MEAN FIELD APPROXIMATIONS TO CONVEX HONEYCOMBS

GÁBOR DOMOKOS AND ZSOLT LÁNGI

Abstract. In a convex mosaic in $\mathbb{R}^3$ we denote the average number of vertices of a cell by $\bar{v}$ and the average number of cells meeting at a node by $\bar{n}$. While there is no known formula prohibiting points in any range of the $[\bar{n}, \bar{v}]$ plane (except for the unphysical $\bar{n}, \bar{v} \leq 4$ stripes), still, if we plot the 28 points corresponding to convex uniform honeycombs, the 28 points corresponding to their duals and the 3 points corresponding to Poisson-Voronoi, Poisson-Delaunay and random hyperplane mosaics, then these points appear to accumulate in the vicinity of a curve. Our construction of an average cell leads to a mean field formula which provides a good approximation to that curve. We call this approximation the (virtual or real) Platonic mosaic associated to the geometric mosaic and we introduce the harmonic degree $\bar{h} = \bar{n}\bar{v}/(\bar{n} + \bar{v})$ of a mosaic to measure the error of our approximation. We also show that the harmonic degree has deeper geometric interpretations. In particular, in case of Euclidean mosaics it is related to the average of the sum of vertex angles and their polars, and in case of 2D mosaics, it is related to the average excess angle.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Definition and brief history of mosaics. A $d$-dimensional mosaic $\mathcal{M}$ is a countable system of compact domains in $\mathbb{R}^d$, with nonempty interiors, that cover the whole space and have pairwise no common interior points [9]. We call a mosaic convex if these domains are convex and in this case all domains are convex polytopes [9, Lemma 10.1.1]. In this paper we deal only with convex mosaics. We call these polytopes the cells of the mosaic, and the faces, edges and vertices of the cells the faces, edges and nodes of the mosaic, respectively. A cell having $v$ vertices is called a cell of degree $v$, and a node which is the vertex of $n$ cells is called a node of degree $n$. Our prime focus is to determine how average values of these quantities, denoted by $\bar{v}$ and $\bar{n}$, respectively, depend on each other. We remark that for planar regular mosaics, the pair $\{\bar{v}, \bar{n}\}$ is called the Schl"afli symbol of the mosaic. These, and closely related global averages have been studied before and proved to be powerful tools in the geometric study of mosaics: in [7] the planar isoperimetric problem restricted to convex polygons with $v < 6$ vertices is resolved using these quantities.

Our main focus will be face-to-face mosaics, in which each face of the mosaic (that is, each face of any cell of the mosaic) is the face of exactly two cells. Unless stated otherwise, any mosaic discussed in our paper will be a convex face-to-face mosaic and we will only discuss non face-to-face mosaics in Subsection 5.2. Furthermore, we assume that the set of the diameters of the cells of a mosaic is bounded from above, and their volumes are bounded from below by a positive constant. This implies, in particular, that the volumes of the cells are bounded from above, and that the mosaic is locally finite; that is, each point of space belongs to finitely many cells. We note that a precise definition of $\bar{v}$ and $\bar{n}$ can be obtained in the usual way, that is, by taking the limit of the average degrees of cells/nodes contained in a large ball whose radius tends to infinity. Here, we always tacitly assume that these limits exist.

Geometric intuition suggests that $\bar{v}$ and $\bar{n}$ should have an inverse-type relationship: more polytopes meeting at a node implies smaller internal angles in the polytopes, which, in turn, suggests a smaller number of vertices for each polytope. To be able to verify this intuition we introduce

Definition 1. The harmonic degree of a mosaic $\mathcal{M}$ is defined as

\[ \bar{h}(\mathcal{M}) = \frac{\bar{n}(\mathcal{M})\bar{v}(\mathcal{M})}{\bar{n}(\mathcal{M}) + \bar{v}(\mathcal{M})}, \]

where $\bar{v}(\mathcal{M})$, $\bar{n}(\mathcal{M})$ denote the average vertex and nodal degrees of $\mathcal{M}$, respectively.

The variation of the harmonic degree $\bar{h}$ (computed on an ensemble of mosaics) may serve as a measure of how good our intuition was: a constant value of $\bar{h}$ describes an exact inverse-type relationship while small variation of $\bar{h}$ still indicates
that our intuitive approach is, to some extent, justified. To describe a deeper, geometric meaning of the harmonic degree we introduce

**Definition 2.** Let $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a mosaic, $C$ be a cell of $\mathcal{M}$ and $p$ be a vertex of $C$. Then the total angle $\Omega(C,p)$ of the pair $(C,p)$ is the sum of the internal and external angles of $C$ at $p$; the former defined as the surface area of the spherical convex hull of the unit tangent vectors of the edges of $C$ at $p$, the latter defined as the surface area of the set of the outer unit normal vectors of $C$ at $p$. The average total angle $\overline{\Omega}(\mathcal{M})$ associated with the mosaic $\mathcal{M}$ is defined as the average of $\Omega(C,p)$, taken over all pairs $(C,p)$ in $\mathcal{M}$.

