

The fundamental Laplacian eigenvalue of the regular polygon with Dirichlet boundary conditions

Robert Stephen Jones*

Independent Researcher, Sunbury, Ohio

February 2, 2022

Abstract

The lowest eigenvalue of the Laplacian within the S -sided regular polygon with Dirichlet boundary conditions is the focus of this report. As suggested by others, this eigenvalue may be expressed as an asymptotic expansion in powers of $1/S$ where, interestingly, they have shown that the first few coefficients in that expansion, up to sixth order, may be expressed analytically in terms of Riemann zeta functions and roots of Bessel functions. This report builds on that work with three main contributions: (1) compelling numerical evidence independently supporting those published results, (2) a conjecture adding two more terms to the asymptotic expansion, and (3) an observation that higher-order coefficients both alternate in sign and grow rapidly in magnitude, which suggest the series doesn't converge unless $S \geq 10$. This report is based on a numerical computation of the eigenvalues precise to fifty digits for S up to 150.

Keywords: Laplacian eigenvalue; regular polygon; asymptotic expansion

Introduction

Let Ω_S denote the interior of an S -sided regular polygon, and $\partial\Omega_S$ its boundary. The Laplacian eigenvalue problem with Dirichlet boundary conditions for that polygon is defined by

$$\left. \begin{aligned} [\Delta + \lambda] \Psi(\mathbf{r}) &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{r} \in \Omega_S \\ \Psi(\mathbf{r}) &= 0 & \text{for } \mathbf{r} \in \partial\Omega_S \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (1)$$

where Δ is the two-dimensional Laplacian, $\lambda > 0$ is an eigenvalue, and $\Psi(\mathbf{r}) \not\equiv 0$ is a corresponding eigenfunction.

A given regular polygon has an infinite tower of eigenvalues, but this report shall focus only on the lowest (fundamental) eigenvalue, and, more specifically, an asymptotic expansion of the form

$$\lambda(S) \sim \hat{\lambda}(S) \equiv j_{01}^2 \left[1 + \sum_{\mu=1}^{\infty} \frac{C_{\mu}}{S^{\mu}} \right] = j_{01}^2 \left[1 + \frac{C_1}{S} + \frac{C_2}{S^2} + \frac{C_3}{S^3} + \dots \right] \quad (2)$$

*rsjones7@yahoo.com , <https://www.hbeLabs.com>

where $j_{01}^2 \approx 5.7831$ is the lowest eigenvalue of the unit-radius circle¹. Since we don't [yet] know how the expansion converges, make the distinction: $\lambda(S)$ denotes the exact fundamental eigenvalue for all $S = 3, 4, 5, \dots$; whereas $\widehat{\lambda}(S)$ denotes its asymptotic expansion. When $\widehat{\lambda}(S)$ is truncated at C_N/S^N , i.e., to N th order, it shall be written $\widehat{\lambda}^{[N]}(S)$ so that

$$\lambda(S) \sim \widehat{\lambda}(S) = \widehat{\lambda}^{[N]}(S) + O(1/S^{N+1}). \quad (3)$$

Built into the series is the assumption that as the polygon approaches the unit-radius circle, i.e., in the limit $S \rightarrow \infty$, $\lambda(\infty) = \widehat{\lambda}(\infty) = j_{01}^2$. This assumption seems natural, and is supported by numerics, but in passing, recall the curious *polygon-circle paradox* of thin-plate theory [8] where an analogous assumption breaks down.

When the area of Ω_S is held constant at π , i.e., the same area as the unit-radius circle, the proposed expansion to eighth order is

$$\widehat{\lambda}^{[8]}(S) = j_{01}^2 \left\{ 1 + \frac{4\zeta(3)}{S^3} + \frac{[12 - 2j_{01}^2]\zeta(5)}{S^5} + \frac{[8 + 4j_{01}^2]\zeta^2(3)}{S^6} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{[36 - 12j_{01}^2 - \frac{1}{2}j_{01}^4]\zeta(7)}{S^7} + \frac{[48 + 8j_{01}^2 + 2j_{01}^4]\zeta(3)\zeta(5)}{S^8} \right\} \quad (4)$$

where $\zeta(n) = \sum_{\mu=1}^{\infty} \mu^{-n}$ is the well-known Riemann zeta function, and where the last two terms are contributions of this work.

The constant area of π is chosen to more readily expose interesting facts about the eigenvalue and its asymptotic expansion. Doing so automatically factors out the well-known area rescaling dependence² and simplifies the expressions. The Appendix details the relationship between this *transcribed* (equal area) regular polygon eigenvalue and the inscribed one, as well as some other relationships.

Over the last twenty years, a few others have considered this problem. A common theme is that those workers computed the eigen-solution while gradually deforming the circle into the regular polygon. In 1997, Molinari [7] suggested an expansion of $\sqrt{\lambda(S)}$ in powers of $1/S$ and used conformal mapping to estimate the leading coefficients of what he called a ‘‘partial resummation of terms in the $1/S$ expansion’’, which he claimed improved convergence. In 2004, Grinfeld and Strang [3] proposed³ Eq. (2), and they used ‘‘the calculus of moving surfaces’’ (CMS) and numerics to estimate the first few coefficients. Although of limited numerical precision, these early efforts seemed promising and offered interesting insights.

More recently, in 2012, Grinfeld and Strang [4] revisited the problem and were able to express the coefficients up to C_4 as integer multiples of the Riemann zeta function⁴. An interesting application of that work appears in 2010 when Oikonomou [10] studied the Casimir energy of a scalar field within a regular polygon. Several years later, in 2015, Boady [2], working with Grinfeld, and also using CMS, contributed two more terms, C_5 and C_6 . Their results were obtained using a computer algebra system and do not depend on numerical computations per se. The terms up to sixth order – first line of Eq. (4) – shall be referred to as the Grinfeld-Strang-Boady [GSB] terms.

¹The corresponding [un-normalized] eigenfunction within that circle is $\Psi(\mathbf{r}) = J_0(j_{01}r)$ where $r = |\mathbf{r}| \leq 1$, and the number $j_{01} \approx 2.4048$ is the first root of the Bessel function of the first kind, $J_0(x)$.

²If the polygon area is rescaled from A to tA , an eigenvalue changes from λ to λ/t , i.e., $A\lambda$ is constant.

³They did note, but without citation, that ‘‘others’’ had already established that series.

⁴If they actually used the constant π -area Ω_S , which they suggested, they would have found $\widehat{\lambda}^{[4]}(S) = j_{01}^2 \{1 + 4\zeta(3)/S^3\}$. See the Appendix for details.

