

# On the Global Optimality of Fibonacci Lattices in the Torus

Nicolas Nagel\*

## Abstract

We investigate the question of the optimality of Fibonacci lattices with respect to tensor product energies on the torus, most notably the periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy, diaphony and the worst case error of the quasi-Monte Carlo integration over certain parametrized dominating mixed smoothness Sobolev spaces  $H_p^d$  of periodic functions. We consider two methods for this question.

First, a method based on Delsarte's LP-bound from coding theory which will give us, among others, the Fibonacci lattices as the natural candidates for optimal point sets. Second, we will adapt the continuous LP-bound on the sphere (and other spaces) to the torus to get optimality in the continuous setting.

We conclude with a more in depth look at the 5-point Fibonacci lattice, giving an effectively computable algorithm for checking if it is optimal and rigorously proving its optimality for quasi-Monte Carlo integration in the range  $0 < p \leq 11.66$ . We also prove a result on the universal optimality of 3 points in any dimension.

The novelty of this approach is the application of LP-methods for tensor product energies in the torus and the systematic study of the simultaneous global optimality of periodic point sets for a class of tensor product potential functions.

---

\*DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY CHEMNITZ, GERMANY  
nicolas.nagel@math.tu-chemnitz.de  
ORCID iD: 0009-0004-3362-3543

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Motivation

The notion of an energy of a point set is by now a classical one in physics, geometry and coding theory. Simply put, this asks to find a configuration of a given number of points in some space such that the total energy of the system, that is the sum of all the potential interactions between the points, is minimized. The case of the sphere (or more generally of two-point homogeneous spaces, such as the projective plane) has garnered particular attention over the last couple of decades [1, 2, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21, 23, 24, 29, 36, 37, 62, 72]. There, a straight forward notion of energy of a finite point set  $X \subseteq S^d \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$  for a potential function  $c : (0, 2] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is given by

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} c(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|),$$

where  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the Euclidean norm in  $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ . A classical example would be Thomson's problem [2, 59, 68, 72] on  $S^2$  with the (scaled) Coulomb potential  $c(r) = r^{-1}$ . In this particular case, the optimal configurations for  $N = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6$  and 12 points are known. Much more general, for certain dimensions  $d$  and certain numbers of points  $N$  there are point sets that are the minimizers of a large class of potentials simultaneously, a phenomenon known as *universal optimality* [24].

In this paper we will consider the case of the torus, denoted by  $[0, 1)^d$  (in the literature also denoted by  $\mathbb{T}^d$ ) with opposite faces identified. Consequently, functions on  $[0, 1)^d$  will be considered as periodic functions, extended to  $\mathbb{R}^d$  in the obvious way if desired. So far, energies on the torus have mostly been studied where the interaction between particles depends on the Euclidean distance between them. In this sense, every point on the torus  $[0, 1)^d$  is associated to a corresponding shifted (and possibly skewed) lattice in  $\mathbb{R}^d$  and all possible interactions from a given point to all points of the corresponding lattice are considered, see [25, 26, 27, 40, 56, 58, 67] for some references. In this context, tools from complex analysis and modular forms are frequently used.

In contrast, we will be interested in energies that reflect the product structure of the torus. Given a potential  $c : [0, 1)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  these energies are of the form

$$E(X) := \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} c(|x_1 - y_1|, \dots, |x_d - y_d|), \quad (1.1)$$

where usually  $c(\mathbf{s}) = \prod_{i=1}^d f_i(s_i)$  tensorizes. For some situations we will also assume further, natural properties, see for example (1.4) or (2.1) below. The necessity of such energies should not be understated and can be motivated in multiple ways. Here we want to demonstrate a connection to quasi-Monte Carlo integration as was stated in [43].

## 1.2 Quasi-Monte Carlo integration, discrepancy and diaphony

Let  $p > 0$  be a parameter. Consider the space  $H_p^1$  of 1-periodic, absolutely continuous functions  $f : [0, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  with

$$\|f\|_{H_p^1}^2 := \left( \int_0^1 f(x) dx \right)^2 + \frac{1}{p} \int_0^1 f'(x)^2 dx = \hat{f}(0)^2 + \frac{4\pi^2}{p} \sum_{n \neq 0} n^2 |\hat{f}(n)|^2 < \infty$$

( $f'$  denoting the first weak derivative of  $f$  and  $\hat{f}$  its Fourier coefficients). This space turns out to be a reproducing kernel Hilbert space with kernel function [7, 43, 69]

$$K_p^1(x, y) = 1 + \frac{p}{2} \left( \frac{1}{6} - |x - y| + |x - y|^2 \right),$$

that is function evaluation at any point  $y \in [0, 1)$  can be realized via a scalar product with  $K(\cdot, y)$  in  $H_p^1$ :

$$f(y) = \left( \int_0^1 f(x) dx \right) \left( \int_0^1 K(x, y) dx \right) + \frac{1}{p} \int_0^1 f'(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x} K(x, y) dx$$

for all  $f \in H_p^1$  (in particular, function evaluation is continuous). Taking  $d$ -fold tensor products  $H_p^d = H_p^1 \otimes \dots \otimes H_p^1$  gives a reproducing kernel Hilbert space of functions  $f : [0, 1)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  (a Sobolev space of periodic functions of dominating mixed smoothness) having the kernel

$$K_p^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{i=1}^d K_p^1(x_i, y_i)$$

for  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1)^d$ . With this at hand we can consider the quasi-Monte Carlo integration algorithm [33, 39, 46, 50] for  $f \in H_p^d$ , that is we approximate

$$\int_{[0, 1)^d} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} f(\mathbf{x})$$

where  $X \subseteq [0, 1)^d$  is a finite set of sample nodes with  $\#X = N$ . The quality of this approximation depends on the choice of evaluation nodes  $X$  and can be quantified via the worst case error [33, 51]

$$\sup_{\|f\|_{H_p^d} \leq 1} \left| \int_{[0,1]^d} f(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} f(\mathbf{x}) \right|^2 = -1 + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X} K_p^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$$

(another notion would be an average case error for some probability distribution on  $H_p^d$  [71]). The expression on the right hand side is related to the mainly geometric notion of periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy on the torus [32, 41, 49]

$$L_2^{\text{per}}(X)^2 := -\frac{N^2}{3^d} + \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X} \prod_{i=1}^d \left( \frac{1}{2} - |x_i - y_i| + |x_i - y_i|^2 \right)$$

(unnormalized, as given in [41]), in fact for  $p = 6$  it only differs from the worst case integration error by a factor of  $N^2/3^d$ . It is also similar to the notion of diaphony [49, 73]

$$F_N(X)^2 := \sum_{\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{Z}^d - \mathbf{0}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^d \max\{1, |h_i|\} \right)^{-2} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{x}) \right|^2$$

see [41, 53] for details. For small  $N$  or  $d$  optimal point configurations minimizing the discrepancy have been determined in [52, 70] (note that they use a slightly different notion of discrepancy) and [43].

It is useful to think of these concepts as measuring how “uniform” a finite set is in  $[0, 1)^d$ . Intuitively, if a set avoids having large gaps or concentrated clusters of points then it more evenly samples a function and should give better results for the quasi-Monte Carlo algorithm. It is also possible to consider quasi-Monte Carlo integration and its corresponding worst case error over other (periodic) reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces, see Example 19 on page 318 in [7]. While we will concentrate on the case for smoothness  $s = 1$  (the above described Sobolev space) in this paper it seems like it could be possible to generalize this to spaces of arbitrary smoothness  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  although with some modifications to the method, see the remark after Theorem 5.2 below.

### 1.3 Tensor product energies

Another interpretation, more akin to the notion of energy, is to observe that minimizing the worst case integration error is equivalent to minimizing

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} K_p^d(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} \prod_{i=1}^d \left( 1 + \frac{p}{2} \left( \frac{1}{6} - |x_i - y_i| + |x_i - y_i|^2 \right) \right),$$

which is of the form 1.1. We can think of every point as some sort of particle whose interaction is given by some potential function and the potential between any two points  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  only depends on

$$(\min\{|x_1 - y_1|, 1 - |x_1 - y_1|\}, \dots, \min\{|x_d - y_d|, 1 - |x_d - y_d|\}) \quad (1.2)$$

(since  $s^2 - s = (1 - s)^2 - (1 - s)$  for  $0 \leq s \leq 1$ ). The terms in the components are respectively the shortest distances between two points on the circle of circumference 1. Minimizing the worst case integration error is thus equivalent to minimizing this sort of energy given by the kernel function  $K_p^d$ . Note that the diaphony can also be expressed to fit this tensor product energy form.

**Remark 1.1.** Note that due to the kink of the kernel  $K_p^1(x, y)$  for  $x = y$  the minimizers of this tensor product energy as given by the worst case error will consist of points with distinct coordinates, as was already used implicitly in Section 3.3 of [43]. Intuitively one should think of this as a force pushing the particles apart so that the points become roughly evenly distributed if we look at their projections onto the coordinate axes. This statement is nontrivial and will be further elaborated on in the future work [13].

In the case of  $d = 2$  and  $p \in \{1, 6\}$  the minimizers of the worst case integration error were determined in [43] for  $N \leq 16$  points. Interestingly, it was observed that if  $N = F_\ell$  is a Fibonacci number (in this range 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13) the algorithm found that the Fibonacci lattices given by

$$\Phi_\ell := \left\{ \left( \frac{k}{F_\ell}, \left\{ \frac{kF_{\ell-1}}{F_\ell} \right\} \right) : k = 0, 1, \dots, F_\ell - 1 \right\} \quad (1.3)$$

(where  $\{\cdot\}$  denotes the fractional part) are the global optimizers for the worst case integration error for their respective numbers of points. Ever since these results, and perhaps already before that, it was commonly believed that the Fibonacci lattices indeed could be best possible for this situation, although a rigorous proof remains elusive. Prior to that, it was already known that

the Fibonacci lattices are at least asymptotically of optimal order, matching (up to a multiplicative constant) the lower bound given by (for  $d = 2$ )

$$-1 + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X} K_p^2(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \gtrsim \frac{\log N}{N^2},$$

see [14, 15, 16, 34, 41, 42, 54, 66]. In this paper we pose the question whether Fibonacci lattices are also optimal with respect to a larger class of energies and give an affirmative answer for 5-point Fibonacci lattices for the potential from the worst case integration error in the range  $0 < p \leq 11.66$  (see Theorem 5.2), with numerics suggesting that this could even be the case up to  $p \leq 13.38$  (see end of Section 5.2). The precise setup goes as follows:

Given a potential function  $c : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  having the property

$$\begin{aligned} c(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_d) &= c(1 - s_1, s_2, \dots, s_d) \\ &= c(s_1, 1 - s_2, \dots, s_d) \\ &\vdots \\ &= c(s_1, s_2, \dots, 1 - s_d), \end{aligned} \tag{1.4}$$

for a given  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  we want to find a set  $X \subseteq [0, 1]^d$  with  $\#X = N$  such that for any other set  $Y \subseteq [0, 1]^d$  with  $\#Y = N$  it holds  $E(Y) \geq E(X)$ , that is  $X$  minimizes the energy for the potential  $c$  among all point sets of given cardinality. The requirement (1.4) on the potential naturally reflects the geometry of the torus as in (1.2).

