

# 1

## The state of the art in Smale's 7th problem

*Carlos Beltrán. Depto. de Matemáticas, Estadística y Computación, U. Cantabria. Avda. Los Castros s/n. Santander, 39005 Spain. Partially supported by MTM2010-16051 (Spanish Ministry of Science and Innovation MICINN)*

### 1.1 A very brief historical note

Smale's 7th problem is the computational version of an old problem dating back to Thomson [30] and Tammes [29], see Whyte's early review [32] for its history, namely, the sensible distribution of points in the two-dimensional sphere. In Whyte's paper different possible definitions of "well-distributed points in the sphere" are suggested:

1. Points which maximise the product of their mutual distances (called elliptic Fekete points<sup>1</sup> after [14]).
2. Points which minimise the sum of the inverse of their mutual distances (Thomson's problem), and more generally which minimise some sum of potentials which depend on the mutual distances (like Riesz potentials).
3. Points which maximise the least distance between any pair.
4. Points which are the center of the optimal packing problem, that is, the problem of finding the smallest radius of a sphere such that one can place on its surface  $k$  non-overlapping circles of a given radius.

This beautiful problem is terribly challenging! A first shocking result by Leech [19] showed that even though the set of  $N$  particles on the sphere

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confused with the so called Fekete points.

which are critical points for the problem in item (2) for *every possible* potential can be completely described, this description is not enough to solve the problem for *any particular* potential. Namely, solving problem (2) for some particular potential may be completely meaningless for solving problem (2) for another, different potential. We quote Leech:

There is no obvious way of relating the present problems to other extremal problems such as minimising the greatest distance at which an arbitrary point can be placed from the nearest point of a configuration. In fact, since a configuration which is not balanced is out of equilibrium under almost all laws of force, it is not to be expected that any such configuration will be found to be of significance in respect to both an equilibrium problem and another extremal problem, or even under two different significant equilibrium problems.

The problem has so many ramifications that it is difficult even to mention all of them. There are dozens of papers written about each of the mentioned problems. In this paper we focus only on the explicit version proposed by Smale [27]: the problem of finding elliptic Fekete points in the two-dimensional sphere. Our reference list will also refer only to this problem, and thus many important articles dealing with the other versions are omitted, for the sake of brevity.

## 1.2 The problem

Given  $N$  different points  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , let  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  and

$$\mathcal{E}(X) = \mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = - \sum_{i < j} \log \|x_i - x_j\|$$

be its *logarithmic potential* or *logarithmic energy*<sup>2</sup>. Let

$$\mathbb{S} = \{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : a^2 + b^2 + (c - 1/2)^2 = 1/4\} = \{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = c\}$$

be the Riemann sphere, i.e. the sphere in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  of radius  $1/2$  centered at  $(0, 0, 1/2)^T$ , and let

$$m_N = \min_{x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{S}} \mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_N)$$

be the minimum value of  $\mathcal{E}$ . A minimising  $N$ -tuple  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is called a set of elliptic Fekete points. Note that such a  $N$ -tuple can also be defined as a set of  $N$  points in the sphere which *maximise the product of their mutual distances*.

<sup>2</sup> Sometimes  $\mathcal{E}(X)$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{E}_0(X)$ ,  $\mathcal{E}(0, X)$  or  $V_N(X)$

**Smale's 7th problem [27]:** *Can one find  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  such that*

$$\mathcal{E}(X) - m_N \leq c \log N, \quad c \text{ a universal constant.} \quad (1.1)$$

By “can one find” Smale means “can one describe an algorithm (in the BSS model of computation<sup>3</sup>) which on input  $N$  produces such a  $N$ -tuple, in running time bounded by a polynomial in  $N$ ?”.