Of note is that only two solutions with finite S are known in closed form, which for π -area Ω_S are

$$\lambda(3) = \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(4) = 2\pi \tag{5}$$

All numerical evidence indicates that the π -area regular polygon eigenvalues are monotonic with S ,

$$7.2552 \approx \frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \geq \lambda(S) > \lambda(S + 1) > j_{01}^2 \approx 5.7831 \tag{6}$$

which is not unexpected [1, 9].

As terms are added to the asymptotic expansion per Eq. (4), interesting facts begin to emerge. For example, the Riemann zeta function arguments are (so far) chosen from $\{3, 5, 7, \dots\}$, and – within each term – sum to that term’s order.⁵ That pattern automatically requires $C_1 = C_2 = C_4 = 0$, which is a priori not obvious; and, for example, the eighth order term involves only $\zeta(3)\zeta(5)$ since $3 + 5$ is the only way to get 8 from that set. Of course, each added term also brings us a little closer to identifying the elusive form of the function $\lambda(N)$ for which $\hat{\lambda}(N)$ is merely its asymptotic expansion.

Of more practical interest is the ability to rapidly compute relatively high-precision eigenvalues. Indeed, using Eq. (4) and the computed, fifty-digit eigenvalues, the relative discrepancy is empirically determined to be

$$\frac{\hat{\lambda}^{[8]}(S) - \lambda(S)}{\lambda(S)} \approx \frac{-18.38}{S^{7.86}} \tag{7}$$

apparently valid for all $S \geq 5$. To illustrate, the ordinarily difficult-to-calculate $S = 128$ eigenvalue is readily found to a precision of about fifteen digits,

$$\lambda(128) = 5.78319922243209895 \dots \quad (\text{exact}) \tag{8}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}^{[8]}(128) = 5.78319922243209606 \dots \tag{9}$$

with a relative discrepancy of -5.0×10^{-16} , and where an ellipsis in a number indicates truncation, not rounding.

My approach is quite straightforward. It begins with a high-precision numerical computation [5] of the eigenvalues for S from 5 to 150, precise to about fifty digits. These computed eigenvalues (skipping the lowest few) are then fit using linear regression to a truncated version of Eq. (2) with just under forty terms. My conjecture for the seventh and eighth order terms is derived using an LLL integer relation algorithm on the fit values of the coefficients. The list of computed eigenvalues, the LLL technique, and some other details are provided in the Appendix.

All computations were performed on my personal commodity hardware running free software⁶ with GNU/Linux (lubuntu 16.04.3 LTS) and its numerous ancillary utilities. For the eigenvalue computations, which took several months, I used a six-core (12-thread) i7-5820K @ 3.30 GHz with 64 GB RAM computer. Software of choice was the `pari/gp` [11] calculator (compiled with `gmp` and `pthread`). A few symbolic computations were performed using `maxima` [6].

⁵The next term in that sequence is most likely greater than eight but is otherwise not known. Boday conjectured that the sequence consists of positive odd integers excluding 1, but the three numbers $\{3, 5, 7\}$ also start the sequence of odd primes.

⁶Typically per the GPL, <http://www.gnu.org/philosophy/free-sw.html>.

Linear Regression

With the computed eigenvalues, linear regression shall be used to seek numerical values of the coefficients C_μ of Eq. (2). Because this process uses up to around forty coefficients and requires up to several dozen digits of precision, this unusual application of linear regression requires some computational caveats.

The numerically computed eigenvalues shall be denoted $\Lambda^{[\text{up}]}(S)$ and $\Lambda^{[\text{dn}]}(S)$ for the upper and lower bounds, respectively, or generically, $\Lambda(S)$ (which can refer to either bound or their mean). The relative difference between the computed bounds satisfies

$$(0.114) \times 10^{-50} < \frac{\Lambda^{[\text{up}]}(S) - \Lambda^{[\text{dn}]}(S)}{\Lambda(S)} < (0.998) \times 10^{-50} \quad (10)$$

which is just under 10^{-50} , and with a mean of $(0.871) \times 10^{-50}$.

To develop the model equation, first let the independent variable be $X = 1/S$. The dependent variable Y shall incorporate (1) the computed eigenvalues, (2) the assumption that $\lambda(\infty) = j_{01}^2$, and (3) analytic expressions for the coefficients. Initially, all coefficients are assumed unknown. Only after compelling numerical evidence supports an analytic expression for a coefficient shall that coefficient be considered known and exact, embellished with a tilde (so that C_μ becomes \tilde{C}_μ), and incorporated into Y .

Virtually nothing is published regarding the convergence of Eq. (2) except for the vague but obvious notion that convergence improves as S increases. If we fit using low values of S for which the asymptotic series doesn't converge, the method will fail because it won't capture the true nature of the function $\lambda(S)$. Therefore, the fit shall exclude the lowest few computed eigenvalues, and that fit used to conjecture convergence properties.

To make this work, as many coefficients as possible must be included in the fit, but not so many that the fit function begins to oscillate wildly as it tries to "connect the dots" with a polynomial in X . Also, because of the numerically ill-conditioned nature of the linear regression matrix computations, sufficient precision must be used. To that end, the precision of the linear regression computations is set to a more-than-adequate 200 digits. Both the number of terms to include in the expansion and the computation precision are established experimentally.

To estimate the precision of the coefficients, the upper and lower eigenvalue bounds are separately fit to the same model equation. This process yields two sets of numerical values for the coefficients, $\{C_\mu^{[\text{up}]}\}$ and $\{C_\mu^{[\text{dn}]}\}$, which incidentally do not form bounds. The relative difference and approximate number of digits in agreement between a pair of these numbers are, respectively,

$$\epsilon_\mu = \frac{C_\mu^{[\text{up}]} - C_\mu^{[\text{dn}]}}{\frac{1}{2} [C_\mu^{[\text{up}]} + C_\mu^{[\text{dn]}]}} \quad \text{and} \quad d_\mu = -\log_{10} |\epsilon_\mu| \quad (11)$$

In this report, a given coefficient shall be reported as the average value rounded one digit beyond a rounded d_μ , along with the value of d_μ . By example, if $C_{28}^{[\text{up}]} = 1.26128551 \times 10^{16}$ and $C_{28}^{[\text{dn}]} = 1.26175766 \times 10^{16}$, then this coefficient is reported as

$$C_{28} \{d_{28}\} = 1.262 \times 10^{16} \{3.4\} \quad (12)$$

where $\epsilon_{28} = -3.74 \times 10^{-4}$. Parameters are adjusted so that $d_\mu > 1$ in every case.

Three important observations regarding the numerical values of the coefficients – looking down the series – include a drop in precision, an alternation in sign, and a growth in magnitude. These observations are quantified below.