## 1.4 Outline of the paper and main results

The paper will be structured as follows. First, we will use a discretization of the torus to apply Delsarte's method from coding theory to energies on the torus (a similar approach for discrepancy on finite metric spaces was already used in [5, 6]). The section will be completely selfcontained and no deeper knowledge about these algebraic techniques will be required. This will lead to an LP (2.5) which can be solved easily by computer. Furthermore, in some cases the LP also gives a hint at the structure of the possibly optimal point sets (given by their distance distribution which will be elaborated further below). We thus get candidate sets for further investigations.

Next we will use a continuous method to show optimality of finite sets on the torus (Theorem 3.1). This follows what was already done on the sphere [24, 29, 72], but we will again give a completely selfcontained account. It will turn out that the optimality of a certain point set (namely the Fibonacci lattices) follows from the existence of a "magic" function  $\beta$ .

We will need some technical but well known tools from numerical analysis, namely Hermite interpolation and absolutely monotonic functions, which we will introduce in Section 4 as well as some of their important properties.

We will apply this to get a candidate for an explicit construction of such a function  $\beta$  for the 5-point Fibonacci lattice in (5.7), showing that it is optimal for quasi-Monte Carlo integration as described above for in the range  $0 < p \leq 11.66$  (generalizing the results for  $p \in \{1, 6\}$  as were considered in [43] in the case of the 5-point Fibonacci lattice). These results will be summarized in Theorem 5.2.

We will finish by showing the universal optimality of 3-point lattices in arbitrary dimensions for a large class of potential functions (Theorem 6.1) and conclude with an outlook at similar problems on products of spheres, where an analogous statement for point sets derived from regular simplices can be attained.

As far as the author is aware, these LP-bounds have not been studied for these sort of energies on the torus and results on the optimality of a given point set relied heavily on numerical computations without a clear way how this would generalize to an arbitrary number of points. We aim to develop some new direction that could lead to such a more systematic result.

In the upcoming paper [13] by the author and colleagues we will investigate further techniques to give lower bounds on such energies with focus on *permutation sets*, especially the 5-point Fibonacci lattice. It turns out that for a large class of potentials the 5-point Fibonacci lattice turns out to be the unique minimizer among all 5-point sets in the discretized torus  $G_5$  (see next section) and it is also the minimizer among all point sets in the continuous case that have the same *permutation type* as it, that is those whose points are ordered in the same way relative to each other. Details and more can be found in the paper once it is available. This gives further evidence that a universal optimality result for Fibonacci lattices should be achievable.

As for notation  $\#X$  will denote the cardinality of a set  $X$ . Removing an element of a set, we will write  $X - x$  for  $X \setminus \{x\}$ . For intervals, a bracket means that we include the endpoint, a parenthesis means that we exclude it. Vectors and points will be written in bold letters, number such as their components will be denoted by usual type. By  $\mathbf{v}^\top$  and  $\mathbf{v}^*$  we will denote the transpose and hermitian transpose respectively, with the same convention for matrices. Given a function  $f$  we will denote its coefficients expressed using an orthogonal basis by  $\hat{f}$  (such as the representation via Fourier series or via Chebyshev polynomials).

## 2 Delsarte's LP-Method

### 2.1 Derivation of the constraints

We will outline the method as we need it for our situation, for a more detailed account see [5, 6, 28, 57].

To start, this method only works over finite sets. We thus introduce a **discretization parameter**  $R \in \mathbb{N}$  and the **discretized torus**

$$G_R := \left\{ \frac{0}{R}, \frac{1}{R}, \dots, \frac{R-1}{R} \right\}^d.$$

For  $s, t \in [0, 1)$  we set

$$\delta(s, t) := \min\{|s - t|, 1 - |s - t|\}$$

(similar to the *Lee metric* in coding theory [31, 47, 55], called *symmetrized metric* in [43]) and define the **distance vector** between  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in [0, 1)^d$  by

$$\text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) := (\delta(x_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(1)}), \dots, \delta(x_{\tau(d)}, y_{\tau(d)})),$$

where  $\tau$  is a permutation of  $\{1, \dots, d\}$  (depending on  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ ) such that

$$\delta(x_{\tau(1)}, y_{\tau(1)}) \leq \delta(x_{\tau(2)}, y_{\tau(2)}) \leq \dots \leq \delta(x_{\tau(d)}, y_{\tau(d)}),$$

that is we order the distances by size. One should think of the distance vector as a sort of “vector valued metric” on  $[0, 1)^d$ . For any (periodic) potential  $c : [0, 1)^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which fulfills the symmetry assumptions

$$c(s_1, s_2, \dots, s_d) = c(1 - s_1, s_2, \dots, s_d)$$

and

$$c(s_1, \dots, s_d) = c(s_{\tau(1)}, \dots, s_{\tau(d)}) \tag{2.1}$$

for all permutations  $\tau$  of  $\{1, \dots, d\}$  we thus have

$$c(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = c(|x_1 - y_1|, \dots, |x_d - y_d|) = c(\text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})). \tag{2.2}$$

We impose (2.1) as a symmetry reduction, making it less computationally heavy to solve the linear program (2.5) later on, although such energies are also natural considering the symmetries of the torus.

If  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in G_R$  then  $\text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  only takes values in

$$\Delta_R := \left\{ \left( \frac{k_1}{R}, \dots, \frac{k_d}{R} \right) : k_1, \dots, k_d \in \mathbb{N}_0, k_1 \leq \dots \leq k_d \leq \lfloor R/2 \rfloor \right\}.$$

For every  $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  we define a relation on  $G_R$  by

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}} := \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in G_R^2 : \text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{d}\}.$$



**Proposition 2.1.** The relations  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  form a *symmetric association scheme* over  $G_R$ , that is ...

- (i)  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{0}} = \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in G_R\}$  is the identity relation, ...
- (ii) for any  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in G_R$  and any  $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  it holds  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}$  if and only if  $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}$  (all relations are symmetric), ...
- (iii)  $\bigcup_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}} = G_R^2$  disjointly and ...
- (iv) for any  $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in \Delta_R$  and  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}$  the number

$$\#\{\mathbf{z} \in G_R : (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{e}}, (\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}\}$$

only depends on  $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{e}$  and  $\mathbf{f}$  but not on the specific choice of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ .

*Proof.* Points (i), (ii) and (iii) are clear. As for (iv), note that if  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}') \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}$  then there is an isometry, that means a mapping  $f : G_R \rightarrow G_R$  preserving distance vectors, that maps  $\mathbf{x}$  to  $\mathbf{x}'$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  to  $\mathbf{y}'$ . This isometry maps the  $\mathbf{e}$ -sphere  $\{\mathbf{z} \in G_R : \text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{e}\}$  bijectively to  $\{\mathbf{z} \in G_R : \text{dv}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{e}\}$  and the same holds for the corresponding  $\mathbf{f}$ -spheres around  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{y}'$ . Consequently the intersections

$$\{\mathbf{z} \in G_R : \text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{e}\} \cap \{\mathbf{z} \in G_R : \text{dv}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{f}\}$$

and

$$\{\mathbf{z} \in G_R : \text{dv}(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{e}\} \cap \{\mathbf{z} \in G_R : \text{dv}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{y}') = \mathbf{f}\}$$

are also in bijection to each other via this isometry, in particular they are of the same size. This cardinality is precisely the quantity given in (iv) so that it does not depend on the specific choice of  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ .  $\square$

There is a large literature on association schemes, see [4, 19, 30, 38, 60, 63] to name a few. The numbers in (iv) above are called *structure constants*, *parameters* or *intersection numbers* of the symmetric association scheme  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  and will be denoted by  $p_{\mathbf{e}\mathbf{f}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ . The quantity  $v(\mathbf{d}) := p_{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{d}}^{\mathbf{0}}$  is called the **valency** of  $\mathbf{d}$  and can be written as

$$v(\mathbf{d}) = \#\{\mathbf{x} \in G_R : \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{d}\},$$

that is the size of a  $\mathbf{d}$ -sphere. As an example, in  $d = 2$  dimensions the valency only takes the values 1, 2, 4 or 8 and can be given explicitly as

$$v(\mathbf{d}) = \begin{cases} 1 & , \text{ if } \mathbf{d} = (0, 0) \text{ or } \mathbf{d} = (1/2, 1/2) \\ 2 & , \text{ if } \mathbf{d} = (0, 1/2) \\ 4 & , \text{ if } \mathbf{d} \in \{(0, k/R), (k/R, 1/2), (k/R, k/R) : 1 \leq k < R/2\} \\ 8 & , \text{ if } \mathbf{d} \in \{(k/R, l/R) : 1 \leq k < l < R/2\} \end{cases}$$

One can do a similar case distinction in arbitrary dimensions but this will not be too important for us.

Next consider the **adjacency matrices**  $A_{\mathbf{d}} \in \{0, 1\}^{G_R \times G_R}$  for every  $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  given by  $(A_{\mathbf{d}})_{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}} = 1$  if and only if  $\text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{d}$  (or equivalently  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}$ ). We can interpret these matrices as a convolution operator on  $\mathbb{C}^{G_R}$  with its action given by

$$(A_{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{v})_{\mathbf{y}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in G_R: \\ \text{dv}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{d}}} v_{\mathbf{x}}$$

for  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{C}^{G_R}$ . The properties (i) to (iv) of Proposition 2.1 translate in the following way in terms of the adjacency matrices:

- (i)  $A_{\mathbf{0}} = I$  is the identity on  $\mathbb{C}^{G_R}$ , ...
- (ii)  $A_{\mathbf{d}}^{\top} = A_{\mathbf{d}}$  for all  $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$ , ...
- (iii)  $\sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} A_{\mathbf{d}}$  is the all-ones matrix and ...
- (iv) for all  $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in \Delta_R$  it holds

$$A_{\mathbf{e}}A_{\mathbf{f}} = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} p_{\mathbf{ef}}^{\mathbf{d}} A_{\mathbf{d}} \tag{2.3}$$

The last point is arguably the most important one and states that  $\text{span}\{A_{\mathbf{d}} : \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R\}$  forms an algebra closed under matrix multiplication. Furthermore this multiplication is commutative since

$$A_{\mathbf{e}}A_{\mathbf{f}} = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} p_{\mathbf{ef}}^{\mathbf{d}} A_{\mathbf{d}} = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} p_{\mathbf{fe}}^{\mathbf{d}} A_{\mathbf{d}} = A_{\mathbf{f}}A_{\mathbf{e}}.$$

This commutative algebra is referred to as the *Bose-Mesner algebra* of the symmetric association scheme  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  [4, 19, 22]. The following lemma expresses the adjacency matrices via another set of matrices  $E_{\mathbf{e}}$  with desirable properties.