**Remark 1** *The original question in [27] is not for points in  $\mathbb{S}$  but for points in the unit sphere  $\{(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 1\}$ . We prefer to use the Riemann sphere instead of the unit sphere because some of the results look more natural when stated in  $\mathbb{S}$ . Another powerful reason to do so is that  $-\log \|x - y\|$  is positive for every  $x, y \in \mathbb{S}$  while the same claim is not true for  $x, y$  in the unit sphere. This helps intuition at some moments. Of course, the problems of finding a set of elliptic Fekete points in  $\mathbb{S}$  or in the unit sphere are equivalent via the transformation*

$$(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{S} \mapsto (2a, 2b, 2c - 1).$$

*If  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{S}$  and we denote  $\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_N$  their associated unit sphere points via this transform, then we have:*

$$\mathcal{E}(\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_N) = \mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_N) - \frac{\log 2}{2} N(N - 1)$$

*We thus state all the results for  $\mathbb{S}$ , translating them from their original citations when necessary.*

### 1.3 The value of $m_N$

The first problem one encounters in dealing with Smale's 7th problem is that the value of  $m_N$  is not known, even to  $O(N)$ . A general technique (valid for Riemannian manifolds) given by Elkies shows that

$$m_N \geq \frac{N^2}{4} - \frac{N \log N}{4} + O(N).$$

<sup>3</sup> For the nonexpert reader, a BSS algorithm is just an algorithm in the natural sense of the word: a sequence of instructions (arithmetic operations, comparisons and, in general, any of the usual instructions present in a computer program) that, correctly executed, gives an answer. The arithmetic operations are assumed to be exact when performed on real numbers. See [9, 8] for details.

Wagner [31] used the stereographic projection and Hadamard's inequality to get another lower bound. His method was refined by Rakhmanov, Saff and Zhou [21], who also proved an upper bound for  $m_N$  using partitions of the sphere. The lower bound was subsequently improved upon by Dubickas and Brauchart [13], [10]. The following result summarizes the best known bounds:

**Theorem 1.1** *Let  $C_N$  be defined by*

$$m_N = \frac{N^2}{4} - \frac{N \log N}{4} + C_N N.$$

*Then,*

$$-0.4375 \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} C_N \leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} C_N \leq -0.3700708\dots$$

## 1.4 The separation distance

The separation distance of a  $N$ -tuple  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{S}^N$  is defined by

$$d_{\|\cdot\|, sep}(X) = \min_{i \neq j} \|x_i - x_j\|.$$

By the definition of  $\mathcal{E}$ , it is clear that if  $X$  is a set of elliptic Fekete points then  $d_{\|\cdot\|, sep}(X)$  cannot be too small. Using tools from classical potential theory, Rakhmanov, Saff and Zhou [22, 21] first proved the lower bound  $3/(10\sqrt{N})$  for the separation distance of a set of elliptic Fekete points. Their result was improved by Dubickas [13] to  $7/(8\sqrt{N})$ . The sharpest known bound is due to Dragnev [11]:

**Theorem 1.2** *Let  $X$  be a set of elliptic Fekete points. Then,*

$$d_{\|\cdot\|, sep}(X) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-1}}.$$

Recall that given two points  $x, y \in \mathbb{S}$ , the Riemannian distance  $d_R(x, y)$  is the length of the shortest curve in  $\mathbb{S}$  joining  $x$  and  $y$ . Elementary trigonometry shows that

$$d_R(x, y) = \arcsin \|x - y\|.$$

Thus, if we define

$$d_{R, sep}(X) = \min_{i \neq j} d_R(x_i, x_j),$$

### 1.5 The condition number of polynomials and Bombieri–Weyl norm 5

we have

$$d_{R,sep}(X) \geq \arcsin \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-1}} \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-1}}, \quad (1.2)$$

for  $X$  as above.

## 1.5 The condition number of polynomials and Bombieri–Weyl norm

According to [27], one of Smale’s motivations for studying the problem of elliptic Fekete points was to find polynomials all of whose zeros are well conditioned. Shub and Smale [24] defined a certain quantity (the “condition number”) and used it to measure the stability and complexity of polynomial zero finding algorithms. Given a homogeneous polynomial

$$h(z, t) = \sum_{k=0}^N a_k z^k t^{N-k}, \quad a_k \in \mathbb{C}, a_N \neq 0$$

of degree  $N \geq 1$ , and a projective zero  $\zeta \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2)$  of  $h$ , the condition number of  $h$  at  $\zeta$  is<sup>4</sup>

$$\mu(h, \zeta) = N^{1/2} \|(Dh(\zeta) |_{\zeta^\perp})^{-1}\| \|h\| \|\zeta\|^{N-1},$$

or  $+\infty$  if  $Dh(\zeta) |_{\zeta^\perp}$  is not an invertible mapping. Here,  $Dh(\zeta) |_{\zeta^\perp}$  is the restriction of the derivative to the orthogonal complement of  $\zeta$  in  $\mathbb{C}^2$ , and

$$\|h\| = \left( \sum_{k=0}^N \binom{N}{k}^{-1} |a_k|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

is the Bombieri–Weyl norm (sometimes called the Kostlan norm) of  $h$ . If no zero of  $h$  is specified, we just take the maximum:

$$\mu(h) = \max_{\zeta \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}^2): h(\zeta)=0} \mu(h, \zeta).$$