In order to satisfy all the criteria, the following is chosen

$$\boxed{\text{Fit Parameters: (a) include up to } C_{38} \text{ and (b) use } S = 13, 14, \dots, 150} \quad (13)$$

In hindsight, this will ensure that the minimum S -value is not too small, enough terms are included in the fit, and that every $d_\mu > 1$.

There shall be four passes, of which the first three successfully establish the analytic set of coefficients depicted in Eq. (4). The final pass is used to estimate the remaining coefficients. With each pass, the number of unknown coefficients decreases, increasing their numerical precision slightly.

Pass 1

To begin, assume all of the first 38 coefficients are unknown and fit the computed eigenvalue data to the truncated series

$$Y_a \equiv S \cdot \left[\frac{\Lambda(S)}{j_{01}^2} - 1 \right] = C_1 + C_2 X + C_3 X^2 + \dots + C_{38} X^{37} \quad (14)$$

When this is done, the leading nine coefficients – listed in Table 1 – dramatically reveal that C_1 , C_2 , and C_4 range from thirty to forty orders of magnitude smaller than the nearby non-zero coefficients. Indeed, to the precision of the computation, they are effectively zero, which offers compelling numerical evidence in support of the GSB result that

$$\boxed{\tilde{C}_1 = \tilde{C}_2 = \tilde{C}_4 = 0} \quad (15)$$

Table 1: First pass results. The first nine and the last of 38 coefficients, assuming none are initially known per Eq. (14). Note the [near-]zero coefficients marked with arrows.

μ	$C_\mu \{d_\mu\}$
1	+0.00019 {1.4} ←
2	-0.00039 {1.4} ←
3	+4.8082276126383771415989526460458038 {34.4}
4	-0.0023 {1.3} ←
5	+0.44964098545032430901630041787 {27.9}
6	+44.98497175863112456004906931 {27.3}
7	-50.539324388135164383037966 {24.9}
8	+200.872237801870351587037 {23.1}
9	-317.7704850739388022226 {21.1}
...	
38	+2.53 × 10 ²¹ {1.6}

Pass 2

Next, incorporate Eq. (15) into the dependent variable and refit the computed eigenvalue data to the model equation

$$Y_b \equiv S^3 \cdot \left[\frac{\Lambda(S)}{j_{01}^2} - 1 \right] = C_3 + C_5 X^2 + C_6 X^3 + \dots + C_{38} X^{35} \quad (16)$$

which now includes 35 terms in the expansion on the right hand side. The first three coefficients of the fit are then compared to the non-zero GSB terms

$$\left. \begin{aligned} C_3 \{d_3\} &= 4.80822761263837714159895264604579996267 \{38.0\} \\ 4\zeta(3) &= 4.808227612638377141598952646045799963059 \dots \end{aligned} \right\} 36 \text{ digits} \quad (17)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} C_5 \{d_5\} &= 0.44964098545032430901630041683027 \{30.8\} \\ (12 - 2j_{01}^2) \zeta(5) &= 0.449640985450324309016300416829603 \dots \end{aligned} \right\} 28 \text{ digits} \quad (18)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} C_6 \{d_6\} &\approx 44.98497175863112456004906966023 \{29.8\} \\ (8 + 4j_{01}^2) \zeta(3)^2 &= 44.984971758631124560049069660994 \dots \end{aligned} \right\} 29 \text{ digits} \quad (19)$$

where the number of digits in agreement is indicated. This result provides compelling numerical evidence supporting the remaining GSB terms,

$$\boxed{\tilde{C}_3 = 4\zeta(3)} \quad \boxed{\tilde{C}_5 = (12 - 2j_{01}^2) \zeta(5)} \quad \boxed{\tilde{C}_6 = (8 + 4j_{01}^2) \zeta(3)^2} \quad (20)$$

Pass 3

Next, incorporate the full GSB result, Eqs. (15) and (20), into the dependent variable and refit the computed eigenvalue data to the model equation

$$Y_c \equiv S^7 \cdot \left[\frac{\Lambda(S)}{j_{01}^2} - \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{C}_3}{S^3} + \frac{\tilde{C}_5}{S^5} + \frac{\tilde{C}_6}{S^6} \right) \right] = C_7 + C_8 X + \dots + C_{38} X^{31} \quad (21)$$

which now includes 32 terms in the expansion on the right hand side. Comparing the resulting numerical coefficients C_7 and C_8 to the proposed expressions yields

$$\left. \begin{aligned} C_7 \{d_7\} &= -50.53932438813516438303806289079 \{30.4\} \\ (36 - 12j_{01}^2 - \frac{1}{2}j_{01}^4) \zeta(7) &= -50.539324388135164383038062890904 \dots \end{aligned} \right\} 29 \text{ digits} \quad (22)$$

$$\left. \begin{aligned} C_8 \{d_8\} &= +200.87223780187035158705886400 \{27.8\} \\ (48 + 8j_{01}^2 + 2j_{01}^4) \zeta(3) \zeta(5) &= +200.872237801870351587058864190 \dots \end{aligned} \right\} 27 \text{ digits} \quad (23)$$

which provide compelling numerical evidence in support of my conjecture,

$$\boxed{\tilde{C}_7 = (36 - 12j_{01}^2 - \frac{1}{2}j_{01}^4) \zeta(7)} \quad \boxed{\tilde{C}_8 = (48 + 8j_{01}^2 + 2j_{01}^4) \zeta(3)\zeta(5)} \quad (24)$$

To *discover* the above relationships, the numerical coefficients, C_7 and C_8 , are input into an LLL integer relation algorithm using

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= a_7 C_7 + (b_7 + c_7 j_{01}^2 + d_7 j_{01}^4) \zeta(7) \\ 0 &= a_8 C_8 + (b_8 + c_8 j_{01}^2 + d_8 j_{01}^4) \zeta(3) \zeta(5) \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the respective four integers $\{a, b, c, d\}$ are sought. The form of the integer relation is guided by the GSB result. Details, including a computer program, are given in the Appendix.

Pass 4

Finally, incorporate Eqs. (15), (20), and (24) into the dependent variable and refit the computed eigenvalue data to the model equation

$$Y_d \equiv S^9 \cdot \left[\frac{\Lambda(S)}{j_{01}^2} - \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{C}_3}{S^3} + \frac{\tilde{C}_5}{S^5} + \frac{\tilde{C}_6}{S^6} + \frac{\tilde{C}_7}{S^7} + \frac{\tilde{C}_8}{S^8} \right) \right] = C_9 + C_{10}X + C_{11}X^2 + \dots + C_{38}X^{29} \quad (26)$$

which now includes 30 terms in the expansion on the right hand side. The complete results of this fit are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Fourth pass results listing all thirty coefficients of the model Eq. (26). Note the sign alternation, growth in magnitude of C_μ , and decrease in precision, d_μ .