**Lemma 2.2.** We have

$$A_{\mathbf{d}} = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R} \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) E_{\mathbf{e}} \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in G_R: \\ \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{d}}} \exp(2\pi i \text{Re}^{\top} \mathbf{x})$$

and

$$E_{\mathbf{e}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m} \in G_R: \\ \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{e}}} \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}} (\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}})^*$$

with

$$\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}} = \frac{1}{R} [\exp(2\pi i R \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x})]_{\mathbf{x} \in G_R}.$$

Morally this states that, since the adjacency matrices are symmetric and commute with each other, they are simultaneously diagonalizable. The common, normalized eigenvectors are given by  $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}}$ . The spaces  $W_{\mathbf{e}} := \text{span}\{\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}} : \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{e}\}$  form an orthogonal decomposition  $\mathbb{C}^{G_R} = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R} W_{\mathbf{e}}$  into the common subeigenspaces of the  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$ ,  $\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  and  $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})$  is the common eigenvalue of all vectors in  $W_{\mathbf{e}}$  for  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$ . Also note that  $\dim W_{\mathbf{e}} = v(\mathbf{e})$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.2.* We first show that  $\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}}$  is an eigenvector of  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$  with eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})$  for  $\mathbf{e} = \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m})$ . Indeed, for any  $\mathbf{y} \in G_R$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} (A_{\mathbf{d}} \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{y}} &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in G_R: \\ \text{dv}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{d}}} \frac{1}{R} \exp(2\pi i R \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x}) \\ &= \left( \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in G_R: \\ \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{d}}} \exp(2\pi i R \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x}) \right) \cdot \frac{1}{R} \exp(2\pi i R \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

The term in the paranthesis only depends on  $\text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m})$  but not on  $\mathbf{m}$  directly. Indeed, if  $\mathbf{m}' \in G_R$  fulfills  $\text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m}') = \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m})$  then we get that  $\mathbf{m}'$  can be constructed from  $\mathbf{m}$  by permuting its components in some way and exchanging some components  $m_i$  by  $1 - m_i$ . However, the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in G_R: \\ \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{d}}} \exp(2\pi i R \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x})$$

is built in a way as to compensate these sort of symmetries by summing over the corresponding symmetries for  $\mathbf{x}$ . Thus this sum only depends on  $\mathbf{e} = \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m})$  and we get

$$(A_{\mathbf{d}} \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}})_{\mathbf{y}} = \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{y}}^{\mathbf{m}},$$

that is it is an eigenvector of the corresponding eigenvalue. The system  $\{\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}}\}_{\mathbf{m}}$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\mathbb{C}^{G_R}$  as the tensor product of the Fourier

basis, so that this is a complete description of all eigenvectors of  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$  and its eigenvalue decomposition is given by

$$A_{\mathbf{d}} = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in G_R} \lambda_{\text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{d}) \mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}} (\mathbf{v}^{\mathbf{m}})^* = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R} \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) E_{\mathbf{e}}.$$

□

By symmetry (namely  $\text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{x})$ ) we can write equivalently

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x} \in G_R: \\ \text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{d}}} \cos(2\pi R \mathbf{e}^\top \mathbf{x}),$$

emphasizing that these quantities are real valued. The matrices  $E_{\mathbf{e}}$  are the orthogonal projection onto  $W_{\mathbf{e}}$  and thus are hermitian  $E_{\mathbf{e}}^* = E_{\mathbf{e}}$  and fulfil  $E_{\mathbf{e}}^2 = E_{\mathbf{e}}$  and  $E_{\mathbf{e}} E_{\mathbf{e}'} = 0$  if  $\mathbf{e} \neq \mathbf{e}'$ . By (2.4) they are also a basis of the Bose-Mesner algebra of  $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{d}}, \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R$  with basis exchange matrix

$$\Lambda = [\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})]_{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R},$$

so that (with some abuse of notation)

$$[A_{\mathbf{d}}]_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R}^\top = [E_{\mathbf{e}}]_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R}^\top \Lambda.$$

We will need to express the matrices  $E_{\mathbf{e}}$  in terms of  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** It holds  $E_{\mathbf{e}} = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} q_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) A_{\mathbf{d}}$  with

$$q_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{v(\mathbf{e})}{v(\mathbf{d}) R^2} \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}).$$

*Proof.* By (2.3) for the trace we have

$$\text{tr}(A_{\mathbf{d}} A_{\mathbf{d}'}) = \sum_{\mathbf{f} \in \Delta_R} p_{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{d}'}^{\mathbf{f}} \text{tr} A_{\mathbf{f}} = p_{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{d}'}^{\mathbf{0}} \text{tr} A_{\mathbf{0}} = R^2 v(\mathbf{d}) \delta_{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{d}'}$$

But note that since  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$  and  $A'_{\mathbf{d}}$  are simultaneously diagonalizable, the eigenvalues of  $A_{\mathbf{d}} A_{\mathbf{d}'}$  are  $\lambda_{\text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{d}) \lambda_{\text{dv}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{m})}(\mathbf{d}')$  for  $\mathbf{m} \in G_R$  and thus

$$\text{tr}(A_{\mathbf{d}} A_{\mathbf{d}'}) = \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R} v(\mathbf{e}) \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}').$$

Combining the two expressions for  $\text{tr}(A_{\mathbf{d}} A_{\mathbf{d}'})$  we get

$$\sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R} \frac{v(\mathbf{e})}{v(\mathbf{d}) R^2} \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}') = \delta_{\mathbf{d}\mathbf{d}'}$$

Using this orthogonality relation in (2.4) to express  $E_{\mathbf{e}}$  in terms of  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$  yields the claim. □

We will collect the values  $q_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})$  in a matrix

$$Q := [q_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})]_{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R}$$

as well as a reduced version

$$\tilde{Q} := \left[ \frac{\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})}{v(\mathbf{d})} \right]_{\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R}.$$

We now come to the main part of Delsarte's LP-method. For a set  $X \subseteq G_R$  let  $\mathbf{a}$  be its **distance distribution** defined by

$$a(\mathbf{d}) := a_X(\mathbf{d}) := \#\{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in X^2 : d_V(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{d}\}.$$

**Theorem 2.4.** If  $\mathbf{a}$  is the distance distribution of a set  $X \subseteq G_R$  then  $Q\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{0}$  componentwise.

*Proof.* Let  $\chi_X \in \{0, 1\}^{G_R}$  be the characteristic vector of  $X$ , that is  $\chi_X(\mathbf{x}) = 1$  if and only if  $\mathbf{x} \in X$ . Then we have (using that the matrices  $E_{\mathbf{e}}$  are orthogonal projections)

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \|E_{\mathbf{e}}\chi_X\|^2 &= \chi_X^\top E_{\mathbf{e}}^* E_{\mathbf{e}} \chi_X = \chi_X^\top E_{\mathbf{e}} \chi_X \\ &= \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} q_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) \chi_X^\top A_{\mathbf{d}} \chi_X = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R} q_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) a(\mathbf{d}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\chi_X^\top A_{\mathbf{d}} \chi_X = a(\mathbf{d})$  follows easily from the definition of  $A_{\mathbf{d}}$ .  $\square$

Clearly we could equivalently write  $\tilde{Q}\mathbf{a} \geq \mathbf{0}$ .

## 2.2 Numerical experiments for Delsarte's LP-bound

Given a symmetric potential  $c$  as to have (2.2) the energy  $E(X)$  of a set  $X \subseteq G_R$  as given by 1.1 can be written in terms of the distance distribution  $\mathbf{a}$  of  $X$  as

$$E(X) = \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}} c(\mathbf{d}) a(\mathbf{d}).$$

We want to optimize this quantity over all  $X \subseteq G_R$  of given size  $\#X = N$ . Theorem 2.4 allows us to get a linear relaxation of this problem by (using  $\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{0}) = 1$ ,  $\lambda_{\mathbf{0}}(\mathbf{d}) = v(\mathbf{d})$  and  $a(\mathbf{0}) = N$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}} c(\mathbf{d}) a(\mathbf{d}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & a(\mathbf{d}) \geq 0 \quad (\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}), \\ & \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}} a(\mathbf{d}) = N^2 - N, \\ & \sum_{\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}} \frac{\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})}{v(\mathbf{d})} a(\mathbf{d}) \geq -N \quad (\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

The solution of this LP will give a lower bound for  $E(X)$  as  $X$  runs through all  $N$ -element subsets of  $G_R$ . The optimality of a solution can be verified by finding a corresponding solution with the same objective value in the dual problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max \quad & (N^2 - N)\hat{b}(\mathbf{0}) - N \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}} \hat{b}(\mathbf{e}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \hat{b}(\mathbf{e}) \geq 0 \quad (\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R), \\ & \frac{1}{v(\mathbf{d})} \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R} \hat{b}(\mathbf{e}) \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) \leq c(\mathbf{d}) \quad (\mathbf{d} \in \Delta_R - \mathbf{0}) \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

(the condition  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{0}) \geq 0$  is not necessary for the dual but it seems like its inclusion does not compromise the optimal solution). The reason why we chose to name the dual variables by  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{e})$  is due to the following interpretation, similar to the Fourier transform: defining

$$b(\mathbf{d}) := \frac{1}{v(\mathbf{d})} \sum_{\mathbf{e} \in \Delta_R} \hat{b}(\mathbf{e}) \lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d}) \quad (2.7)$$

we see that if  $b(\mathbf{d})$  has positive coefficients  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{e})$  if we expand it in terms of  $\frac{\lambda_{\mathbf{e}}(\mathbf{d})}{v(\mathbf{d})}$  and it fulfills  $b(\mathbf{d}) \leq c(\mathbf{d})$  (except for at most at  $\mathbf{d} = \mathbf{0}$ ), then  $N^2\hat{b}(\mathbf{0}) - Nb(\mathbf{0})$  is a lower bound for  $E(X)$  as  $X$  runs through all  $N$ -element subsets of  $G_R$ . We will investigate something similar but in a continuous setting in the next section.

While it seems hard to solve the primal or dual program by hand, we can look at the numerical calculations. If we do this for the potential of the periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy on  $[0, 1)^2$  and for multiple values of  $N$  with the refinement  $R = N$  we get the values in Table 1 (up to 11 digits).

Here  $X_N$  denotes a point set, rounded to lie in  $G_R$  if necessary, as was already investigated in [43] or the Fibonacci lattice (1.3) for larger values of  $N$ . We emphasize that these are just numerical values which we have cut off after numerical imprecision takes over, but they still seem to show that for certain values the derived bound via Delsarte's method seems to reconstruct the periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy of a point set. If we increase the refinement  $R = kN, k = 1, 2, \dots$  for Fibonacci numbers  $N$  this even seems to be stable as shown in Table 2.

Increasing the refinement for the 4- and 12-point sets, where we also get a matching bound between the discrepancy and the solution of the LP for  $R = N$ , we see that the LP will not anymore reconstruct the periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy. Even though the 12-point set, which is a lattice, is still of optimal periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy [43], the LP does not seem to be fine enough to capture this. We will thus not investigate these exceptional cases further here.

Table 1: A comparisson between the point sets from [43] and the numerically calculated solution to (2.5) for refinement  $R = N$ .

$N$	$L_2^{\text{per}}(X_N)^2$	LP solution	Match?
1	0.138888888888	0.138888888888	✓
2	0.180555555555	0.180555555555	✓
3	0.21296296296	0.21296296296	✓
4	0.23784722222	0.23784722222	✓ (except.)
5	0.24022222222	0.24022222222	✓
6	0.26080246913	0.25648148148	
7	0.27494331065	0.26991658971	
8	0.27170138888	0.27170138888	✓
9	0.29679164761	0.28172999364	
10	0.29788888888	0.28907202296	
11	0.30914137619	0.29493932090	
12	0.29976851851	0.29976851851	✓ (except.)
13	0.30062458908	0.30062458908	✓
14	0.31515225137	0.30711124073	
15	0.32377777777	0.31308804345	
16	0.33289930555	0.31830881022	
21	0.33087679516	0.33087679516	✓
34	0.36048635140	0.36048635140	✓
55	0.39039302111	0.39039302111	✓
89	0.42016650534	0.42016650534	✓

Table 2: The solutions to (2.5) for higher refinements  $R = kN$ .