Now, let  $f$  be a univariate polynomial

$$f(X) = \sum_{k=0}^N a_k X^k, \quad a_k \in \mathbb{C}, a_N \neq 0,$$

and let  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  be a zero of  $f$ . We define

$$\mu(f, z) = \mu(h, (z, 1)), \quad \mu(f) = \max_{z \in \mathbb{C}: f(z)=0} \mu(f, z),$$

<sup>4</sup> Sometimes  $\mu$  is denoted  $\mu_{\text{norm}}$  or  $\mu_{\text{proj}}$  but we here keep the simpler notation.

where  $h(X, Y) = \sum_{k=0}^N a_k X^k Y^{N-k}$  is the homogeneous counterpart of  $f$ . Taking  $\|f\| = \|h\|$ , one can write:

$$\mu(f, z) = \frac{N^{1/2}(1 + |z|^2)^{\frac{N-2}{2}}}{|f'(z)|} \|f\|.$$

In [26] Shub and Smale proved the following relation between the condition number and elliptic Fekete points. Let  $\Re$  and  $\Im$  be, respectively, the real and complex part of a complex number.

**Theorem 1.3** *Let  $z_1, \dots, z_N \in \mathbb{C}$  be a set of complex numbers. For  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , let  $x_i \in \mathbb{S}$  be the preimage of  $z_i$  under the stereographic projection, that is*

$$x_i = \left( \frac{\Re(z_i)}{1 + |z_i|^2}, \frac{\Im(z_i)}{1 + |z_i|^2}, \frac{1}{1 + |z_i|^2} \right)^T \in \mathbb{S}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq N. \quad (1.3)$$

*Assume that  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  are a set of elliptic Fekete points. Let  $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a degree  $N$  polynomial such that its zeros are  $z_1, \dots, z_N$ . Then,*

$$\mu(f) \leq \sqrt{N(N+1)}.$$

*More generally, let  $z_1, \dots, z_N \in \mathbb{C}$  be any collection of  $N$  distinct complex numbers, let  $f$  be a polynomial with zeros  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  and let  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  be given by (1.3). Then,*

$$\mu(f) \leq \sqrt{N(N+1)} \frac{e^{\mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_N)}}{e^{m_N}}.$$

It is interesting to remark that there exists no explicit known way of describing a sequence of polynomials satisfying  $\mu(f) \leq N^c$ , for any fixed constant  $c$  and  $N \geq 1$ . Theorem 1.3 says that, if a  $N$ -tuple satisfying (1.1) can be described for any  $N$ , then such a sequence of polynomials can also be generated.

Here is a nice formula (which just follows from the definitions) relating  $\mathcal{E}$  to  $\mu$  and Bombieri–Weyl norm:

$$\mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \log \mu(f, z_i) + \frac{N}{2} \log \frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1 + |z_i|^2}}{\|f\|} - \frac{N}{4} \log N.$$

Note that the term

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1 + |z_i|^2}}{\|f\|} \quad (1.4)$$

in the previous formula is the quotient between the product of the Bombieri–Weyl norm of the factors of  $f$  and the Bombieri–Weyl norm

of  $f$ . That quantity is always greater than 1, see [3]. Experiments suggest that minimising  $\mathcal{E}$  is a problem similar to minimising the sum of  $\log \mu(f, z_i)$ , and to maximising the quotient (1.4)<sup>5</sup>. We recall from [3, Theorem 2.1] (see also [4]) that for two polynomials  $f, g$  of respective degrees  $r$  and  $s$ ,

$$\|f \cdot g\| \geq \sqrt{\frac{r!s!}{(r+s)!}} \|f\| \cdot \|g\|, \quad (1.5)$$

and this bound is optimal. Maximising (1.4) would be solved by finding an analogue of (1.5) for products of  $N$  polynomials, a nice mathematical problem in its own right. As pointed out in [4], it follows from (1.5) that

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^N \sqrt{1 + |z_i|^2}}{\|f\|} \leq \sqrt{N!},$$

but this inequality is far from optimal (for example, if the  $z_i$ 's are the  $N$ th roots of unity, then the value of this quotient is  $\sqrt{2^{N-1}} \ll \sqrt{N!}$ ).