μ	$C_\mu \{d_\mu\}$	μ	$C_\mu \{d_\mu\}$
9	-317.77048507393880222654502267 {27.5}	24	+6.590391 $\times 10^{12}$ {5.7}
10	+1816.7620988762759616659826 {25.1}	25	-4.19643 $\times 10^{13}$ {5.0}
11	-6016.33571769034682922143 {22.8}	26	+2.7470 $\times 10^{14}$ {4.4}
12	+25200.97379293246467587 {20.9}	27	-1.8436 $\times 10^{15}$ {3.9}
13	-93352.057545638041207 {19.0}	28	+1.262 $\times 10^{16}$ {3.4}
14	+395412.696177504392 {17.2}	29	-8.702 $\times 10^{16}$ {3.0}
15	-1718008.2767654300 {15.6}	30	+5.934 $\times 10^{17}$ {2.7}
16	+7970543.96349877 {14.2}	31	-3.89 $\times 10^{18}$ {2.5}
17	-38310267.955146 {12.8}	32	+2.36 $\times 10^{19}$ {2.3}
18	+192454613.5202 {11.5}	33	-1.27 $\times 10^{20}$ {2.1}
19	-1004632656.0 {10.3}	34	+5.80 $\times 10^{20}$ {2.0}
20	+5.447327793 $\times 10^9$ {9.2}	35	-2.12 $\times 10^{21}$ {1.9}
21	-3.05943716 $\times 10^{10}$ {8.2}	36	+5.77 $\times 10^{21}$ {1.8}
22	+1.7770589 $\times 10^{11}$ {7.3}	37	-1.03 $\times 10^{22}$ {1.8}
23	-1.065749 $\times 10^{12}$ {6.5}	38	+8.96 $\times 10^{21}$ {1.7}

Convergence

Numerically, the coefficients of Eq. (2) exhibit two important properties which can be seen clearly in Table 2. As one looks down that series, beyond the first few terms, the coefficients appear to both alternate in sign and grow in magnitude very rapidly, apparently consistent with

$$\begin{cases} C_\mu = (-1)^\mu |C_\mu| & \text{for } \mu > 7 \\ \ln |C_\mu| \sim a\mu + b & \text{as } \mu \rightarrow \infty \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

To analyze the coefficient growth, the natural logarithm of the absolute value of the non-zero coefficients is plotted against the series index in Fig. 1 (circled and squared dots). The down-turn in the last ten or so coefficients is an artifact of the truncation (here, at $\mu=38$). Also visible (at this scale) is that a smooth pattern isn't established until $\mu \approx 10$.

If “ $\ln |C_\mu|$ ” does indeed approach a straight-line asymptote, the slope “ a ” of that asymptote determines convergence. To see this, for sufficiently large but finite N , the remainder

$$R_N(S) \equiv \frac{\widehat{\lambda}(S) - \widehat{\lambda}^{[N-1]}(S)}{j_{01}^2} = \sum_{\mu=N}^{\infty} \frac{C_\mu}{S^\mu} \approx e^b \sum_{i=N}^{\infty} (-1)^i \left[\frac{e^a}{S} \right]^i \quad (28)$$

certainly diverges if S is too small. Indeed, the alternating geometric series in the last term is absolutely convergent if $S > e^a$, and diverges otherwise. (Both a and S are positive.) Since $\widehat{\lambda}^{[N]}(S)$ is finite, conclude that $\widehat{\lambda}(S)$ is absolutely convergent if and only if

$$S > S_{\text{cr}} \equiv e^a \quad (\text{critical } S\text{-value}) \quad (29)$$

The challenge is to determine the slope of the asymptote, presuming there is one. Without a known functional form for the coefficients, there must be some mathematical caution with this numerical




Figure 1: Coefficient growth. The coefficient data (Pass 2) are fit to a simple model using from $\mu = 10$ to 29, inclusive. (Circled data excluded from fit.) The inset displays the residuals of the points used in the fit on $50\times$ scale.

exploration. The most straightforward technique is to fit the numerical values of the coefficients to a model with the simple criteria that it have as few parameters as possible and a built-in asymptote.

The model chosen here is the three-parameter exponential approach to the asymptote,

$$\ln |C_\mu| = a\mu + b(1 - e^{-c\mu}) \quad (30)$$

Some numerical values are excluded from the fit to avoid both the artificial down-turn at the high end and the non-smooth behavior in the low end. For the current set of data, using $10 \leq \mu \leq 29$ yields

$$\begin{cases} a = 2.185 \pm 0.013 \\ b = -27.81 \pm 0.57 \\ c = 0.07244 \pm 0.0013 \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

where the expected values and standard deviations are reported. This choice of model fits the data quite well and even extrapolates through the lower end as shown in Fig 1. The inset displays the residuals for the coefficients used in the fit. With these numbers,

$$S_{\text{cr}} = e^a = 8.89 \pm 0.12 = \underbrace{8.53 \text{ to } 9.25}_{6\sigma \text{ interval}} \quad (32)$$

Other simple models yield values anywhere between 7 and 9, but none as large as 10. Erring on the side of caution, conclude that the asymptotic series converges if S is at least 10. In hindsight, since $S_{\text{cr}} < 13$, this result is consistent with the fit parameters, Eq. (13), used to determine the coefficients.

Future

There is much room for future work. For example, it is tempting to search for yet higher-order coefficients and to study other eigenvalues of the regular polygon. Another direction is to establish more rigorous convergence criteria. Yet another higher goal is to establish an analytic form of $\lambda(S)$, not merely its asymptotic expansion.

Of note is that I am unable to extend the results to the ninth-order term (or higher). The natural extension of Eq. 25 might look like

$$0 = a_9 C_9 + [b_9 + c_9 j_{01}^2 + d_9 j_{01}^4 + e_9 j_{01}^6] \zeta(3)^3 + [f_9 + g_9 j_{01}^2 + h_9 j_{01}^4 + i_9 j_{01}^6] \zeta(9) \quad (33)$$

where the nine [small] integers $\{a_9, b_9, \dots, i_9\}$ must be determined – provided the Boady conjecture is somewhat valid. However, C_9 is computed here to *only* about 27 digits (Table 2), and the LLL routine does not suggest a unique solution as it does with the lower-order terms. The failure may be due to either a breakdown in the simple pattern or an insufficient precision for the LLL algorithm, or both.