$N$	$R$	$L_2^{\text{per}}(X_N)^2$	LP solution
5	5	0.2402222222	0.2402222222
	10		0.2402222222
	15		0.2402222222
	20		0.2402222222
	30		0.2402222222
	50		0.2402222222
8	8	0.27170138888	0.27170138888
	16		0.27170138888
	24		0.27170138888
	32		0.27170138888
	40		0.27170138888
	64		0.27170138888
13	13	0.30062458908	0.30062458908
	26		0.30062458908
	39		0.30062458908
	52		0.30062458908
	65		0.30062458908
21	21	0.33087679516	0.33087679516
	42		0.33087679516
	63		0.33087679516
34	34	0.36048635140	0.36048635140
	68		0.36048635140



We can even look at the solution vector  $\mathbf{a}$  the program finds and every time  $N = F_\ell$  is a Fibonacci number it turns out to find the distance distribution of the Fibonacci lattice. These results thus seem to suggest that the Fibonacci lattices are the optimal point sets with respect to this energy. For no other values  $N \leq 100$  did we find an integer solution  $\mathbf{a}$ , in particular no distance distribution of a real point set.

Before coming to another method we conclude with some experiments for higher dimensions  $d$ . For  $d = 3$  the optimal assignment of  $\mathbf{a}$  in (2.5) only gives vectors with integer entries if  $N = 1, 2, 3, 5, 7$  (for relatively small  $N$ , at some point the LP becomes too big for a computer to solve in a reasonable time). In fact, these correspond to the distance distributions of the lattices in  $[0, 1]^3$  spanned respectively by the vectors

$$\frac{1}{1}[0, 0, 0]^\top, \frac{1}{2}[1, 1, 1]^\top, \frac{1}{3}[1, 1, 1]^\top, \frac{1}{5}[1, 1, 2]^\top, \frac{1}{7}[1, 2, 3]^\top.$$

For  $d \geq 4$  we only seem to get the distance distribution of a point set for  $N = 1, 2, 3, 5$ , again lattices spanned by

$$\frac{1}{1}[0, \dots, 0]^\top, \frac{1}{2}[1, \dots, 1]^\top, \frac{1}{3}[1, \dots, 1]^\top, \frac{1}{5}[1, \dots, 1, 2, \dots, 2]^\top,$$

where the last vector consists of  $\lceil N/2 \rceil$  ones and  $\lfloor N/2 \rfloor$  twos. The cases for  $N = 1$  and  $N = 2$  are optimal for trivial reasons ( $N = 1$  needs no argument,  $N = 2$  follows for all potentials  $c$  which attain their minimum in  $(1/2, \dots, 1/2)$ ). For the case of  $N = 3$  we will give an easy argument for their optimality below in Theorem 6.1 (for certain  $c$ ). The case of  $N = 5$  in general  $d$  and  $N = 7$  in  $d = 3$  seems to be more interesting. Indeed, it is notable that we seem to find infinitely many optimal point sets in  $d = 2$  (the Fibonacci lattices), one exceptional case for  $d = 3$  (the 7-point lattice, which we call the *123-lattice* due to its generating vector) and otherwise just  $N = 1, 2, 3, 5$ . It should also be noted that all these lattices are generated by vectors of the form

$$\frac{1}{N}(1, g, g^2, \dots, g^{d-1})$$

where  $g \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}$  with  $\gcd(g, N) = 1$  and the powers  $g^k$  are evaluated modulo  $N$ . For every case mentioned above it is easy to find the corresponding value of  $g$  (using torus symmetries to transform the above vectors into a vector of this type). Note the similarities to so called *Frolov lattices*, see [35, 44, 45, 65] for details.

### 3 Continuous LP

We already mentioned another interpretation of the dual LP (2.6) via a positive definite function (2.7) lying below the potential. More general in the continuous setting we have the following theorem [24, 29, 72]. In this case we generally do *not* require  $c$  or  $b$  to be invariant under permutation of the variables.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let  $c : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and let  $b : [0, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $c(\mathbf{x}) \geq b(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^d$  and for its Fourier expansion we have

$$b(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x})$$

with  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) \geq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d - \mathbf{0}$ . Then

$$E(X) \geq N^2 \hat{b}(\mathbf{0}) - Nb(\mathbf{0})$$

(see (1.1)) for all  $X \subseteq [0, 1]^d$  with  $\#X = N$ .

A function on the torus  $[0, 1]^d$  all of whose Fourier coefficients are nonnegative is also called *positive definite*. Since  $b$  is real-valued and has real Fourier coefficients we know that  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) = \hat{b}(-\mathbf{m})$ .

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* Let  $b$  be as in the assumptions, then

$$\begin{aligned} E(X) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} c(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \geq \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} b(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) = -Nb(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X} b(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}) \\ &= -Nb(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) \sum_{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{m}^\top (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y})) \\ &= -Nb(\mathbf{0}) + \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) \left| \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x}) \right|^2 \\ &\geq N^2 \hat{b}(\mathbf{0}) - Nb(\mathbf{0}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Since we aim to show the optimality of the Fibonacci lattice  $\Phi_\ell$  (1.3), we would like to have a function  $b$  as in Theorem 3.1 with  $N^2 \hat{b}(\mathbf{0}) - Nb(\mathbf{0}) = E(\Phi_\ell)$ . Since we then would have equality everywhere in the above chain of inequalities we also get the condition that  $c(\mathbf{x}) = b(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Phi_\ell - \mathbf{0}$  as well as

$$\hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) \left| \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Phi_\ell} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x}) \right|^2 = 0$$

for all  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - \mathbf{0}$ . This can be reformulated as saying that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \Phi_\ell} \exp(2\pi i \mathbf{m}^\top \mathbf{x}) \neq 0$$

implies that  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) = 0$ . For the Fibonacci lattice this is the case if and only if

$$m_1 + F_{\ell-1} m_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{F_\ell}.$$

Thus, we want to construct a function  $b$  with the following properties:

- (i)  $b(\mathbf{x}) \leq c(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in [0, 1]^2, \dots$
- (ii)  $b(\mathbf{x}) = c(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \Phi_\ell - \mathbf{0}, \dots$
- (iii)  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) \geq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - \mathbf{0}$  and  $\dots$
- (iv)  $\hat{b}(\mathbf{m}) = 0$  for  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - \mathbf{0}$  with  $m_1 + F_{\ell-1} m_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{F_\ell}$ .

Assuming that  $b$  and  $c$  are sufficiently smooth, points (i) and (ii) amount to an interpolation problem where we do not just interpolate the function values but also all partial first derivatives. An approach would thus be to construct  $b$  via an *Hermite interpolation* of  $c$  at the desired points. Indeed, in [24] it was shown that in the one-dimensional setting and for a large class of potentials  $c$  this method is enough to give a feasible interpolant  $b$ . The higher dimensional (here two-dimensional) analogue of that seems to be more involved though: Hermite interpolation at the points of the Fibonacci lattice even for the potential of the periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy does not yield a function lying below  $c$  (to try to fix this one could introduce auxiliary functions such as in (5.12) below). We thus need to add some further assumptions and use some new techniques.

Following [24], we start by transforming our potential and interpolant using

$$\gamma(s, t) := c\left(\frac{\arccos s}{2\pi}, \frac{\arccos t}{2\pi}\right)$$

(assuming  $c(x, y) = c(1 - x, y) = c(x, 1 - y)$  the function  $c$  is completely determined by its values on  $[0, 1/2]^2$ , the image of  $(s, t) \mapsto \left(\frac{\arccos s}{2\pi}, \frac{\arccos t}{2\pi}\right)$ ) and

$$\beta(s, t) := b\left(\frac{\arccos s}{2\pi}, \frac{\arccos t}{2\pi}\right).$$

The energy of a point set  $X \subseteq [0, 1]^2$  in this formulation is given by

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} \gamma(\cos(2\pi(x_1 - y_1)), \cos(2\pi(x_2 - y_2))). \quad (3.1)$$

The corresponding conditions on  $b$  become the following for  $\beta$ :

- (i)  $\beta(s, t) \leq \gamma(s, t)$  for all  $(s, t) \in [0, 1]^2, \dots$
- (ii)  $\beta(u_k, v_k) = \gamma(u_k, v_k)$  with  $(u_k, v_k) = (\cos(2\pi k/F_\ell), \cos(2\pi F_{\ell-1}k/F_\ell))$  for  $k = 1, \dots, F_\ell - 1, \dots$
- (iii)  $\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{m}) \geq 0$  for all  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - \mathbf{0}$  and ...
- (iv)  $\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{m}) = 0$  for  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 - \mathbf{0}$  with  $m_1 + F_{\ell-1}m_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{F_\ell}$ .

Here

$$\beta(s, t) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{m}) T_{|m_1|}(s) T_{|m_2|}(t)$$

is the expansion with (**tensor product**) **Chebyshev polynomials**, where  $T_n(s) = \cos(n \arccos s)$ , and indeed

$$\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{m}) = \hat{b}(\mathbf{m})$$

for all  $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ . For the Chebyshev polynomials we also have the recurrence  $T_0(s) = 1, T_1(s) = s$  and

$$T_{n+1}(s) = 2sT_n(s) - T_{n-1}(s) \tag{3.2}$$

for  $n \geq 1$ . Frequencies  $\mathbf{m}$  whose corresponding coefficients  $\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{m})$  are required to be zero according to condition (iv) above will be called **forbidden** frequencies. All other frequencies will be called **allowed**.

For the special case where the potential is given via the worst case integration error with parameter  $p > 0$  we set

$$w_p(s) := 1 + \frac{p}{2} \left( \frac{1}{6} - \frac{\arccos s}{2\pi} + \left( \frac{\arccos s}{2\pi} \right)^2 \right) \tag{3.3}$$

and

$$\gamma_p(s, t) = w_p(s)w_p(t). \tag{3.4}$$

Note that due to Remark 1.1 we may restrict  $\gamma_p$  to  $[-1, 1]^2$  without compromising any minimizers.

## 4 Hermite interpolation and absolutely monotonic functions

We will recall some technical definitions and tools from [24].

Given a function  $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , nodes  $a \leq x_1 < \dots < x_n \leq b$  and numbers  $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ , the **Hermite interpolant** of  $f$  in the nodes  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  of respective orders  $k_1, \dots, k_n$  is the unique polynomial  $h$  of degree  $< k_1 + \dots + k_n$  such that  $f^{(j)}(x_i) = h^{(j)}(x_i)$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and all  $0 \leq j < k_i$ . Here  $f^{(j)}$  denotes the  $j$ -th derivative with  $f^{(0)} = f$ . Of course, we always assume that  $f$  is sufficiently smooth so that all required derivatives exist. We will recall some facts about the Hermite interpolation. We start with an error formula ([24], Lemma 2.1 or [3, 64]).