## 1.6 The average value and random polynomials

Random polynomials<sup>6</sup> have been known, since [25], to be well-conditioned on average, meaning that their condition number is polynomially bounded by their degree, on average. This, combined with Theorem 1.3, suggests that spherical points associated with zeros of random polynomials should produce small values of  $\mathcal{E}$ . To properly state this fact, let us consider  $\mathcal{E}$  as a function defined on  $\mathbb{S}^N \setminus \Sigma$  where

$$\Sigma = \{(x_1, \dots, x_N) \in \mathbb{S}^N : x_i = x_j \text{ for some } i \neq j\}.$$

Note that  $\Sigma$  is the set of  $N$ -tuples  $(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  of points in  $\mathbb{S}$  such that the polynomial  $f$  whose zeros are associated with the  $x_i$  satisfies  $\mu(f) = \infty$ .

Here and throughout this paper, for a measure space  $X$ , a measurable, finite volume subset  $U \subseteq X$ , and a measurable function  $f : U \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  we set

$$\int_U f = \frac{\int_U f}{\int_U 1} = \frac{1}{\text{Volume}(U)} \int_U f.$$

One can easily compute the average value of  $\mathcal{E}$  when  $x_1, \dots, x_N$  are

<sup>5</sup> This may seem surprising at a first glance. It turns out that (1.4) is minimal, i.e., equal to 1, precisely when all the  $z_i$  are equal, which implies  $\mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_N) = \infty$ .

<sup>6</sup> in the sense of Theorem 1.4 below.

chosen at random in  $\mathbb{S}$ , uniformly and independently with respect to the probability distribution induced by Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{S}$ :

$$\int_{x \in \mathbb{S}^N \setminus \Sigma} \mathcal{E}(X) = \frac{N^2}{4} - \frac{N}{4}.$$

By comparing this with Theorem 1.1, we can see that random choices of points in the sphere already produce pretty low values of the minimal energy. One can ask if other (simple) probability distributions produce even lower average results. In [2] we proved a relation with random polynomials.

**Theorem 1.4** *Let  $f(X) = \sum_{k=0}^N a_k X^k$  be a random polynomial where the  $a_k$  are independent complex random variables, such that the real and imaginary parts of  $a_k$  are independent (real) Gaussian random variables centered at 0 with variance  $\binom{N}{k}$ . Let  $z_1, \dots, z_N$  be the complex zeros of  $f$ , and let  $x_i$  be given by (1.3). Then, the expected value of  $\mathcal{E}(x_1, \dots, x_N)$  equals*

$$\frac{N^2}{4} - \frac{N \log N}{4} - \frac{N}{4}.$$

Again, by comparing this with Theorem 1.1, we conclude that spherical points coming from zeros of random polynomials are pretty well distributed, as they agree with the minimal value of  $\mathcal{E}$ , to order  $O(N)$ . This result fits into a more general (yet, less precise) kind of result related to random sections on Riemann surfaces, see [33, 34]. Note that the notion of “random polynomial” used in Theorem 1.4 is strongly related to the Bombieri–Weyl norm. It is the natural Gaussian distribution associated with the space of polynomials, considered as a normed vector space with the Bombieri–Weyl norm.

## 1.7 Properties of the critical points of $\mathcal{E}$

One of the first things to do when faced with an optimization problem is to study the critical points of the objective function, i.e. the points where the derivative vanishes. In our case the derivative of  $\mathcal{E}$  is easy to compute. Algebraic manipulation of its expression was used in [7, 12] to get the following <sup>7</sup>:

<sup>7</sup> In [12] the result is stated for global minima, but the proof indeed valid for any critical point of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Moreover, the third item in this theorem is here stated in greater generality than in [12] but the same proof holds.