Although $\bar{h}$ appears to be a combinatorial property and $\overline{\Omega}$ appears to be a metric property of the mosaic, nevertheless, they are closely linked, which is expressed in

**Theorem 1.** Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a convex, face-to-face mosaic in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $S_{d-1}$ denote the surface area of the $d$-dimensional unit sphere. Then we have

$$\bar{h}(\mathcal{M})\overline{\Omega}(\mathcal{M}) = S_{d-1}.$$ 

We will prove Theorem 1 in Subsection 3.1 and in Subsection 4.2 we extend it to 2-dimensional spherical mosaics. Since there is no natural definition of average for hyperbolic mosaics (cf. also Subsection 4.2), Theorem 1 cannot be extended to mosaics in hyperbolic planes. While $\Omega(p) = \pi$ is constant in $d = 2$ dimensions for Euclidean mosaics (implying, via Theorem 1 constant value for the harmonic degree $\bar{h}$) however, if $d > 2$ then $\Omega(p)$ may vary, so our original intuition appears to become ambiguous for $d > 2$ and the variation of $\bar{h}$ will serve as an indicator of this ambiguity.

In one dimension ($d = 1$) we have $v = n = 2$ for each cell and vertex and thus, trivially $\bar{h} = 1$ for all mosaics. In two dimensions one can have cells and nodes of various degrees, nonetheless, it is known [9, Theorem 10.1.6] that for all convex mosaics $\bar{h} = 2$.

The situation in $d = 3$ dimensions appears, at least at first sight, to be radically different. Schneider and Weil [9] provide the general equations governing 3D random mosaics. In Section 2 we present an elementary proof that the same governing equations hold for any convex mosaic under some simple finiteness condition. These equations have three variable parameters. We also show that, beyond the trivial inequalities $\bar{v}, \bar{n} \geq 4$ these formulae do not yield additional constraints on $\bar{n}, \bar{v}$ suggesting that in the $[\bar{n}, \bar{v}]$ plane, except for the unphysical domains characterized by $\bar{n}, \bar{v} < 4$, we might expect to see mosaics anywhere. However, this is not the case if we look at the best known mosaics: uniform honeycombs. The latter are a special class of convex mosaics where cells are congruent, uniform polyhedra and all nodes are identical under translation. The quest to find all such uniform honeycombs started with Plato [8] who claimed that the five regular polyhedra (also known as Platonic solids) fill space without gaps, forming the four fundamental substances: earth, air, fire and water, and the fifth solid (the dodecahedron) is the building block of the cosmos. Rather soon it appeared that Plato’s views may have been flawed. Aristotle claimed that only the cube and the tetrahedron fill space without gaps. The latter statement is incorrect if it refers to the regular tetrahedron, however, there exist space-filling tetrahedral honeycombs [8]. Plato’s idea was resurrected in the study of non-Euclidean mosaics [3] where, by choosing suitable sign for the
curvature, all Platonic solids fill space. We will discuss these mosaics in Subsections 4.2 and 4.1 and show that for 2D mosaics on the sphere the harmonic degree only differs from the (suitably averaged) angle excess by a constant.

Our main target is nevertheless Euclidean space which imposes strict constraints on the geometry of mosaics and our goal is to explain how, under these constraints, some part of the Platonic idea may be salvaged and also serve the understanding of Euclidean mosaics. The list of all possible convex uniform honeycombs was completed only recently by Johnson [6] who described 28 such mosaics (for more details on the 28 uniform honeycombs see [5, 2] and more details on the history see [8]). To provide the complete list of these 28 honeycombs has been a major result in discrete geometry. If these mosaics were spread out on the \([\bar{n}, \bar{v}]\) plane, that would certainly imply that the associated values of the harmonic degree \(\bar{h}\) cover a very broad range. However, this is not the case: all values of \(\bar{h}\) are in the range \(3.31 \leq \bar{h} \leq 4\). In addition, we also computed the values of \(\bar{h}\) associated with the 28 dual mosaics, hyperplane random mosaics, the Poisson-Voronoi and Poisson-Delaunay random mosaics and found that for the total of all the 60 mosaics the range is the same. The indicated narrow range for the harmonic degree implies that on the \([\bar{n}, \bar{v}]\) plane the points corresponding to these mosaics appear to accumulate on a narrow stripe (cf. Figure 1).