**Lemma 4.1.** Let  $h$  be the Hermite interpolant of  $f$  at the points described above. For every  $t \in [a, b]$  there is a  $\tau = \tau(t) \in [a, b]$  with

$$f(t) - h(t) = \frac{f^{(k_1 + \dots + k_n)}(\tau)}{(k_1 + \dots + k_n)!} \prod_{i=1}^n (t - x_i)^{k_i}.$$

A smooth function  $f$  is called **absolutely monotonic** if  $f^{(n)}(t) \geq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and all  $t \in (a, b)$ . These functions are of special importance since if we consider their Hermite interpolant with  $k_i$  all even (except if possibly  $x_1 = a$ ), then by the above error formula we see that  $f(t) \geq h(t)$  for all  $t \in [a, b]$ . The following also holds true ([24], Proposition 2.2).

**Lemma 4.2.** Let  $h$  be the Hermite interpolant of  $f$  at the points described above. If  $f$  is absolutely monotonic, then so is

$$\frac{f(t) - h(t)}{(t - x_1)^{k_1} \dots (t - x_n)^{k_n}}.$$

The following is a special case of the main result of [24] for the circle  $S^1$  and follows from the discussion in Section 6 therein.

**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $f$  be an absolutely monotonic function on  $[-1, 1)$  and let  $h$  be the Hermite interpolant of  $f$  at  $x_i = \cos(2\pi i/N)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$  up to order  $k_i = 2$ . Writing

$$h(t) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \hat{h}(m) T_m(t)$$

in terms of the Chebyshev polynomials it holds  $\hat{h}(m) \geq 0$  for all  $m$ .

A particular example of an absolutely monotonic function is given by (3.3) for  $0 \leq p \leq 24$  since it holds (by formula (13) in [48])

$$w_p(s) = 1 - \frac{p}{24} + \frac{p}{4\pi^2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^n}{n^2 \binom{2n}{n}} (s+1)^n \quad (4.1)$$

for all  $-1 \leq s \leq 1$ .

## 5 The 5-point Fibonacci lattice

We will concentrate on the particular case of the 5-point Fibonacci lattice. The forbidden frequencies are of the form  $(m_1, m_2) \neq (0, 0)$  with  $m_1 + 3m_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{5}$ . Our construction will only use frequencies from the square  $(m_1, m_2) \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}^2$  although a bigger range could also be considered. There, the forbidden frequencies are

$$(1, 3), (2, 1), (3, 4), (4, 2). \quad (5.1)$$

We also need  $\beta$  to eventually interpolate  $\gamma$  in the points

$$(u, v) := (\cos(2\pi/5), \cos(6\pi/5)) = \left( \frac{\sqrt{5}-1}{4}, -\frac{\sqrt{5}+1}{4} \right) \quad (5.2)$$

and  $(v, u)$  up to first partial derivatives.

### 5.1 A rigorous construction

Assume for now that the potential has the form  $\gamma(s, t) = f_1(s)f_2(t)$  with  $f_1, f_2 : [-1, 1) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  absolutely monotonic (it will turn out that having  $f_i^{(k)} \geq 0$  for  $k \leq 5$  will suffice for what follows). Consider the Hermite interpolants  $h_1, h_2$  for  $f_1, f_2$  respectively at the points  $-1, v, v, u, u$ , meaning that we interpolate the function values in  $-1, v, u$  and also the derivatives in  $v, u$ . By Lemma 4.1 and the small discussion thereafter we have

$$f_1(s) \geq h_1(s), \quad f_2(s) \geq h_2(s). \quad (5.3)$$

We collect some facts for the interpolation at these points.

**Lemma 5.1.** Let  $h$  be the Hermite interpolant of  $f : [-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  at  $-1, v, v, u, u$ . Then

$$h(s) = \sum_{m=0}^4 \hat{h}(m) T_m(s)$$

with coefficients given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} \hat{h}(0) \\ \hat{h}(1) \\ \hat{h}(2) \\ \hat{h}(3) \\ \hat{h}(4) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 & -\frac{10+4\sqrt{5}}{5} & \frac{5+\sqrt{5}}{5} & -\frac{10-4\sqrt{5}}{5} & \frac{5-\sqrt{5}}{5} \\ 8 & -\frac{100+36\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{17+3\sqrt{5}}{10} & -\frac{100-36\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{17-3\sqrt{5}}{10} \\ 6 & -\frac{75+21\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{6+\sqrt{5}}{5} & -\frac{75-21\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{6-\sqrt{5}}{5} \\ 4 & -\frac{50+14\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{4+\sqrt{5}}{5} & -\frac{50-14\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{4-\sqrt{5}}{5} \\ 2 & -\frac{25+9\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{10} & -\frac{25-9\sqrt{5}}{25} & \frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{10} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} f(-1) \\ f(v) \\ f'(v) \\ f(u) \\ f'(u) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Furthermore, if  $f$  is absolutely monotonic then all  $\hat{h}(m) \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* The formula for the coefficients can be verified by simply checking the interpolation conditions. We omit the details here, but note that the columns of the matrix are the Chebyshev coefficients of the basis functions expressing the Hermite interpolant directly through the data  $f^{(k)}(s), k \in \{0, 1\}, s \in \{-1, v, u\}$  akin to Lagrange polynomials for standard polynomial interpolation (see equations (3.6.2-4) in [3]).

Assume now  $f$  to be absolutely monotonic. By Lemma 4.2 we have that

$$g(s) := \frac{f(s) - f(-1)}{s + 1}$$

is also absolutely monotonic. Let  $\tilde{h}$  be the Hermite interpolant of  $g$  in  $v, v, u, u$ . By Lemma 4.3 we know that  $\tilde{h}$  has nonnegative Chebyshev coefficients. But then  $h(s) = f(-1) + (s + 1)\tilde{h}(s)$  (by uniqueness of the Hermite interpolant) and using (3.2), from which we get

$$sT_m(s) = \begin{cases} T_1(s) & , m = 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}(T_{m+1}(s) + T_{m-1}(s)) & , m \geq 1 \end{cases},$$

we obtain that  $h$  only has nonnegative Chebyshev coefficients.  $\square$

The nonnegativity of  $\hat{h}(m)$  can also be proven in a more elementary way. Using the divided difference algorithm for Hermite interpolation [3, 64] we get coefficients  $c_0, \dots, c_4$  with

$$\begin{aligned} h(s) = & c_0 + c_1(s + 1) + c_2(s + 1)(s - v) \\ & + c_3(s + 1)(s - v)^2 + c_4(s + 1)(s - v)^2(s - u). \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

Using Rolle's theorem and the divided difference structure of the  $c_m$  it is possible to show that  $c_m = f^{(m)}(s_m)/m! \geq 0$  for suitable  $s_m \in [-1, u]$  (which can also be seen as a consequence of the Hermite-Genocchi formula [3]). The basis functions  $(s + 1)(s - v)$ ,  $(s + 1)(s - v)^2$  and  $(s + 1)(s - v)^2(s - u)$  can all easily be expressed as nonnegative combinations of Chebyshev polynomials, for example

$$(s + 1)(s - v)^2 = \frac{1}{4}T_3(s) + \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{4}T_2(s) + \frac{13 + 5\sqrt{5}}{8}T_1(s) + \frac{9 + 3\sqrt{5}}{8}$$

and similarly for the other basis functions, from which  $\hat{h}(m) \geq 0$  follows.

We come back to finding a suitable function  $\beta$  to show the optimality of the 5-point Fibonacci lattice. If we would have  $h_1(s), h_2(s) \geq 0$  then together with (5.3) we get

$$h_1(s)h_2(t) = \sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^4 \hat{h}_1(m_1)\hat{h}_2(m_2)T_{m_1}(s)T_{m_2}(t) \leq \gamma(s, t)$$

with equality in  $(s, t) \in \{-1, v, u\}^2$ , importantly for  $(s, t) = (u, v)$  and  $(v, u)$ . The nonnegativity of the Hermite interpolant at the points  $-1, v, v, u, u$  can be verified in multiple ways:

- (i) Since  $|T_m(s)| \leq 1$  for  $s \in [-1, 1]$  we get  $h(s) = \hat{h}(0) + \sum_{m=1}^4 \hat{h}(m)T_m(s) \geq 0$  if

$$\hat{h}(0) \geq \sum_{m=1}^4 \hat{h}(m). \quad (5.5)$$

This condition in turn is implied by  $\hat{h}(m) \leq 2^{-m}\hat{h}(0)$  for  $1 \leq m \leq 4$ , which seems to hold in certain cases. In the case of the worst case integration error  $w_p$ , which is absolutely monotonic for  $0 \leq p \leq 24$  by (4.1), (5.5) is fulfilled for all  $p \leq 17.49$ .

- (ii) Taking the representation via divided differences (5.4) and using the bounds

$$s+1 \geq 0, \quad (s+1)(s-v) \geq -\frac{7-3\sqrt{5}}{32} > -0.01, \quad (s+1)(s-v)^2 \geq 0,$$

$$(s+1)(s-v)^2(s-u) \geq -\frac{349+591\sqrt{5}+3\sqrt{230334+32182\sqrt{5}}}{16384} > -0.21$$

for  $s \in [-1, 1]$ , the positivity of  $h$  follows by (for nonnegative coefficients  $c_m$ )

$$c_0 \geq 0.01c_2 + 0.21c_4. \quad (5.6)$$

For absolutely monotonic  $f$  and by the remark after (5.4) this is implied by

$$f(-1) \geq \frac{0.01}{2}f^{(2)}(u) + \frac{0.21}{24}f^{(4)}(u).$$

Again for  $f = w_p$  this is fulfilled for  $p \leq 22.11$ .

We could also inspect a representation of the form  $h(s) = \sum_{m=0}^4 h_m(s+1)^m$ . However, the coefficients  $h_m$  seem to be hard to control analytically and do not seem to give too much of an improvement to the above methods. So far, we do not have a systematic criterion on  $f$  that implies  $h(s) \geq 0$ .

Since all coefficients  $\hat{h}_i(m_i)$  are nonnegative by Lemma 5.1,  $h_1(s)h_2(t)$  would almost qualify as a function  $\beta$  verifying the optimality of the 5-point Fibonacci lattice. The only problem is that we possibly use some of the forbidden frequencies (5.1). This can be fixed by considering the following



functions

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{(1,3)}(s, t) &:= \frac{1}{2}(2s + 2t + 1)^2 t^2, \\
d_{(2,1)}(s, t) &:= \frac{1}{4}(2s + 2t + 1)^2 (s + 1), \\
d_{(3,4)}(s, t) &:= (4st + 1)^2 (s(2t^2 - 1) + 1), \\
d_{(4,2)}(s, t) &:= (4st + 1)^2 s^2.
\end{aligned}$$

These functions are chosen so that ...

- (i)  $d_{(m_1, m_2)}(s, t) \geq 0$  for all  $-1 \leq s, t \leq 1$  and ...
- (ii)  $d_{(m_1, m_2)}(u, v) = d_{(m_1, m_2)}(v, u) = 0$ .

Indeed, point (i) follows by inspection of the expressions for the individual functions. Point (ii) is a consequence of the identities  $2u + 2v + 1 = 4uv + 1 = 0$ , as can be easily verified from (5.2). Furthermore, their representations using tensor product Chebyshev polynomials are given in Tabel 3.