**Theorem 1.5** *Let  $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \mathbb{S}$  be a critical point of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Let*

$$\mathbf{o} = \left(0, 0, \frac{1}{2}\right)^T$$

*be the center of  $\mathbb{S}$ . Then,*

- *The center of mass of the  $x_i$  is  $\mathbf{o}$ . Namely,*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \overrightarrow{\mathbf{o}x_i} = \mathbf{o}, \quad \text{or equivalently} \quad \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x_i = \mathbf{o}.$$

- *For every  $1 \leq i \leq N$ , we have:*

$$\sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\overrightarrow{x_j x_i}}{\|x_j - x_i\|^2} = 2(N-1)\overrightarrow{\mathbf{o}x_i}.$$

- *For every  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ , we have:*

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \|x - x_i\|^2 = \frac{N}{2}.$$

Other natural questions are, which types of critical points does  $\mathcal{E}$  have and how many of them exist? There are some conjectures about their number (some authors conjecture that the number of local minima grows exponentially on  $N$ , see the references in Section 1.12 below) but no precise result is known. It was pointed out in [26] that there exist critical points of  $\mathcal{E}$  of index  $N$ , namely  $N$  points evenly distributed on some equator of  $\mathbb{S}$ . It follows from (1.6) below and the maximum principle of harmonic analysis that no local maximum of  $\mathcal{E}$  can exist.

## 1.8 Harmonic properties of $\mathcal{E}$

Let us endow  $\mathbb{S}^N$  with its natural Riemannian structure, that is the product structure (or equivalently, the structure inherited from  $\mathbb{R}^{3N}$ ). Again viewing  $\mathcal{E}$  as a function  $\mathcal{E} : \mathbb{S}^N \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we computed in [5] its (Riemannian) Laplacian. It turns out that

$$\Delta \mathcal{E} \equiv 2N(N-1), \tag{1.6}$$

is a constant. If a function defined on an open set of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  has a constant Laplacian, then the classical mean value theorem of harmonic analysis gives a formula for the mean value of the function on a ball centered at every point. In the case of  $\mathbb{S}^N$ , one can use the theory of harmonic

manifolds to analyze the mean value of  $\mathcal{E}$  in products of spherical caps, that is in sets of the form

$$\begin{aligned} B_\infty(X, \vec{\varepsilon}) &= \{(y_1, \dots, y_N) \in \mathbb{S}^N : d_R(x_i, y_i) < \varepsilon_i, 1 \leq i \leq N\} \\ &= B(x_1, \varepsilon_1) \times \dots \times B(x_N, \varepsilon_N) \subseteq \mathbb{S}^N, \end{aligned}$$

where  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ ,  $\vec{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_N)$  and for  $x \in \mathbb{S}$ ,  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,  $B(x, \varepsilon)$  is the open spherical cap of (Riemannian) radius equal to  $\varepsilon$ . Abusing notation, if  $\varepsilon = 0$  we define  $B(x, 0) = \{x\}$ . The mean value of  $\mathcal{E}$  in  $B_\infty(X, \vec{\varepsilon})$  was studied in [5]:

**Theorem 1.6** *Let  $X \in \mathbb{S}^N \setminus \Sigma$  and  $\vec{\varepsilon} \in [0, \pi/2)^N$  be such that  $B_\infty(X, \vec{\varepsilon}) \subseteq \mathbb{S}^N \setminus \Sigma$ . Then,*

$$\int_{B_\infty(X, \vec{\varepsilon})} \mathcal{E}(Y) dY = \mathcal{E}(X) + C_N(\vec{\varepsilon}),$$

where

$$C_N(\vec{\varepsilon}) = (N-1) \sum_{j=1}^N \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\log(\cos \varepsilon_j)}{\tan^2 \varepsilon_j} \right) \in \left[ 0, \frac{N-1}{2} \right),$$

with the convention that

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\log(\cos 0)}{\tan^2 0} = 0.$$

The reader may find useful the estimate  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\log(\cos \varepsilon)}{\tan^2 \varepsilon} \approx \frac{\varepsilon^2}{4}$  for small values of  $\varepsilon$ .