Remark 1. If, instead of using the \([\bar{n}, \bar{v}]\) plane we plotted the same mosaics on the \([\bar{h}, \bar{Ω}]\) plane then, according to Theorem 1, all points would lie on a segment of the hyperbola \(\bar{h}\bar{Ω} = 4\pi\). What the endpoints of this segment are and whether or not the set of all 3D convex mosaics is a dense subset of this segment is certainly not clear. We will ask related questions in Section 5.

1.2. Platonic approximation of mosaics: the main results. Our goal is to give a heuristic explanation for this narrow range by using suitable mean-field approximations which we will call (real or virtual) Platonic mosaics associated to geometric mosaics.

A cell in a \(d\)-dimensional mosaic \(M\) is characterized by \(d\) integers \(m_i\) \((i = 0, 1, 2 \ldots d - 1)\) defining the numbers of \(i\)-dimensional faces. We will refer to these scalars as the cell descriptors.

Remark 2. Our choice of cell descriptors is, of course, arbitrary. For example, we did not include overall descriptors such as elongation, the isoperimetric ratio or the average of angles. Our choice was motivated by the mean field model we intend to construct.

In a random mosaic the cell descriptors associated with a typical cell [9] are \(d\) random variables corresponding the aforementioned scalars. Motivated by this we introduce

Definition 3. The average cell of a \(d\)-dimensional mosaic \(M\) is a geometric model using the \(d\) average values \(\bar{m}_i, i = 0, 1, \ldots d - 1\) of cell descriptors associated with \(M\) as cell descriptors and the assumption that all angles between \(i\)-dimensional faces are equal. If the descriptors \(\bar{m}_i\) are identical to the descriptors of a \(d\)-dimensional regular polytope then we call the average cell real, otherwise we call it a virtual cell. We will refer to the (real or virtual) mosaic composed of the average cell as a
Platonic mosaic associated with $\mathcal{M}$ and we denote it by $P(\mathcal{M})$. We call a Platonic mosaic real if the average cell is real and it fills space without gaps.

We may regard the associated Platonic mosaic $P(\mathcal{M})$ as a mean-field approximation of $\mathcal{M}$.

**Remark 3.** Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a mosaic in 2D and let $P(\mathcal{M})$ be its platonic approximation. The average cell of $\mathcal{M}$ will be real if and only if $\bar{v}(\mathcal{M})$ is an integer and $P(\mathcal{M})$ will be real if and only if $\bar{v}(\mathcal{M}) \in \{3, 4, 6\}$. This follows from the fact that the only polygons filling the Euclidean plane are the regular triangle, the square and the hexagon.

**Remark 4.** Let $\mathcal{M}$ be a mosaic in 3D and $P(\mathcal{M})$ its platonic approximation. The average cell of $\mathcal{M}$ will be real if and only if 

$$(\bar{v}(\mathcal{M}), \bar{f}(\mathcal{M})) \in \{(4, 4), (6, 8), (8, 6), (12, 20), (20, 12)\}$$

and $P(\mathcal{M})$ we be real if and only if $(\bar{v}(\mathcal{M}), \bar{f}(\mathcal{M})) = (8, 6)$ and in this case $P(\mathcal{M})$ will be the cubic grid. This follows from the fact that the only space-filling platonic solid is the cube.

Our key observation is the following
Remark 5. While virtual cells do not admit the global construction of a polytope, they still might admit the computation of vertex angles and nodal angles. We will denote all quantities computed based on the average cell by ˆ().

Using this concept we immediately have a heuristic argument supporting the ¯h = 2 result for planar mosaics. To construct the average cell in d = 2 dimensions we just need the average number ¯v of vertices; for the angles we use the fact that they are constant in the average cell. Now we can construct the average cell as a polygon with ¯v vertices. If ¯v is an integer then the average cell is real because it can be realized as a regular polygon with internal angles α = π(¯v - 2)/¯v. However, if ¯v is not an integer this formula still yields an angle. Next we construct a virtual node to compute the approximation ˆn for the nodal degree ¯n as ˆn = 2π/α = 2¯v/(¯v − 2).