The idea is to subtract of suitable, nonnegative multiples of the functions  $d_{(m_1, m_2)}$  off of  $h_1(s)h_2(t)$  as to eliminate all forbidden frequencies. By (i) above, we still get a function that lies below  $\gamma$  and by (ii) we do not disturb the relevant interpolation conditions. Setting

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(s, t) &:= h_1(s)h_2(t) - \hat{h}_1(4)\hat{h}_2(2)d_{(4,2)}(s, t) \\
&\quad - \hat{h}_1(3)\hat{h}_2(4)d_{(3,4)}(s, t) \\
&\quad - (\hat{h}_1(2)\hat{h}_2(1) - 2\hat{h}_1(3)\hat{h}_2(4))d_{(2,1)}(s, t) \\
&\quad - \hat{h}_1(1)\hat{h}_2(3)d_{(1,3)}(s, t)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

thus results in a function that does not have any forbidden frequencies. Note that one also needs to check

$$\hat{h}_1(2)\hat{h}_2(1) - 2\hat{h}_1(3)\hat{h}_2(4) \geq 0. \tag{5.8}$$

It remains to check that all other Chebyshev coefficients are nonnegative. This can be interpreted as a certain decay condition on  $\hat{h}_i(m_i)\hat{h}_j(m_j)$ . One could also try to find other functions  $d_{(m_1, m_2)}$  which might be better suited for other potentials  $\gamma$ .

It is a straightforward task to check these finitely many inequalities for a given potential  $\gamma$ . We will discuss the case for  $\gamma_p$  in particular. Let  $h_p$  be the Hermite interpolant of  $w_p$  at  $-1, v, v, u, u$ . The coefficients  $\hat{h}_p(m)$  are of the form  $c_0 + c_1 p$  for some constants  $c_0, c_1$  depending on  $m$ . Thus, the

Table 3: Tables of (tensor product) Chebyshev coefficients of the functions  $d_{(m_1, m_2)}$ , forbidden frequencies are in bold.

$d_{(1,3)}$	$T_0(s)$	$T_1(s)$	$T_2(s)$	$T_3(s)$	$T_4(s)$
$T_0(t)$	3/2	1	1/2		
$T_1(t)$	3/2	3			
$T_2(t)$	7/4	1	1/2		
$T_3(t)$	1/2	<b>1</b>			
$T_4(t)$	1/4				

$d_{(2,1)}$	$T_0(s)$	$T_1(s)$	$T_2(s)$	$T_3(s)$	$T_4(s)$
$T_0(t)$	7/4	5/2	1	1/4	
$T_1(t)$	2	3	<b>1</b>		
$T_2(t)$	1/2	1/2			
$T_3(t)$					
$T_4(t)$					

$d_{(3,4)}$	$T_0(s)$	$T_1(s)$	$T_2(s)$	$T_3(s)$	$T_4(s)$
$T_0(t)$	5	3	4	1	
$T_1(t)$	2	8	<b>2</b>		
$T_2(t)$	4	7	4	2	
$T_3(t)$	2		2		
$T_4(t)$		3		<b>1</b>	

$d_{(4,2)}$	$T_0(s)$	$T_1(s)$	$T_2(s)$	$T_3(s)$	$T_4(s)$
$T_0(t)$	7/2		9/2		1
$T_1(t)$		6		2	
$T_2(t)$	3		4		<b>1</b>
$T_3(t)$					
$T_4(t)$					

tensor product Chebyshev coefficients of  $h_p(s)h_p(t)$  and of the corresponding function  $\beta_p(s, t)$  are degree 2 polynomials in the variable  $p$ . It can be checked that the coefficients of  $\beta_p$  are all nonnegative for  $0 < p \leq 11.66439115\dots$ , after which only the  $(0, 4)$ -coefficient  $\hat{h}_p(0)\hat{h}_p(4) - \frac{1}{4}\hat{h}_p(1)\hat{h}_p(3)$  turns negative. The precise value of the upper bound can be determined by solving for the positive root of this quadratic equation if desired. Otherwise, in the range  $0 < p \leq 24$  only the  $(0, 2)$ -,  $(2, 0)$ - and  $(3, 0)$ -coefficient of  $\beta_p$  will turn negative at some point. It would thus be interesting to know if there are other auxiliary functions  $d_{(m_1, m_2)}$  such that all coefficients of  $\beta_p$  in this range stay nonnegative.

We suspect that not only the absolute monotonicity of  $f$  but also (logarithmic) convexity might be important to get a corresponding function  $\beta$  (as well as possibly further assumptions). It is not hard to check that  $w_p$  is logarithmically convex for  $s \in [-1, 1]$  (so that  $\gamma_p$  is convex in  $(s, t) \in [-1, 1]^2$ ) if and only if

$$p \leq \frac{24\pi^2}{18 + \pi^2} = 8.4992\dots \quad (5.9)$$

(while the corresponding, untransformed version  $1 + \frac{p}{2}(\frac{1}{6} - x + x^2)$ ,  $x \in [0, 1]$  is only logarithmically convex for  $p \leq 6$  [43]). For more on convexity and its relation to tensor products see [61]. Further below we will show how such concepts will help to prove the optimality of the 3-point lattices as discussed at the end of Section 2 in arbitrary dimensions.

To conclude this section we also ask how necessary the tensor product structure of  $\gamma(s, t) = f_1(s)f_2(t)$  in this scenario really is. It is easy to see that if  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$  have suitable functions  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ , then for  $\gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_n$  the function  $\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_n$  is a certificate for the optimality of a given point set (so far the 5-point Fibonacci lattice), thus the method can also be applied to potentials that can be represented (or even just approximated) by sums of such terms  $f_1(s)f_2(t)$  with absolute monotonic  $f_1, f_2$ . In general we could simply interpolate  $\gamma$  directly in  $\{-1, v, u\}^2$  with matching partial derivatives where necessary (obtaining 25 conditions), to get  $h(s, t) = \sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^4 \hat{h}(m_1, m_2)T_{m_1}(s)T_{m_2}(t)$ . We do not know of any condition on  $\gamma$  that guarantees that this function  $h$  lies below it. Only requiring

$$\frac{\partial^k}{\partial s^k} \frac{\partial^\ell}{\partial t^\ell} \gamma(s, t) \geq 0$$

for all  $k, \ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and all  $-1 \leq s, t < 1$  will not suffice as can be observed with the function  $(1+s)^{10}(1+t)^{10}$ , which has only nonnegative derivatives but the interpolant at the above points does not stay below. The main problem

here is that we cannot guarantee  $h(s) \geq 0$  for the Hermite interpolants of the individual factors except if say (5.6) holds, but it would be more desirable to have a more direct condition on the potential and its derivative, akin to [24]. Perhaps logarithmic convexity, (5.15) below or other properties could help in that.

We summarize this section into the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.2.** Let  $f_i : [-1, 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, i = 1, 2$  be functions such that  $f_i^{(k)}$  is nonnegative for all  $k \leq 5$  and assume that (5.6) holds for the Hermite interpolants of  $f_i$  at the nodes  $-1, v, v, u, u$  (5.2). If  $\beta$  as in (5.7) only has nonnegative tensor product Chebyshev coefficients and (5.8) holds, then the 5-point Fibonacci lattice is a minimizer of the energy given by the potential  $\gamma(s, t) = f_1(s)f_2(t)$  as in (3.1). In particular this holds for the worst case integration error  $\gamma_p$  (3.4) for  $p \leq 11.66$ .

It would already be interesting to do a similar analysis for the potentials given by the worst case error of quasi-Monte Carlo integration over periodic Sobolev spaces of higher smoothness as given in Example 19 in [7]. Unfortunately the here described algorithm does not seem to work for that (the  $(2, 2)$ -coefficient of the corresponding  $\beta$  functions turns ever so slightly negative, perhaps finding other auxiliary functions  $d_{(m_1, m_2)}$  or using more frequencies for  $\beta$  could already help).

## 5.2 A numerical construction

We want to describe another construction for the function  $\beta$  which relies more on numerics but therefore gives a slightly expanded range for  $p$ . In the previous part we first constructed a function that lies below  $\gamma$  and then used auxiliary functions to eliminate forbidden coefficients. Now we first construct an interpolant of  $\gamma$  at the desired points and then use auxiliary functions to guarantee that it stays below  $\gamma$  while avoiding forbidden frequencies. Since we only have numerical calculations we only want to outline the method, mainly for the case of  $\gamma_p$ .

We start with constructing a function  $h(s, t)$  which interpolates  $\gamma(s, t)$  in  $(s, t) = (u, v)$  and  $(v, u)$  up to first partial derivatives. Assume for simplicity that

$$\gamma(s, t) = \gamma(t, s) \tag{5.10}$$

is symmetric (as is the case for  $\gamma_p$ ), so if we impose symmetry on  $h$  then we only need to check the conditions at  $(u, v)$ , the respective conditions at  $(v, u)$  follow by symmetry. As an ansatz we use

$$h(s, t) = c_0 + c_1(s + t) + c_2(2s^2 + 2t^2 - 2),$$

which consist of symmetrized Chebyshev polynomials  $T_m(s) + T_m(t)$ . We use the frequencies  $(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 2), (1, 0), (2, 0)$ , which are all allowed (using other frequencies is also possible). Determining the coefficients  $c_0, c_1, c_2$  using

$$\gamma(u, v) = h(u, v), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial s}\gamma(u, v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial s}h(u, v), \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma(u, v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}h(u, v),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \gamma(u, v) + \frac{5 + 2\sqrt{5}}{20} \frac{\partial}{\partial s}\gamma(u, v) + \frac{5 - 2\sqrt{5}}{20} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma(u, v), \\ c_1 &= \frac{5 + \sqrt{5}}{10} \frac{\partial}{\partial s}\gamma(u, v) + \frac{5 - \sqrt{5}}{10} \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma(u, v), \\ c_2 &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{5}} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial s}\gamma(u, v) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma(u, v) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For  $\gamma_p$  we can calculate the coefficients  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  numerically and see that they are nonnegative for  $p \leq 11.97$ . More systematically,  $c_1 \geq 0$  follows from the absolute monotonicity of  $w_p$  (4.1) since

$$\frac{5 + \sqrt{5}}{10} > \frac{5 - \sqrt{5}}{10} > 0$$

(the same argument shows  $c_0 \geq 0$ ). As for  $c_2 \geq 0$ , note that by (5.9) we know that  $\gamma_p$  is convex for  $p \leq \frac{24\pi^2}{18+\pi^2}$ , in particular for a fixed parameter  $-1 < r_0 < 1$  the function

$$g(r) := \gamma_p(r_0 + r, r_0 - r)$$

is symmetric  $g(r) = g(-r)$  by (5.10) and convex (where it is defined, so that  $-1 \leq r_0 \pm r < 1$ ). We conclude

$$0 \leq g'(r) = \frac{\partial}{\partial s}\gamma_p(r_0 + r, r_0 - r) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma_p(r_0 + r, r_0 - r)$$

for  $r \geq 0$ . Setting  $r_0 = -1/4$ ,  $r = \sqrt{5}/4$  and using (5.2) we thus obtain

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s}\gamma_p(u, v) - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\gamma_p(u, v) \geq 0.$$

In fact, more generally we have shown

$$\left( \frac{\partial}{\partial s} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \gamma(s, t) \geq 0 \tag{5.11}$$

for all  $s \geq t$ , as long as  $\gamma$  is symmetric, convex and sufficiently smooth (so that the partial derivatives exist).