## 1.9 The limiting distribution

It follows from classical potential theory that optimal logarithmic energy points are uniformly distributed over  $\mathbb{S}$ , asymptotically as  $N \mapsto \infty$ , in the following sense: Let  $\{X^{(N)} = (x_1^{(N)}, \dots, x_N^{(N)})\}$  be a sequence such that  $X^{(N)} \in \mathbb{S}^N$  is a set of  $N$  elliptic Fekete points in  $\mathbb{S}$  for every  $N \geq 2$ . Then, for any continuous function  $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  we have:

$$\int_{\mathbb{S}} f = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f(x_j^{(N)}). \quad (1.7)$$

One way to analyze this qualitative result is to study the so called spherical cap discrepancy, that is for fixed  $N \geq 2$ :

$$D_C(X^{(N)}) = \sup_C \left| \frac{\#(X^{(N)} \cap C)}{N} - \int_{\mathbb{S}} \chi_C \right|,$$

where  $\chi_C$  is the characteristic function of  $C$  and the supremum is taken over all possible spherical caps  $C$  in  $\mathbb{S}$ . Note that  $D_C(X^{(N)})$  measures how far the counting measure is from the probability measure associated with Lebesgue measure in  $\mathbb{S}$ . In [10], Brauchart proved the following estimate:

**Theorem 1.7** *Let  $\{X^{(N)} = (x_1^{(N)}, \dots, x_N^{(N)})\}$  be a sequence such that  $X^{(N)} \in \mathbb{S}^N$  is a set of elliptic Fekete points for every  $N \geq 2$ . Then,*

$$D_C(X^{(N)}) \leq cN^{-1/4},$$

for some constant  $c$ .

We also note the following interesting corollary from [10]<sup>8</sup>:

**Corollary 1** *In the notation of Theorem 1.7, let  $f : \mathbb{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a Lipschitz continuous function with Lipschitz modulus  $K$ . There then exists a constant  $C \geq 0$  such that*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{S}} f - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f(x_j^{(N)}) \right| \leq K(C + \|f\|_{\infty})N^{-1/4}.$$

This gives a more detailed version of (1.7).

## 1.10 Admissible errors and an exponential time algorithm

A question we can ask about Smale's 7th problem is, how close must one be to an actual set of elliptic Fekete points to ensure that (1.1) is satisfied? One can analyze this question using the *admissible error function*  $\mathbf{e} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  given by:

$$\mathbf{e}(t) = \sup\{\varepsilon : Y \in B_{\infty}(X, \vec{\varepsilon}) \text{ implies } \mathcal{E}(Y) \leq m_N + t\},$$

where  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  is a set of elliptic Fekete points and  $\vec{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon, \dots, \varepsilon)$ . Note that the supremum is indeed a maximum and that, for fixed  $t \in [0, \infty)$ ,  $\mathbf{e}(t)$  is the maximum coordinate-wise error (measured in Riemannian distance in  $\mathbb{S}$ ) that one can permit when writing a set of elliptic Fekete points, if an inequality  $\mathcal{E}(Y) \leq m_N + t$  is to be guaranteed. Using Theorem 1.6, the following result was proved in [5]:

<sup>8</sup> The version in [10] is more precise, we just include a simplified version here.

**Theorem 1.8** *Let  $N \geq 3$  and let  $d_{R,sep}$  be the Riemannian separation distance of some set of elliptic Fekete points. The admissible error function satisfies<sup>9</sup>*

$$\mathbf{e}(t) \in \left[ \sqrt{\frac{t}{2N^2(N-1)}}, \sqrt{\frac{2t}{N(N-1)}} \right], \quad \text{for } 0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{18}. \quad (1.8)$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathbf{e}\left(\frac{1}{18}\right) \in \left[ \frac{1/6}{N\sqrt{N-1}}, \frac{1/3}{\sqrt{N(N-1)}} \right]. \quad (1.9)$$

The meaning of (1.9) is the following. If a  $N$ -tuple  $Y$  satisfying  $\mathcal{E}(Y) \leq m_N + 1/18$  is desired, then we can make an error of approximately  $1/(6N^{3/2})$  in the description of each coordinate, but if we make an error greater than approximately  $1/(3N)$  then we risk that our  $N$ -tuple will not satisfy the desired inequality.