Conclusion

This investigation of the asymptotic expansion of the fundamental Dirichlet eigenvalue of the Laplacian within the S -sided regular polygon leads to three original results:

1. independent and compelling numerical evidence in support of the GSB result,
2. a conjecture for the next two terms (seventh and eighth order), and
3. numerical evidence that the asymptotic series may converge only if $S \geq 10$.

These results are obtained using fifty-digit computed eigenvalues for S up to 150. Regression analysis of that data provides the evidence in support of the GSB result. The GSB result, together with an integer relation analysis of the numerical coefficients, leads to the conjecture for the next two terms with compelling numerical evidence supporting it. Looking further down the asymptotic series, a simple pattern (sign alternation and coefficient growth) emerged that suggests it may converge only if $S \geq 10$.

Appendix

Relation to the GSB result The S -sided regular polygon used by others [7, 3, 10, 4, 2] is typically *inscribed* in a unit-radius circle. Grinfeld and Strang use the term *transcribe* to refer to an area-preserving circle-to-polygon deformation. Although I don't deform a circle, the sequence ($S = 3, 4, 5, \dots$) of π -area regular polygons shall herein be referred to as *transcribed* regular polygons to distinguish them from *inscribed* polygons, both in relation to that unit-radius circle.

To distinguish the two problems, a prime is placed on the inscribed problem variables. Thus

$$A(S) = \pi \quad \text{and} \quad A'(S) = S \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{S}\right) \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{S}\right) \quad (34)$$

are, respectively, the transcribed and inscribed area of the S -sided regular polygon. Note that $A'(\infty) = \pi$, as required.

The area-rescaling relation for the eigenvalues is then either

$$\lambda(S) \pi = \lambda'(S) A'(S) \quad \text{or} \quad \widehat{\lambda}(S) \pi = \widehat{\lambda}'(S) A'(S) \quad (35)$$

assuming $\widehat{\lambda}(S)$ and $\widehat{\lambda}'(S)$ converge. By asymptotically expanding this, it is straightforward to show the relationship between the published GSB-result (inscribed) and my π -area (transcribed) result, as discussed around Eqs. 11.46 to 11.48 of the Boady thesis. The following, lightly-commented `maxima` [6] code will do that. Note that my `maxima` function `g(S)` is $\widehat{\lambda}^{[6]}(S)/j_{01}^2$ and variable `L` is j_{01}^2 .

```

/* g(S) , for pi-area regular polygon , to sixth order */
g(S):=1 + 4*zeta(3)/S^3 + (12-2*L)*zeta(5)/S^5
      + (8+4*L)*zeta(3)*zeta(3)/S^6;
/* Area of inscribed regular polygon divided by pi */
A(S):=(S/%pi)*cos(%pi/S)*sin(%pi/S);
/* expand out to sixth order in powers of 1/S */
expr:taylor(g(S)/A(S),S,inf,6);
/* Kludge to express in terms of zeta functions. */
expr:expr,[%pi^2=6*Z(2),%pi^4=90*Z(4),%pi^6=945*Z(6),
          zeta(3)=Z(3),zeta(5)=Z(5)];
/* The next line shows the GSB result , Boady thesis Eq. 11.46 */
collectterms(expand(ratsimp(expr)),S);

```

The transcribed and inscribed expressions are, respectively,

$$\widehat{\lambda}^{[6]}(S) = j_{01}^2 \left[1 + \frac{4\zeta(3)}{S^3} + \frac{(12 - 2j_{01}^2)\zeta(5)}{S^5} + \frac{(8 + 4j_{01}^2)\zeta^2(3)}{S^6} \right] \quad (36)$$

$$\widehat{\lambda}^{[6]'}(S) = j_{01}^2 \left[1 + \frac{4\zeta(2)}{S^2} + \frac{4\zeta(3)}{S^3} + \frac{28\zeta(4)}{S^4} + \frac{(12 - 2j_{01}^2)\zeta(5) + 16\zeta(2)\zeta(3)}{S^5} + \frac{(8 + 4j_{01}^2)\zeta^2(3) + 124\zeta(6)}{S^6} \right] \quad (37)$$

One thing to note is that terms with even zeta function arguments appear to be artifacts of the area dependence.

Relation to other eigenvalues

The focus of this report has been on the lowest eigenvalue. It is important to note that the asymptotic series may be readily modified for eigenvalues within the same symmetry class as the lowest one, i.e., those with S even lines of symmetry intersecting at the polygon center. Indeed, some of the other efforts were not limited to the lowest eigenvalue. The extension is made by simply replacing j_{01} with the appropriate Bessel function root. See, for example, the Casimir energy analysis by Oikonomou [10].

LLL procedure

Below is a lightly-commented Pari gp-calculator program that applies an LLL integer-relation algorithm to the five coefficients using the gp routine `qflll`.

```
{
  default(realprecision,100); \\ working precision, 100 digits
  L0= (solve(x=sqrt(5.7),sqrt(5.8),besselj(0,x)))^2; \\ j_{01}^2
  o = [3,5,6,7,8]; \\ vector of term orders
  t = [1,2,2,3,3]; \\ number of terms in RHS

  C = vector(#o); \\ numerical coefficients          order
  C[1] = 4.80822761263837714159895264604579996267; \\ 3
  C[2] = 0.44964098545032430901630041683027;      \\ 5
  C[3] = 44.98497175863112456004906966023;       \\ 6
  C[4] = -50.53932438813516438303806289079;      \\ 7
  C[5] = 200.87223780187035158705886400;         \\ 8

  \\ Choosing zeta functions {3,5,6=3+3,7,8=3+5}
  Z = [zeta(3), zeta(5), zeta(3)^2, zeta(7), zeta(3)*zeta(5)];

  for (i=1, #o, \\ loop over the five terms
    u = [C[i]]; \\ start off u-vector
    u = concat(u, Z[i]*vector(t[i], j, L0^(j-1)));
    N = #u;
    p = 30; \\ rounding parameter
    M = matid(N); \\ NxN identity matrix
    M[N,]=round(u*10^p); \\ put numbers in last row
    v = qflll(M)[,1]; \\ LLL routine, 1st col returned
    v = sign(v[1])*v; \\ make v[1] positive
```

```

    epsil = sum(j=1, #v, u[j]*v[j]); \\ ideally close to zero
    relerr= abs(epsil/C[i]); \\ relative error
    printf(" C_%d=%6.3f ", o[i], C[i]);
    printf(" relerr=%6.3g v=[%d", relerr , v[1]);
    for(j=1,t[i], printf(",%d", v[j+1])); printf("]\n");
  );
}

```

For reference, the output is

```

C_3= 4.808 relerr=8.11 e-38 v=[1,-4]
C_5= 0.450 relerr=1.48 e-30 v=[1,-12,2]
C_6=44.985 relerr=1.70 e-29 v=[1,-8,-4]
C_7=-50.539 relerr=4.53 e-30 v=[2,-72,24,1]
C_8=200.872 relerr=9.46 e-28 v=[1,-48,-8,-2]

```

which can be used to construct the coefficients displayed in Eq. (4), including the non-zero GSB terms.