While  $h$  has nonnegative Chebyshev coefficients and fulfils the interpolation conditions, it generally does not stay below  $\gamma$  (as can be seen by plotting the two functions for  $\gamma_p$ ). Similar to (5.7) we have some symmetric auxiliary functions, namely

$$\begin{aligned} d_1(s, t) &:= 5 + 6(T_2(s) + T_2(t)) + 4(T_3(s) + T_3(t)) \\ &= -7 - 12(s + t) + 12(s^2 + t^2) + 16(s^3 + t^3), \\ d_2(s, t) &:= 5 + 2(T_1(s) + T_1(t)) + 4(T_2(s) + T_2(t)) + 2(T_3(s) + T_3(t)) \quad (5.12) \\ &\quad + 4T_1(s)T_1(t) \\ &= -3 - 4(s + t) + 8(s^2 + t^2) + 8(s^3 + t^3) + 4st, \end{aligned}$$

(in the following only  $d_1$  will be important for us but it could still be useful to have other functions with similar properties for different potentials) which have nonnegative Chebyshev coefficients of allowed frequencies and fulfil

$$d_i(u, v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial s} d_i(u, v) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} d_i(u, v) = 0,$$

so

$$\beta(s, t) := h(s, t) + \alpha_1 d_1(s, t) + \alpha_2 d_2(s, t)$$

for  $\alpha_i \geq 0$  has nonnegative Chebyshev coefficients of allowed frequencies and still fulfils the desired interpolation conditions. At least in the case of (3.3) these functions are negative where  $\gamma_p(s, t) \leq h(s, t)$  and indeed for the right choice of  $\alpha_i$  this  $\beta$  seems to stay below  $\gamma_p$ . While we do not have an analytic way how to choose  $\alpha_i$  nor a systematic way of proving that indeed  $\beta \leq \gamma_p$  for these values of  $\alpha_i$ , we found that

$$\alpha_1 = \frac{1}{30} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \gamma_p(u, v) + \frac{1}{30} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \gamma_p(u, v) - \frac{1}{15} \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \gamma_p \left( -\frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{4} \right), \quad \alpha_2 = 0 \quad (5.13)$$

seems to work for  $0.12 \leq p \leq 15.31$ , at least by looking at the plots of  $\beta$  and  $\gamma_p$ . The motivation for choosing this value for  $\alpha_1$  comes from trying to guarantee that the function  $\gamma_p(s, t) - \beta(s, t)$  is monotonically increasing on the ray starting at  $(u, v)$  (where we know  $\gamma_p(u, v) - \beta(u, v) = 0$  by interpolation independent of  $\alpha_1$ ) and ending at  $(s, t)$  for  $s \geq t$ , which would imply  $\gamma_p(s, t) - \beta(s, t) \geq 0$  there and by symmetry also for  $s \leq t$ . That is we want to have

$$\nabla(\gamma_p(s, t) - \beta(s, t))^\top \begin{bmatrix} s - u \\ t - v \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \quad (5.14)$$

for all  $1 \geq s \geq t \geq -1$ , where  $\nabla = [\frac{\partial}{\partial s}, \frac{\partial}{\partial t}]^\top$ . It is straight forward to check that the left-hand side at  $(s, t) = (-1/4, -1/4)$  evaluates to 0 independent of  $\alpha_1$ . A necessary condition for (5.14) to hold in a neighborhood of  $(s, t) = (-1/4, -1/4)$  in  $\{(s, t) : -1 \leq s, t \leq 1, s \geq t\}$  then is that the gradient of the left-hand side at  $(s, t) = (-1/4, -1/4)$  points in the direction  $[1, -1]^\top$ , which leads to (5.13). Again, we do not have any analytic guarantee on  $\gamma$  for (5.14) to hold. By inspection of the plot it seems like (5.14) holds for  $1 \leq p \leq 15.24$ . At the end, remembering that we also need to have nonnegative Chebyshev coefficients, this approach seems to work for  $0.12 \leq p \leq 13.38$  (the term  $\alpha_1 d_1(s, t)$  gives an extra contribution to the coefficient of  $T_2(s) + T_2(t)$ ). For this method the condition (5.11) was of importance to show nonnegativity of the involved coefficients and it is conceivable that for Fibonacci lattices containing even more points we would even want to have

$$\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s} - \frac{\partial}{\partial t}\right)^k \gamma(s, t) \geq 0 \quad (5.15)$$

for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $s \geq t$ , as well as perhaps even more conditions of similar type on  $\gamma$ .

## 6 Universal optimality of the 3-point lattices

Consider, as mentioned at the end of Section 2, the lattice

$$\mathcal{T} := \{(k/3, \dots, k/3) : k = 0, 1, 2\} \subseteq [0, 1]^d,$$

which is up to torus symmetries the uniquely determined  $d$ -dimensional rational lattice with 3 elements (see [14, 41] for details on rational lattices, often also called integration lattices).

**Theorem 6.1.** Let  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\gamma : [-1, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be convex and assume there is an affine function  $\beta(\mathbf{s}) = g + \mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{s}$  with  $g \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  with  $h_i \geq 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ ,  $\beta(\mathbf{s}) \leq \gamma(\mathbf{s})$  for all  $\mathbf{s} \in [-1, 1]^d$  and

$$\gamma(-1/2, \dots, -1/2) = \beta(-1/2, \dots, -1/2).$$

Then for every  $X \subseteq [0, 1]^d$  with  $\#X = 3$  it holds

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in X \\ \mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{y}}} \gamma(\cos(2\pi(x_1 - y_1)), \dots, \cos(2\pi(x_d - y_d))) \geq 6\gamma(-1/2, \dots, -1/2).$$

The right-hand side corresponds to the energy of the 3-point lattice  $\mathcal{T}$ , showing its optimality for these potential functions. Equivalently, we can also define  $\beta$  as a supporting hyperplane of  $\gamma$  at the point

$$(\cos(2\pi/3), \dots, \cos(2\pi/3)) = (-1/2, \dots, -1/2)$$

which is required to be increasing in every coordinate. The existence of such a function  $\beta$  can be guaranteed if

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s_i} \gamma(\mathbf{s}) \geq 0$$

for all  $\mathbf{s} \in [-1, 1]^d$  (or at least in  $\mathbf{s} = -\frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}$ ) and all  $i = 1, \dots, d$  holds, assuming  $\gamma$  is differentiable and convex.

*Proof of Theorem 6.1.* The result follows directly from Theorem 3.1, transformed to the Chebyshev setting via the cosine-substitution. The frequencies

$$(1, 0, \dots, 0), (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0), \dots, (0, \dots, 0, 1)$$

are allowed since

$$\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{T}} \cos(2\pi x_i) = 1 - 1/2 - 1/2 = 0$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Since  $\beta$  has by assumption nonnegative coefficients (except for possibly  $h_0$ ) the bound in Theorem 3.1 gives the result.  $\square$

Since this case is relatively manageable computation wise it could even be possible to give a simpler proof without using the LP-method, for example via Jensen's inequality similar to [21]. We leave this question to the interested reader.

## 7 Conclusion and outlook

We investigated point sets on the torus with respect to their optimality for energies defined in a tensor product way. We introduced two methods via linear programming, one deriving from Delsarte's method from coding theory and one in the continuous setting, which gave us candidates for possibly optimal point sets and ways to show their optimality. It turned out that in the case of  $d = 2$  we recover the well known Fibonacci lattices in this way, giving further evidence for their utility for quasi-Monte Carlo algorithms and in discrepancy theory. In higher dimensions we determined similar sets, but



only for  $N \leq 7$  points, one notable construction being the 123-lattice in  $d = 3$ . We demonstrated how one can get a candidate function  $\beta$  showing the optimality of the 5-point Fibonacci lattice for a given potential  $\gamma$ , given a finite set of inequalities holds. If this algorithm succeeds then the 5-point Fibonacci lattice is optimal for this potential function. We hope that future research will determine systematic conditions on  $\gamma$ , ideally only using basic properties like nonnegativity after applying differential operators such as in (5.15) or convexity.

We would like to end with one last remark. Note that the torus can be written as a product of circles  $S^1 \times \cdots \times S^1$ . It is natural to ask how this looks more generally on  $\Omega := S^{n_1} \times \cdots \times S^{n_d}$ . Given  $\gamma : [-1, 1]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  the energy of a finite set  $X \subseteq \Omega$  can be given (analogous to [24]) by

$$\sum_{\substack{(\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^d), (\mathbf{y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}^d) \in X \\ (\mathbf{x}^1, \dots, \mathbf{x}^d) \neq (\mathbf{y}^1, \dots, \mathbf{y}^d)}} \gamma(\langle \mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{y}^1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathbf{x}^d, \mathbf{y}^d \rangle).$$

Using tensor product Gegenbauer polynomials (as considered for  $S^n$  in [24]) it is possible to write down an LP-bound similar to Theorem 3.1. While in general we do not have good candidates for optimal point configurations in this setting (the adapted Delsarte method on the discretized torus worked so well, because the circle  $S^1$ , contrary to  $S^n$  for  $n \geq 2$ , has arbitrarily dense, finite subgroups in its isometry group, namely rotations generated by a  $\frac{2\pi}{R}$  angle for all  $R \in \mathbb{N}$ , in addition to coordinate reflexions and permutations), we can still get an analogous result to Theorem 6.1. If  $\Delta^{n+1} \subseteq S^n$  are the vertices of the regular simplex consisting of  $n + 2$  points and setting

$$\mathcal{D}^{n,d} := \{(\mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbf{x}) : \mathbf{x} \in \Delta^{n+1}\} \subseteq (S^n)^d$$

(the diagonal of  $(\Delta^{n+1})^d$ ), it is possible to prove, completely analogous to Theorem 6.1, the universal optimality of  $\mathcal{D}^{n,d}$  among all  $n + 2$  point sets  $X \subseteq (S^n)^d$  with respect to the potential  $\gamma$  fulfilling analogous conditions to the ones in Theorem 6.1, namely convexity and the existence of an increasing supporting hyperplane in

$$\left( -\frac{1}{n+1}, \dots, -\frac{1}{n+1} \right)$$

(the inner product between two distinct points from  $\Delta^{n+1}$ ). This is also similar to the proof of the special case of Theorem 1.2 in [24] on pages 104 and 105. While it is also possible to consider projective planes or any other spaces for further tensor product constructions, we do not have any results in this direction.

## Acknowledgement

The author is supported by the ESF Plus Young Researchers Group ReSIDA-H2 (SAB, project number 100649391). The author would also like to thank Dmitriy Bilyk from the University of Minnesota for many interesting conversations ultimately leading to this paper as well as Melia Haase from the University of Technology Chemnitz for assisting in the coding.