The set of rational points (i.e. points with rational coordinates) is dense in  $\mathbb{S}$ . Moreover, precise bounds on the size of the rational numbers present in a spherical cap of a given radius are known, see for example [23]. A consequence is the following. There exist a  $N$ -tuple  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$  of points in  $\mathbb{S}$  such that  $\mathcal{E}(X) \leq m_N + 1/18$  and such that every  $x_i$  has rational coordinates which can be written using integers of absolute value at most  $(cN)^6$ ,  $c \leq 11$  a constant. Thus, Smale's 7th problem can be transformed into a discrete search problem: among all such  $N$ -tuples, find the one which has smallest value of  $\mathcal{E}$ . Simply by testing all of them, we get:

**Theorem 1.9** *There is an exponential time algorithm (on the BSS model and also on the Turing machine model) for Smale's 7th problem.*

To the knowledge of the author, this algorithm is the only one which has been proved to find  $N$ -tuples satisfying (1.1). Of course, its exponential running time makes it impractical.

### 1.11 Particular values of $N$

For some values of  $N$ , sets of elliptic Fekete points have been encountered:

- For  $N = 2$ , two antipodal points.

<sup>9</sup> Again, we just include a simplified version of this result.

- For  $N = 3$ , the vertices of an equilateral triangle lying on any equator of  $\mathbb{S}$ .
- For  $N = 4$ , the vertices of a regular tetrahedron (see [12, Cor. 3] for a more general version of this fact).
- For  $N = 5$ , two antipodal points, say at the North and South Pole, and three that form an equilateral triangle on the Equator (see [12, Th. 1]).
- For  $N = 6$ , the vertices of a regular octahedron (see [17]).
- For  $N = 12$ , the vertices of the regular icosahedron (see [1]).

Among these, the cases  $N = 2, 3$  are trivial and the case  $N = 4$  is easy. The rest of the cases have more difficult proofs. Note that, for  $N = 5, 6, 12$ , it is already nontrivial to prove that there is a unique (up to rotations and symmetries) set of elliptic Fekete points. Another remark is that the vertices of the platonic bodies do not always form a set of elliptic Fekete points: the value of  $\mathcal{E}$  at the vertices of a regular cube inscribed in  $\mathbb{S}$  is greater than the value at the same set of vertices, when four of them sharing a plane are rotated 45 degrees.

### 1.12 Numerical experiments

Numerical computation of elliptic Fekete points is a hard problem with “massive multiextremality” (see [16]): it is known that  $\mathcal{E}$  has many saddle points, and numerical analysts believe that there exist many local minima, its number possibly growing exponentially with  $N$ , some (or all) of them having values of  $\mathcal{E}$  very close to the (conjectured) global minimal value. Due to this, and to the increasing amount of resources needed to numerically determine solutions, Smale’s 7th problem is well-suited for testing global optimization routines. There have been many attempts which have produced detailed formulas, inspiring pictures and thrilling conjectures. We do not intend to reproduce those works here, but we encourage the reader to read them in [7, 21, 35, 22, 18, 28, 20, 15, 6] and references therein.

## References

- [1] N. N. Andreev. An extremal property of the icosahedron. *East J. Approx.*, 2(4):459–462, 1996.
- [2] D. Armentano, C. Beltrán, and M. Shub. Minimizing the discrete logarithmic energy on the sphere: The role of random polynomials. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 363(6):2955–2965, 2011.
- [3] B. Beauzamy, E. Bombieri, P. Enflo, and H. L. Montgomery. Products of polynomials in many variables. *J. Number Theory*, 36(2):219–245, 1990.
- [4] B. Beauzamy, V. Trevisan, and P. S. Wang. Polynomial factorization: sharp bounds, efficient algorithms. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 15(4):393–413, 1993.
- [5] C. Beltrán. Harmonic properties of the logarithmic potential and the computability of elliptic Fekete points. *to appear*, 2011.
- [6] E. Bendito, A. Carmona, A. M. Encinas, J. M. Gesto, A. Gómez, C. Mouriño, and M. T. Sánchez. Computational cost of the Fekete problem. I. The forces method on the 2-sphere. *J. Comput. Phys.*, 228(9):3288–3306, 2009.
- [7] B. Bergersen, D. Boal, and P. Pálffy-Muhoray. Equilibrium configurations of particles on a sphere: the case of logarithmic interactions. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 27:2579–2586, 1994.
- [8] L. Blum, F. Cucker, M. Shub, and S. Smale. *Complexity and Real Computation*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1998.
- [9] L. Blum, M. Shub, and S. Smale. On a theory of computation and complexity over the real numbers: NP-completeness, recursive functions and universal machines. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 21(1):1–46, 1989.
- [10] J. S. Brauchart. Optimal logarithmic energy points on the unit sphere. *Math. Comp.*, 77(263):1599–1613, 2008.
- [11] P. D. Dragnev. On the separation of logarithmic points on the sphere. In *Approximation Theory, X (St. Louis, MO, 2001)*, Innov. Appl. Math., p. 137–144. Vanderbilt Univ. Press, Nashville, TN, 2002.
- [12] P. D. Dragnev, D. A. Legg, and D. W. Townsend. Discrete logarithmic energy on the sphere. *Pacific J. Math.*, 207(2):345–358, 2002.
- [13] A. Dubickas. On the maximal product of distances between points on a sphere. *Liet. Mat. Rink.*, 36(3):303–312, 1996.