Computed eigenvalues

The computed eigenvalues upon which this work relies are listed in Table 3. This data represents a several-month computation, from July 22 to November 5, 2017. The computer time required for each eigenvalue increased with S from a few seconds for $S=5$ to about 2.5 days at $S=150$.

Table 3: Computed fifty-digit Dirichlet eigenvalues of the Laplacian, per Eq. (1), for the π -area, S -sided regular polygon with S up to 150. By example, $\Lambda = 5.12\frac{59}{37}$ means $5.1237 < \lambda < 5.1256$. ϵ is the relative difference between upper and lower bounds. The first two eigenvalues are closed-form, and the last entry is the $S \rightarrow \infty$ circle eigenvalue.

S	Λ	$\epsilon (\times 10^{-51})$
3	$7.255197456936871402376313030568622929136264992370962 \dots = 4\pi/\sqrt{3}$	
4	$6.283185307179586476925286766559005768394338798750211 \dots = 2\pi$	
5	$6.02213793204263387829800871005424296700530534044855\frac{88}{18}$	1.14
6	$5.9174178316136612156885745768389615450082860040929\frac{721}{266}$	7.67
7	$5.8664493126559858577124749417588410842427349136980\frac{702}{495}$	3.52
8	$5.8384914335924428505166403795638157848367571520259\frac{684}{419}$	4.52
9	$5.821826802270265731735546443716945921671786764620\frac{6082}{5822}$	4.46
10	$5.8112603592191160227888164688111646234421581749002\frac{717}{159}$	9.59
11	$5.8042306367174007218783944528561768184219904268906\frac{603}{187}$	7.15
12	$5.7993698043565000793150253110077586111011868022191\frac{607}{300}$	5.27
13	$5.7959002668560147097907710633371318342893868231820\frac{486}{260}$	3.88
14	$5.793357005271194553273227078683828691973872008926\frac{8251}{7934}$	5.45
15	$5.791450010651579975693848498149681163522889425220\frac{2343}{1931}$	7.09

<<< Continued >>>

S	Λ	$\epsilon (\times 10^{-51})$
16	5.7899918999902085343497522138280801741824641952139 ⁹¹⁰ ₄₀₅	8.70
17	5.7888578719811046986171966351899455269041934747495 ⁴⁶³ ₁₁₀	6.07
18	5.7879625918578468642125683801538930922402544098186 ⁴⁴³ ₀₃₂	7.08
19	5.787246351381961243008036644834744747679263989712 ⁶³⁰⁷ ₅₈₄₃	8.01
20	5.7866665141403722135309129620257370578364779208083 ⁸⁰² ₂₉₀	8.84
21	5.7861920775968442730282037573295124400580514989647 ⁵⁹⁴ ₀₄₀	9.56
22	5.7858001294283650275745860443434083658465152450013 ⁵²¹ ₁₂₆	6.81
23	5.7854734864549016320482640701967564443197042731253 ⁷²⁹ ₄₄₁	4.96
24	5.785199089790024091834463612979690633039598488051 ⁸³²² ₇₈₇₈	7.66
25	5.7849668941304235014186706838851226120341859263223 ⁹⁶⁵ ₅₀₂	7.98
26	5.7847690863148429779922747176926528381622936339967 ⁴⁴⁵ ₁₀₄	5.88
27	5.7845995272364846405932228271557722785394731147071 ⁶⁴⁰ ₁₅₁	8.44
28	5.7844533477517199511967948423990305225015801633632 ⁸¹² ₄₄₈	6.28
29	5.784326652365411207380293385946299260682128920466 ⁵³⁴⁹ ₄₈₄₆	8.68
30	5.784216299392264044119036734072080273019850029152 ¹⁰⁷¹ ₀₆₉₃	6.53
31	5.784119736080032703344528384598811278461255613439 ³⁰⁹⁵ ₂₅₈₈	8.75
32	5.784034873702444318330507486930290862975888102019 ³²⁵³ ₂₈₆₇	6.65
33	5.783959992040508812335032522628621979446533803257 ²¹⁴⁰ ₁₆₃₇	8.69
34	5.7838936656948092520334765687133149515574394886548 ⁹¹⁰ ₄₁₀	8.62
35	5.7838347067709882028407000052233665412473857264158 ⁶¹² ₂₂₇	6.64
36	5.783782119955880627699919965851270952506815797405 ⁸²⁸⁸ ₇₈₀₀	8.42
37	5.783735067049846291962440636524259616676854699958 ³³⁴⁵ ₂₈₆₄	8.30
38	5.7836928387732922677065179222622535502538886661416 ⁹³⁴ ₄₆₁	8.16
39	5.7836548322108711433862079109147809210199222742790 ⁵⁵¹ ₀₈₇	8.02
40	5.783620532655973576951368558889088191821701701593 ⁵³⁹⁸ ₄₉₄₂	7.87
41	5.783589498912728857243541087541613440608196223660 ²²³³ ₁₆₈₁	9.53
42	5.783561351331960679963744950469531484077839530288 ⁶⁵³³ ₅₉₉₅	9.29
43	5.7835357620219719712774467620660707772186262259777 ⁸⁹⁵ ₃₇₂	9.04
44	5.783512446799268033474803357987667934572313002680 ⁷³¹⁷ ₆₈₀₈	8.79
45	5.783491158538856302913858878804287379136291682036 ⁶¹⁴³ ₅₆₄₇	8.55
46	5.7834716816561681101051372252375789382247863870892 ⁵⁹⁵ ₁₁₃	8.31
47	5.783453827508463297379645913916576075154358289917 ³¹⁵⁵ ₂₅₉₂	9.72
48	5.7834374305468654192506360647558848068434756772524 ⁶⁴⁵ ₁₀₀	9.41

