Franceschini, *IEEE Transactions on Ultrasonics, Ferroelectrics, and Frequency Control* **71**, 572 (2024).

- [35] S. Kim and S. Hilgenfeldt, *Soft Matter* **20**, 5598 (2024).
- [36] A. Singh, C. Ness, A. K. Sharma, J. J. de Pablo, and H. M. Jaeger, *Phys. Rev. E* **110**, 034901 (2024).
- [37] U. Malamud, C. M. Schäfer, I. Luciana San Sebastián, M. Timpe, K. Alexander Essink, C. Kreuzig, G. Meier, J. Blum, H. B. Perets, and C. Burger, *The Astrophysical Journal* **974**, 76 (2024).
- [38] J. Bürger, P. O. Hayne, B. Gundlach, M. Läuter, T. Kramer, and J. Blum, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Planets* **129**, e2023JE008152 (2024), e2023JE008152, <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1029/2023JE008152>
- [39] S. Yu, M. Yu, X. Xiao, J. Huang, and L. Xiao, (2024), 10.22541/essoar.173282183.30831648/v1.
- [40] M. Mermet-Guyennet, J. Gianfelice de Castro, H. Varol, M. Habibi, B. Hosseinkhani, N. Martzel, R. Sprik, M. Denn, A. Zaccone, S. Parekh, and D. Bonn, *Polymer* **73**, 170 (2015).
- [41] M. Krief and Y. Ashkenazy, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023253 (2024).
- [42] A. Zaccone, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **32**, 203001 (2020).
- [43] D. J. Meer, I. Galoustian, J. G. d. F. Manuel, and E. R. Weeks, *Physical Review E* **109**, 064905 (2024).
- [44] I. Buttinoni, Z. A. Zell, T. M. Squires, and L. Isa, *Soft Matter* **11**, 8313 (2015).
- [45] A. Maestro and A. Zaccone, *Nanoscale* **9**, 18343 (2017).
- [46] E. A. Lazar, J. Lu, C. H. Rycroft, and D. Schwartz, *Modelling and Simulation in Materials Science and Engineering* **32**, 085022 (2024).
- [47] S. Pal and S. Keten, *Soft Matter* **20**, 7926 (2024).
- [48] A. N. Kato, Y. Jiang, W. Chen, R. Seto, and T. Li, *Journal of Colloid and Interface Science* **641**, 492 (2023).
- [49] C. Pedrosa, D. Martínez-Fernández, M. Herranz, K. Foteinopoulou, N. C. Karayiannis, and M. Laso, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **158**, 164502 (2023), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/5.0137115/16954588/164502.1.5.0137115.pdf>.
- [50] Y. Zeng, P. Gordiichuk, T. Ichihara, G. Zhang, E. Sandoz-Rosado, E. D. Wetzal, J. Tresback, J. Yang, D. Kozawa, Z. Yang, M. Kuehne, M. Quien, Z. Yuan, X. Gong, G. He, D. J. Lundberg, P. Liu, A. T. Liu, J. F. Yang, H. J. Kulik, and M. S. Strano, *Nature* **602**, 91 (2022).
- [51] M. Mirigliano, F. Borghi, A. Podestà, A. Antidormi, L. Colombo, and P. Milani, *Nanoscale Adv.* **1**, 3119 (2019).
- [52] S. Y. An and B. S. Kim, *Electronic Materials Letters* **20**, 733 (2024).
- [53] N. Schramma, E. R. Weeks, and M. Jalaal, “Optimal disk packing of chloroplasts in plant cells,” (2025), arXiv:2501.14335 [cond-mat.soft].
- [54] R. Farhadifar, J.-C. Röper, B. Aigouy, S. Eaton, and F. Jülicher, *Current Biology* **17**, 2095 (2007).
- [55] S. Garcia, E. Hannezo, J. Elgeti, J.-F. Joanny, P. Silberzan, and N. S. Gov, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **112**, 15314 (2015), <https://www.pnas.org/doi/pdf/10.1073/pnas.1510973112>.
- [56] E. E. Petridou, B. Corominas-Murtra, C.-P. Heisenberg, and E. Hannezo, *Cell* **184**, 1914 (2021).
- [57] D. M. Sussman and M. Merkel, *Soft Matter* **14**, 3397 (2018).
- [58] S. Torquato, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **149**, 020901 (2018).
- [59] D. G. Chae, F. H. Ree, and T. Ree, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **50**, 1581 (1969), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/50/4/1581/18860328/1581.1.online.pdf>.
- [60] C. Likos, *Journal Club for Condensed Matter Physics* (2022), 10.36471/JCCM-March-2022-02.
- [61] Á. Mulero, *Theory and simulation of hard-sphere fluids and related systems*, Vol. 753 (Springer, 2008).
- [62] A. Santos, S. B. Yuste, M. López de Haro, and V. Ogarro, *Phys. Rev. E* **96**, 062603 (2017).
- [63] A. Santos, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **136**, 136102 (2012), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.3702439/14714736/136102.1.online.pdf>.
- [64] A. Santos, S. B. Yuste, and M. López de Haro, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **153**, 120901 (2020), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jcp/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/5.0023903/20017843/120901.1.5.0023903.pdf>.
- [65] F. Ghimenti, L. Berthier, and F. van Wijland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **133**, 028202 (2024).
- [66] V. F. Hagh, S. R. Nagel, A. J. Liu, M. L. Manning, and E. I. Corwin, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **119**, 2117622119 (2022).
- [67] V. Bolton-Lum, R. C. Dennis, P. Morse, and E. Corwin, *Arxiv Preprint*, 2404.07492 (2024).
- [68] E. P. Bernard, W. Krauth, and D. B. Wilson, *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **80**, 5 (2009).
- [69] D. Henderson, *Molecular Physics* **30**, 971 (1975), <https://doi.org/10.1080/00268977500102511>.