Substituting this into (1) yields ¯h = 2. While this is certainly a heuristic argument, it happens to provide the exact harmonic degree for all convex mosaics in the plane. We certainly do not expect this construction to be exact for all mosaics, nevertheless, the above examples suggest that it may serve as a useful approximation. In d = 3 dimensions we have 2 independent integer-type cell descriptors: the number v of vertices and the number f of faces with averages ¯v, ¯f and the main result of our paper concerns this case:

Theorem 2. In d = 3 dimensions, the average cell yields the following approximation ˆn for the nodal degree based on the cell descriptors ¯v, ¯f:

\[
\hat{n}(\bar{v}, \bar{f}) = \frac{2\pi \bar{v}}{2(\bar{v} + \bar{f} - 2) \arcsin \left( \frac{\cos \left( \frac{\pi(\bar{v} + f - 2)}{2(\bar{v} + f - 2)} \right)}{\cos \left( \frac{\pi(\bar{v} - 2)}{2(\bar{v} + f - 2)} \right)} \right) - (\bar{f} - 2)\pi}
\]

The formula of Theorem 2 can also be applied to compute the Platonic counterpart ˆh of the harmonic degree, defined as:

\[
\hat{h} = \frac{\hat{n} \bar{v}}{\hat{n} + \bar{v}}
\]

We computed the values of ˆh associated with all the examined 60 mosaics. For better comparison, with the original values we introduce the error term

\[
e = |\hat{h} - \bar{h}|/\bar{h}
\]

based on which we can formulate

Theorem 3. In case of the 28 uniform honeycombs, their duals, hyperplane mosaics, Poisson-Voronoi mosaics and Poisson-Delaunay mosaics we have an average error e_{average} ≤ 2% and a maximal error e_{max} ≤ 11%.

Remark 6. The average cell also yields an approximation ˆΩ for the average of the total angle Ω. In general, ˆh ≠ h, ˆΩ ≠ Ω, nevertheless, due to the geometric model based on the average cell, we always have

\[
\bar{h}\Omega = \hat{h}\hat{\Omega} = 4\pi,
\]

so, at least in this sense, Platonic approximations are exact.

We provide the general formulae governing 3D mosaics in Section 2. Next, we prove Theorems 1, 2 and 3 in Section 3 (the latter is proved by the explicit
computation of all values of $\bar{h}$ and $\hat{h}$, summarized in Table 1. Section 4 discusses non-Euclidean mosaics in $d = 2$ and $d = 3$ dimensions. In Section 5 we discuss non face-to-face mosaics, pose questions related to hyperplane mosaics and draw conclusions.

2. General formulae defining 3D mosaics

In [9], for any $0 \leq i, j \leq d$ and for any random mosaic $M$ in the $d$-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$, the quantity $n_{ij}$ is defined as the number of $j$-faces of a typical $i$-face of $M$ if $j \geq i$, and as the number of $i$ faces containing a typical $i$-face of $M$ if $j > i$. Relations between these quantities are described in [9, Theorem 10.1.6] for the case $d = 2$, and in [9, Theorem 10.1.7] for the case $d = 3$. Here we use elementary, combinatorial arguments to show that these relations hold for any convex mosaic in $\mathbb{R}^3$.

Throughout this section, let $M$ be a convex, face-to-face mosaic in $\mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying the conditions in the introduction. Then we may define $n_{ij}(M)$ as the average number of $j$-faces contained in or containing a given $i$-face, if $j \leq i$ or $j > i$, respectively. If it is clear which convex mosaic $M$ we refer to, for brevity we may use the notation $n_{ij} = n_{ij}(M)$. Here we assume that the average of any $n_{ij}$, for all values of $i$ and $j$ exists, and note that by our conditions for $M$, for any $i$ and $j$, the number of $j$-faces containing a given $i$-face $F$ (or being contained in it) is bounded from above by a constant independent of $F$.

Theorem 4. For any convex mosaic $M$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying the conditions in the previous paragraph, we have

\[
[n_{ij}(M)] = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & \frac{(f-2)n}{v} + 2 & \frac{(f-2)n}{v} + n \\
\frac{2}{f} + 2 & \frac{2(v-2)}{f} + 2 & 1 \\
\frac{2v}{f} + 2 & \frac{2v}{f} + 2 & 2 \\
v + f - 2 & v + f - 2 & f + 1
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where $v = n_{30}$, $f = n_{32}$ and $n = n_{03}$.

Proof. Clearly, $n_{ii} = 1$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$, and since each face belongs to exactly two cells, and each edge has exactly two endpoints, we have $n_{23} = n_{10} = 2$. The formula $n_{31} = v + f - 2$ follows from applying Euler’s formula for each cell of $M$, and observing that then the same formula holds for the average numbers of faces, edges and vertices of a cell.

Let $r$ be sufficiently large, and let $B_r$ be the Euclidean ball, centered at the origin $o$ and with radius $o$. Let $N_v(r), N_e(r), N_f(r)$ and $N_c(r)$ denote the number of vertices, edges, faces and cells of $M$ in $B_r$, respectively.