<<< Continued >>>

S	Λ	$\epsilon (\times 10^{-51})$
49	5.783422345083940177286945516586288853576803572305 ¹³⁶⁵ ₀₈₃₈	9.11
50	5.7834084425682129947801161963236469590292923516017 ⁸⁵⁴ ₃₄₃	8.82
51	5.7833956092779034421663981399445418601302161224952 ⁸⁹³ ₃₉₉	8.53
52	5.7833837443627027000195590153219733045460685739016 ⁷⁴² ₁₇₇	9.76
53	5.7833727581755982440480496612883417072850762249903 ⁷⁰⁶ ₁₆₀	9.42
54	5.7833625708472927428973141440030573413552170062 ⁹⁰⁰⁴⁷³ ₈₉₉₉₄₇	9.09
55	5.783353111064236385644810842163192250719443038200 ⁶⁰⁹³ ₅₅₈₅	8.77
56	5.78334431501812935463844781588756191043588875765 ⁴⁰⁴²⁷ ₃₉₈₅₄	9.89
57	5.7833361255002921030903693546648597586536448335457 ⁶¹⁸ ₀₆₆	9.53
58	5.7833284911188091539136722748217426193090792309470 ⁸⁴⁵ ₃₁₃	9.18
59	5.7833213656200338537379396114645869789760826156081 ⁷⁹⁴ ₂₈₂	8.84
60	5.783314707299059428210797800183990949668498895119 ⁶³⁴⁵ ₅₇₇₄	9.86
61	5.783308478486244250571058736219661811034316213866 ³¹¹³ ₂₅₆₄	9.48
62	5.7833026450989284101703805978440170235282052458579 ⁵³¹ ₀₀₂	9.13
63	5.783297176249175699422050587208076227946408600731 ⁷³⁶⁵ ₆₈₅₆	8.79
64	5.7832920438997850274611258286193147488559177241149 ⁹²⁵ ₃₆₄	9.70
65	5.783287222561990216101379318958387384571634250267 ³²¹⁵ ₂₆₇₅	9.32
66	5.7832826890292492111478490456613641227808808137750 ⁷³² ₂₁₂	8.97
67	5.783278422142346980297970170232395388356378905112 ¹⁴⁷⁰ ₀₉₀₀	9.83
68	5.783274402581728387648667336549538768975499369192 ⁶³¹⁹ ₅₇₇₁	9.45
69	5.7832706126835606254665067931060003616486874965111 ⁵⁵⁴ ₀₂₈	9.08
70	5.783267036276517720104953505291690754885783103053 ³⁴³⁸ ₂₈₆₅	9.89
71	5.7832636585366972675053570571575828141496986506519 ⁹¹⁶ ₃₆₆	9.50
72	5.7832604658584342703907945644030276005726248720419 ⁵⁷⁶ ₀₄₆	9.14
73	5.7832574457390789460408703608938752178996635604860 ⁵⁷⁷ ₀₀₄	9.90
74	5.7832545866760630843215845592704878980855033362418 ⁸⁰⁸ ₂₅₇	9.51
75	5.7832518780747999519072844129240886957218156591922 ⁶⁷⁰ ₁₄₁	9.14
76	5.7832493101661516716346291929211527006058362175622 ⁹⁴⁵ ₃₇₄	9.85
77	5.7832468739323602985306185231341800220529994071590 ⁶³⁹ ₁₅₀	8.45
78	5.783244561040478512305563118717910086346504177634 ⁶⁴⁷² ₅₉₄₅	9.09
79	5.7832423637824563386561208792114744191451563621838 ⁷⁰³ ₁₃₇	9.76
80	5.7832402750211444434602632903336057637956537641100 ⁷³³ ₂₄₆	8.41
81	5.783238288141564708788818913744019150004231228987 ⁶⁰²⁷ ₅₅₀₄	9.01

<<< Continued >>>

S	Λ	$\epsilon (\times 10^{-51})$
82	5.7832363970068770166311668301521069133506020689353 ⁸⁴⁴ ₂₈₅	9.64
83	5.78323459591853914193516915928294052374939682204 ³⁰⁰⁸² ₂₉₅₉₉	8.34
84	5.78323287958021583661957400684452483337094433777 ⁸⁰¹¹¹ ₇₉₅₃₉	9.87
85	5.783231243065044797761869159688729531153474161960 ⁸⁴²⁵ ₇₉₂₉	8.57
86	5.7832296817859122999872941895330211636707297244341 ⁸⁰³ ₂₇₅	9.12
87	5.7832281914684307238009975309857996746289319161078 ⁹¹⁸ ₃₅₆	9.69
88	5.783226768126344787904121271120141989640291161915 ⁸⁰⁸⁹ ₇₆₀₀	8.44
89	5.783225408039123644386441987435525040163562180818 ³²⁴⁹ ₂₇₃₀	8.96
90	5.783224107731522678222767981643965415039391863402 ⁵⁴⁴³ ₄₈₉₃	9.49
91	5.783222863954922345132559440101223356983832893756 ⁴⁴⁴⁶ ₃₉₁₇	9.12
92	5.783221673670272096140477542110521995453407740228 ⁷³⁸⁸ ₆₈₇₉	8.78
93	5.7832205340324857277389860275897345239229247945415 ⁶⁷⁵ ₁₃₈	9.27
94	5.7832194423761506695184080213013434106581037042669 ⁶⁰⁰ ₀₃₃	9.78
95	5.7832183962024280411626163932933568556831624568013 ⁹⁷⁸ ₄₃₃	9.41
96	5.783217393167033007010852241398377430861882282949 ²³²⁷ ₁₇₅₃	9.90
97	5.783216431069196227758518741530320098257066954853 ⁸²⁷⁰ ₇₇₆₅	8.71
98	5.783215507841517228010683796245184675675966031085 ⁸¹²⁸ ₇₅₉₇	9.16
99	5.783214621540629415561788196159738903682817178900 ⁴¹¹⁸ ₃₅₆₀	9.62
100	5.783213770338604434367144876070106403216402193565 ⁴³⁶⁴ ₃₈₂₇	9.26
101	5.7832129525150306224265566440583980748230299905146 ⁵³⁴ ₀₁₈	8.91
102	5.783212166449706678032327479127825448347817055273 ¹¹⁸⁰ ₀₆₃₉	9.34
103	5.783211410615897300382237922986464486484414973146 ³⁴⁴⁶ ₂₈₈₀	9.78
104	5.783210683574102639949628780569819360526210833755 ⁸⁰⁶² ₇₅₆₀	8.66
105	5.783209983966297937380176592129591988164382058292 ³²⁹³ ₂₇₂₃	9.84
106	5.783209310510603806034215145692410082844657773366 ⁶³⁰⁰ ₅₇₉₄	8.72
107	5.7832086619963512745011282308896272842754873361699 ⁷⁷¹ ₂₄₃	9.11
108	5.7832080372795089971773313237835737211106455961164 ⁹⁸⁸ ₄₃₇	9.51
109	5.7832074352784430036203824301621058164531928714376 ⁶⁵² ₀₇₇	9.92
110	5.783206854969982026448346069044505432273217666833 ¹⁰⁸¹ ₀₅₆₉	8.82
111	5.783206295385763854495868384691346982424634552152 ¹³⁸² ₀₈₅₀	9.19
112	5.783205755608840330598899278697864669617886870683 ⁴¹⁹⁸ ₃₆₄₄	9.57
113	5.7832052347705205764174624901385415125593493624890 ⁸⁵⁶ ₂₈₀	9.95
114	5.7832047320474338019919255227789909098567095792232 ⁸⁶² ₃₄₇	8.88