- [14] M. Fekete. Über die Verteilung der Wurzeln bei gewissen algebraischen Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Koeffizienten. *Math. Z.*, 17(1):228–249, 1923.
- [15] D. Hardin and E. B. Saff. Discretizing manifolds via minimum energy points. *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 51(10):1186–1194, 2004.
- [16] J.-B. Hiriart-Urruty. A new series of conjectures and open questions in optimization and matrix analysis. In *ESAIM : Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations*, p. 454–470. 2009.
- [17] A. V. Kolushov and V. A. Yudin. Extremal dispositions of points on the sphere. *Anal. Math.*, 23(1):25–34, 1997.
- [18] A. B. J. Kuijlaars and E. B. Saff. Distributing many points on a Sphere. *Math. Int.*, 19(1):5–11, 1997.
- [19] J. Leech. Equilibrium of sets of particles on a sphere. *Math. Gaz.*, 41:81–90, 1957.
- [20] J. Pintér. Globally optimized spherical point arrangements: Model variants and illustrative results. *Ann. Op. Res.*, 104:213–230, 2001.
- [21] E. A. Rakhmanov, E. B. Saff, and Y. M. Zhou. Minimal discrete energy on the sphere. *Math. Res. Letters*, 1:647–662, 1994.
- [22] E. A. Rakhmanov, E. B. Saff, and Y. M. Zhou. Electrons on the sphere. In *Computational Methods and Function Theory 1994 (Penang)*, volume 5 of *Ser. Approx. Decompos.*, p. 293–309. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1995.
- [23] E. Schmutz. Rational points on the unit sphere. *Cent. Eur. J. Math.*, 6(3):482–487, 2008.
- [24] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bézout’s theorem. I. Geometric aspects. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 6(2):459–501, 1993.
- [25] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bezout’s theorem. II. Volumes and probabilities. In *Computational Algebraic Geometry (Nice, 1992)*, volume 109 of *Progr. Math.*, p. 267–285. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1993.
- [26] M. Shub and S. Smale. Complexity of Bezout’s theorem. III. Condition number and packing. *J. Complexity*, 9(1):4–14, 1993. Festschrift for Joseph F. Traub, Part I.
- [27] S. Smale. Mathematical problems for the next century. In *Mathematics: Frontiers and Perspectives*, p. 271–294. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.
- [28] W. Stortelder, J. Swart, and J. Pintér. Finding elliptic Fekete points sets: two numerical solution approaches. *J. Comp. App. Math.*, 130(1–2), 2001.
- [29] P. M. L. Tammes. *On the origin of number and arrangement of the places of exit on the surface of pollen-grains*. Recueil des travaux botaniques neerlandais 27. Diss. Groningen., 1930.
- [30] J. J. Thomson. On the structure of the atom. *Phil. Mag.*, 7(6):237–265, 1904.
- [31] G. Wagner. On the product of distances to a point set on a sphere. *J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A*, 47(3):466–482, 1989.
- [32] L. L. Whyte. Unique arrangements of points on a sphere. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 59:606–611, 1952.

- [33] Q. Zhong. Energies of zeros of random sections on Riemann surfaces. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 57(4):1753–1780, 2008.
- [34] Q. Zhong. Addendum to “Energies of zeros of random sections on Riemann surfaces”. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, To appear, 2010.
- [35] Y. Zhou. *Arrangements of Points on the Sphere*. Ph. D. Thesis. Math. Department, University of South Florida, 1995.