## References

- [1] Anderson, A., Dostert, M., Grabner, P., Matzke, R., & Stepaniuk, T. (2023). Riesz and Green energy on projective spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Series B*, 10(29), 1039-1076.
- [2] Andreev, N .N. (1996). An Extremal Property Of The Icosahedron. *East Journal on Approximations*, Vol. 2, No. 4, 5-11.
- [3] Atkinson, K. E. (1989). *An Introduction to Numerical Analysis*, 2nd ed., Wiley, New York.
- [4] Bannai, E., Bannai, E., Ito, T., & Tanaka, R. (2021). *Algebraic combinatorics (Vol. 5)*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG.
- [5] Barg, A. (2021). Stolarsky's invariance principle for finite metric spaces. *Mathematika*, 67(1), 158-186.
- [6] Barg, A., & Skriganov, M. (2021). Bounds for discrepancies in the Hamming space. *Journal of Complexity*, 65, 101552.
- [7] Berlinet, A., & Thomas-Agnan, C. (2004). *Reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces in probability and statistics*. Springer Science & Business Media, New York.
- [8] Bilyk, D., & Dai, F. (2019). Geodesic distance Riesz energy on the sphere. *Transactions of the American mathematical Society*, 372(5), 3141-3166.
- [9] Bilyk, D., Dai, F., & Matzke, R. (2018). The Stolarsky principle and energy optimization on the sphere. *Constructive Approximation*, 48(1), 31-60.
- [10] Bilyk, D., Glazyrin, A., Matzke, R., Park, J., & Vlasiuk, O. (2021). Energy on spheres and discreteness of minimizing measures. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 280(11), 108995.

- [11] Bilyk, D., Glazyrin, A., Matzke, R., Park, J., & Vlasiuk, O. (2022). Optimal measures for p-frame energies on spheres. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.* 38 (2022), no. 4, pp. 1129–1160.
- [12] Bilyk, D., & Matzke, R. (2019). On the Fejes Tóth problem about the sum of angles between lines. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 147(1), 51-59.
- [13] Bilyk, D., Nagel, N. & Ruohoniemi, I. Discrepancy and Energy of Permutation Sets in  $\mathbb{T}^2$ . Work in progress.
- [14] Bilyk, D., Temlyakov, V. N., & Yu, R. (2012). The  $L_2$  discrepancy of two-dimensional lattices. In *Recent Advances in Harmonic Analysis and Applications: In Honor of Konstantin Oskolkov* (pp. 63-77). New York, NY: Springer New York.
- [15] Bilyk, D., Temlyakov, V. N., & Yu, R. (2012). Fibonacci sets and symmetrization in discrepancy theory. *Journal of Complexity*, 28(1), 18-36.
- [16] Borda, B. (2017). On the theorem of Davenport and generalized Dedekind sums. *Journal of Number Theory*, 172, 1-20.
- [17] Borda, B., Grabner, P., & Matzke, R. W. (2024). Riesz energy,  $L^2$  discrepancy, and optimal transport of determinantal point processes on the sphere and the flat torus. *Mathematika*, 70(2), e12245.
- [18] Böröczky, K. J., & Glazyrin, A. (2017). Stability of optimal spherical codes. arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.06012.
- [19] Bose, R. C., & Mesner, D. M. (1958). *Linear Associative Algebras Corresponding to Association Schemes of Partially Balanced Designs*. United States Air Force, Office of Scientific Research.
- [20] Boyvalenkov, P., Danev, D., & Mitradjieva, M. (1999). Linear programming bounds for codes in infinite projective spaces. *Journal of Geometry*, 66(1-2), 42-54.
- [21] Brauchart, J., Hardin, D. P., & Saff, E. B. (2012). Discrete energy asymptotics on a Riemannian circle. *Uniform Distribution Theory*, 7(2), 77-108.
- [22] Cameron, P. J., & Van Lint, J. H.. (1991). *Designs, graphs, codes and their links* (Vol. 3). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- [23] Chen, X., Gonzalez, V., Goodman, E., Kang, S., & Okoudjou, K. A. (2020). Universal optimal configurations for the p-frame potentials. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, 46(1), 4.
- [24] Cohn, H., & Kumar, A. (2007). Universally optimal distribution of points on spheres. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 20(1), 99-148.
- [25] Cohn, H., Kumar, A., Miller, S., Radchenko, D., & Viazovska, M. (2022). Universal optimality of the  $E_8$  and Leech lattices and interpolation formulas. *Annals of Mathematics*, 196(3), 983-1082.
- [26] Coulangeon, R. (2006). Spherical designs and zeta functions of lattices. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2006, 49620.
- [27] Coulangeon, R., & Schürmann, A. (2012). Energy minimization, periodic sets and spherical designs. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2012(4), 829-848.
- [28] Delsarte, P. (1973). An algebraic approach to the association schemes of coding theory. *Philips Res. Rep. Suppl.*, 10, vi+-97.
- [29] Delsarte, P., Goethals, J. M., & Seidel, J. J. (1991). Spherical codes and designs. In *Geometry and Combinatorics* (pp. 68-93). Academic Press.
- [30] Delsarte, P., & Levenshtein, V. I. (1998). Association schemes and coding theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(6), 2477-2504.
- [31] Deza, M. M., & Deza, E. (2006). *Dictionary of distances*. Elsevier.
- [32] Dick, J., Hinrichs, A., & Pillichshammer, F. (2020). A note on the periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy of Korobov's p-sets. *Archiv der Mathematik*, 115(1), 67-78.
- [33] Dick, J., & Pillichshammer, F. (2010). *Digital nets and sequences: discrepancy theory and quasi-Monte Carlo integration*. Cambridge University Press.
- [34] Dũng, D., Temlyakov, V., & Ullrich, T. (2018). *Hyperbolic cross approximation*. Springer.
- [35] Frolov, K. K. (1976). Upper error bounds for quadrature formulas on function classes. In *Doklady Akademii Nauk* (Vol. 231, No. 4, pp. 818-821). Russian Academy of Sciences.

- [36] Glazyrin, A. (2023). A short solution of the kissing number problem in dimension three. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 69(3), 931-935.
- [37] Glazyrin, A., & Park, J. (2020). Repeated minimizers of p-frame energies. *SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics*, 34(4), 2411-2423.
- [38] Goethals, J. M. (1979). Association schemes. In *Algebraic coding theory and applications* (pp. 243-283). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [39] Hammersley, J.M., Handscomb, D.C. (1964). *Monte Carlo methods*. Springer Dordrecht.
- [40] Hardin, D., & Tenpas, N. (2023). Bounds for Periodic Energy and the Optimality of Two Periodic Point Configurations in the Plane. arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15822.
- [41] Hinrichs, A., Kritzinger, R., Pillichshammer, F.: Extreme and periodic L2 discrepancy of plane point sets. *Acta Arithmetica* 199, 163-198 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.4064/aa200520-22-12>
- [42] Hinrichs, A., Markhasin, L., Oettershagen, J., & Ullrich, T. (2016). Optimal quasi-Monte Carlo rules on order 2 digital nets for the numerical integration of multivariate periodic functions. *Numerische Mathematik*, 134, 163-196.
- [43] Hinrichs, A., & Oettershagen, J. (2016). Optimal point sets for quasi-Monte Carlo integration of bivariate periodic functions with bounded mixed derivatives. In *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Methods: MCQMC*, Leuven, Belgium, April 2014 (pp. 385-405). Springer International Publishing.
- [44] Kacwin, C., Oettershagen, J., & Ullrich, T. (2017). On the orthogonality of the Chebyshev–Frolov lattice and applications. *Monatshefte für Mathematik*, 184, 425-441.
- [45] Kacwin, C., Oettershagen, J., Ullrich, M., & Ullrich, T. (2021). Numerical performance of optimized Frolov lattices in tensor product reproducing kernel Sobolev spaces. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 21, 849-889.
- [46] Kuipers, L., Niederreiter, H. (1974). *Uniform distribution of sequences*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- [47] Lee, C. (1958). Some properties of nonbinary error-correcting codes. IRE Transactions on Information Theory, 4(2), 77-82.
- [48] Lehmer, D. H. (1985). Interesting series involving the central binomial coefficient. The American Mathematical Monthly, 92(7), 449-457.
- [49] Lev, V. F. (1995). On two versions of  $L^2$ -discrepancy and geometrical interpretation of diaphony. Acta Mathematica Hungarica, 69(4), 281-300.
- [50] Niederreiter, H. (1992). Random number generation and quasi-Monte Carlo methods. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [51] Novak, E., & Woźniakowski, H. (2010). Tractability of Multivariate Problems, Volume II: Standard Information for Functionals, European Math. Soc. Publ. House, Zürich, 3, 2.
- [52] Pillards, T., Vandewoestyne, B., & Cools, R. (2006). Minimizing the  $L_2$  and  $L_\infty$  star discrepancies of a single point in the unit hypercube. Journal of computational and applied mathematics, 197(1), 282-285.
- [53] Pillichshammer, F. (2023). Optimal periodic  $L_2$ -discrepancy and diaphony bounds for higher order digital sequences. Acta Mathematica Hungarica, 169(1), 252-271.
- [54] Roth, K. F. (1954). On irregularities of distribution. Mathematika, 1(2), 73-79.
- [55] Roth, R. M. (2006). Introduction to coding theory. IET Communications, 47(18-19), 4.
- [56] Sarnak, P., & Andreas, S. (2006). Minima of Epstein's zeta function and heights of flat tori. Inventiones mathematicae, 165(1), 115-151.
- [57] Schrijver, A. (2003). A comparison of the Delsarte and Lovász bounds. IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, 25(4), 425-429.
- [58] Schürmann, A. (2010). Perfect, strongly eutactic lattices are periodic extreme. Advances in Mathematics, 225(5), 2546-2564.
- [59] Schwartz, R. E. (2013). The five-electron case of Thomson's problem. Experimental Mathematics, 22(2), 157-186.
- [60] Seidel, J. J. (1991). Introduction to association schemes. Séminaire Lotharingien de Combinatoire [electronic only], 26, B26g-17.

- [61] Shikhman, V., & Stein, O. (2012). On jet-convex functions and their tensor products. *Optimization*, 61(6), 717-731.
- [62] Skriganov, M. (2022). Spherical functions and Stolarski's invariance principle. arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.00071.
- [63] Sloane, N. J. A. (1975). An introduction to association schemes and coding theory. In *Theory and application of special functions* (pp. 225-260). Academic Press.
- [64] Stoer, J., & Bulirsch, R. (2002). *Introduction to numerical analysis* (Vol. 1993). 3rd ed., in: *Texts in Applied Mathematics (TAM, volume 12)*. New York: Springer.
- [65] Suzuki, K., & Yoshiki, T. (2019). Enumeration of the Chebyshev-Frolov lattice points in axis-parallel boxes. *Hiroshima Mathematical Journal*, 49(1), 139-159.
- [66] Temlyakov, V. N. (1992). On a way of obtaining lower estimates for the errors of quadrature formulas. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 71(1), 247.
- [67] Tenpas, N. (2023). A Family of Optimal Configurations for Periodic Energy. arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.05594.
- [68] Thomson, J. J. (1904). XXIV. 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. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 7(39), 237-265.
- [69] Wahba, G. (1975). Smoothing noisy data with spline functions. *Numerische mathematik*, 24(5), 383-393.
- [70] White, B. E. (1977). On optimal extreme-discrepancy point sets in the square. *Numerische Mathematik*, 27(2), 157-164.
- [71] Woźniakowski, H. (1991). Average case complexity of multivariate integration. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)* 24(1): 185-194.
- [72] Yudin, V. A. (1993). The minimum of potential energy of a system of point charges. *Discrete Mathematics and Applications*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 75-81.

- [73] Zinterhof, P. (1976). Über einige Abschätzungen bei der Approximation von Funktionen mit Gleichverteilungsmethoden (in German). Österr. Akad. Wiss. Math.-Naturwiss. Kl. S.-B. II 185, 121-132.