<<< Continued >>>

S	Λ	$\epsilon (\times 10^{-51})$
115	5.7832042466587946646835703161902916564434900898372 ⁵⁷⁸ ₀₀₂	9.95
116	5.783203777863855598037977272725438352252698382214 ⁶⁴⁰³ ₅₈₈₈	8.89
117	5.78320332495953185129119383617831568697480390758 ³⁰³¹⁵ ₂₉₇₈₀	9.23
118	5.7832028872781861783972732175519624981091930701562 ⁵⁷⁴ ₀₁₉	9.58
119	5.7832024641855612037927177369523705379144297168954 ⁵⁹² ₀₁₇	9.93
120	5.7832020550788484815190743450796360573620493874627 ⁷¹⁰ ₁₅₆	9.57
121	5.783201659384884164529487670253652645264573710311 ⁴²⁵⁸ ₃₇₂₄	9.22
122	5.7832012765584620207102095560653892586849534945666 ⁹⁷⁹ ₄₂₆	9.55
123	5.783200906080755279143481813903136517206041981035 ³³⁸⁶ ₂₈₁₄	9.87
124	5.783200547457839471403393668939526347739671446805 ¹⁰⁰⁴ ₀₄₅₂	9.52
125	5.7832002002193090544707614611862501293189148764360 ⁷⁵⁴ ₁₈₄	9.84
126	5.783199863916981169795599727550027796605983950656 ⁵⁴⁴⁴ ₄₈₉₄	9.48
127	5.783199538123680412174552013868591251347340966166 ⁶⁰³⁵ ₅₅₀₅	9.15
128	5.783199222432098956985238320133014718214303003483 ⁵³⁴⁰ ₄₇₉₃	9.44
129	5.783198916453726829015452454213861349980377100531 ³²⁹⁷ ₂₇₃₃	9.74
130	5.783198619817847494322697718282907407501883505901 ³³⁷⁹ ₂₈₃₅	9.40
131	5.783198332170594321576460839361900033150683319289 ³²⁸³ ₂₇₅₈	9.07
132	5.783198053174063794165401631077445539852104232715 ⁸³²⁵ ₇₇₄₇	9.98
133	5.7831977825054816616973973974236090228425636259915 ⁷⁸³ ₂₂₅	9.63
134	5.783197519856418501824964777729256102794211740624 ⁶⁰³⁴ ₅₄₆₀	9.91
135	5.78319726493205142280133747938195184354472751162 ⁴⁰³⁰⁰ ₃₉₇₈₁	8.97
136	5.783197017450468875813125929970793135181216310333 ²²⁰⁸ ₁₆₇₃	9.23
137	5.7831967771420157657553791022485248591356074629077 ⁷⁷⁹ ₂₂₈	9.50
138	5.783196543748676251355969965179691633199779643683 ³²³⁰ ₂₆₉₉	9.17
139	5.78319631702349181190803820593767295255592560127 ¹⁰⁴⁶⁶ ₀₉₉₁₉	9.43
140	5.7831960967300123296839310805154072611401163978360 ⁷⁷⁶ ₂₁₅	9.69
141	5.7831958826417780956100870897864370536602334172115 ⁵⁹³ ₀₁₆	9.95
142	5.78319567454183079209634447072860419375002513070 ²⁰⁰⁰¹ ₁₉₄₇₇	9.03
143	5.783195472222516420511547774247258923709033792146 ⁷⁰⁵ ₁₃₄	9.86
144	5.783195275483725038000991945505785473982967396266 ⁵³⁸¹ ₄₈₂₉	9.52
145	5.783195084135126080710376077178119900703268965184 ⁸⁰²⁵ ₇₄₉₂	9.20
146	5.783194897993130563536383404875214594259743023232 ⁷⁵⁴⁰ ₆₉₉₃	9.43
147	5.7831947168818460376488389106165087799453564413638 ⁸⁷⁸ ₃₁₈	9.67

<<< Continued >>>

S	Λ	$\epsilon (\times 10^{-51})$
148	5.78319454063246268484401771071146302825917616988 $\frac{20197}{19656}$	9.34
149	5.7831943690829228095596336817453011340629123532482 $\frac{985}{431}$	9.57
150	5.7831942020776078403959106662108900488674959487428 $\frac{954}{386}$	9.80
∞	5.783185962946784521175995758455807035071441806423685 $\dots = j_{01}^2$	

References

- [1] P. Antunes and P. Freitas. New bounds for the principal Dirichlet eigenvalue of planar regions. *Experimental Mathematics*, 15:333–342, 2006.
- [2] Mark Boady. *Applications of Symbolic Computation to the Calculus of Moving Surfaces*. PhD thesis, Drexel University, Philadelphia, PA, 2015.
- [3] P. Grinfeld and G. Strang. The Laplacian eigenvalues of a polygon. *Computers and Mathematics with Applications*, 48:1121–1133, 2004.
- [4] P. Grinfeld and G. Strang. Laplace eigenvalues on regular polygons: A series in $1/N$. *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 385:135–149, 2012.
- [5] Robert Stephen Jones. Computing ultra-precise eigenvalues of the Laplacian within polygons. *Advances in Computational Mathematics*, May 2017.
- [6] Maxima. *Maxima, a Computer Algebra System. Version 5.32*. <http://maxima.sourceforge.net/>, 2017.
- [7] Luca Molinari. On the ground state of regular polygonal billiards. *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.*, 30(18):6517–6424, 1997.
- [8] N. W. Murray. The polygon-circle paradox and convergence in thin plate theory. *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, 73(1):279282, 1973.
- [9] Carlo Nitsch. On the first Dirichlet Laplacian eigenvalue of regular polygons. *Kodai Mathematical Journal*, 37:595–607, 2014. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.6709>.
- [10] V. K. Oikonomou. Casimir energy for a regular polygon with Dirichlet boundaries. 2010. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1012.5376>.
- [11] The PARI Group, Univ. Bordeaux. *PARI/GP version 2.9.3*, 2017. Available online <http://pari.math.u-bordeaux.fr/>.