Note that if $r$ is sufficiently large, the sum of the numbers of edges of all faces in $B_r$ is approximately $N_f(r)n_{21}$, and since almost all face in $B_r$ belongs to exactly two cells in $B_r$, and each edge of a given cell belongs to exactly two faces of the cell, we have that this quantity is approximately equal to $N_e(r)n_{31}$. On the other hand, the sum of the numbers of faces the cells in $B_r$ have is approximately $N_e(r)f \approx 2N_f(r)$. More specifically, we have

\[
\frac{f}{2} = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{N_f(r)}{N_e(r)} = \frac{n_{31}}{n_{21}},
\]
which readily yields that \(n_{21} = n_{20} = \frac{2(v+f-2)}{f}\).

Note that the number of cell-vertex incidences in \(B_r\) is approximately \(N_v(r)n \approx N_v(r)n\). Furthermore, for any incident cell-vertex pair \(C, v\), the number of faces that contain the vertex and is contained in the cell is equal to the number of edges with the same property. Let us denote this common number by \(\text{deg}_v(C)\), which then denotes the degree of the vertex \(v\) in the cell \(C\). We compute the approximate value of the quantity \(Q = \sum_{C \subset B_r, v \in C} \text{deg}_v(C)\) in two different ways.

On one hand, we have

\[
Q = \sum_{C \subset B_r} 2e(C) \approx 2n_{31} N_v(r),
\]

where \(e(C)\) denotes the number of the edges of the cell \(C\). On the other hand, since any face belongs to exactly two cells, we also have

\[
Q = \sum_{v \in B_r} \sum_{C \subset B_r, C \ni v} \text{deg}_v(C) \approx 2n_{02} N_v(r).
\]

More precisely, we have obtained that

\[
n_v = \lim_{r \to \infty} \frac{N_v(R)}{N_v(r)} = \frac{n_{02}}{n_{31}},
\]

which implies the expression for \(n_{02}\).

The value of \(n_{01}\) can be obtained from the application of Euler’s formula for the vertex figure at every node. Finally, the value of \(n_{12} = n_{13}\) can be obtained from the the other \(n_{ij}\)s like the value of \(n_{20} = n_{21}\). \(\square\)

**Remark 7.** By Theorem 4 it seems that the combinatorial properties of the convex mosaic \(M\) are determined by three parameters, say by \(v, f, n\). One may try to find upper and lower bounds for these values by observing that each entry in \([n_{ij}]\) has a minimal value: e.g. \(n_{30}, n_{32}, n_{03}, n_{01} \geq 4\) and \(n_{12}, n_{21} \geq 3\). Nevertheless, solving these inequalities put no restrictions on the values of \(v, f, n\), apart from \(v, f, n \geq 4\).

It is worth noting that in contrast, for convex polyhedra (or, in other words, for convex spherical 2-dimensional mosaics, cf. Remark 15), the sharp inequalities \(v/2 + 2 \leq f \leq 2v + 4\) are immediate consequences of the fact that each face of the polyhedron has at least 3 vertices, and each vertex belongs to at least 3 faces.

**Remark 8.** Note that if \(M\) is a convex mosaic in \(\mathbb{R}^3\) and \(M^o\) is its dual, then

\[
n_{ij}(M^o) = n_{(3-i)(3-j)}(M),
\]

for all \(0 \leq i, j \leq 3\).

### 3. Proof of the Theorems

#### 3.1. Proof of Theorem 1

**Proof.** First we show that in case of Euclidean mosaics (in arbitrary dimensions) the harmonic degree may be interpreted as the averaged inverse sum of two angles linked by polarity, one of which is the internal vertex angle of a cell.

Consider a convex face-to-face mosaic \(M\) in \(\mathbb{R}^d\). For any cell \(C\) in \(M\) and any vertex \(p\) of \(C\), let \(I(C, p) \subset S^{d-1}\) denote the set of unit vectors such that the rays in the direction of a vector in \(I(C, p)\) and starting at \(p\) contain points of \(C \setminus \{p\}\).
Furthermore, let $E(C, p) \subset S^{d-1}$ denote the set of outer unit normal vectors of $C$ at $p$. Then, by definition, we have that $E(C, p)$ is the polar $(I(C, p))^\circ$ of $I(C, p)$. Let us denote the spherical volumes of $E(C, p)$ and $I(C, p)$ by $\Omega_E(C, p)$ and $\Omega_I(C, p)$, respectively, and let $\bar{\Omega}_E, \bar{\Omega}_I$ define the average values of $\Omega_E(C, p)$ and $\Omega_I(C, p)$, respectively, over all incident pairs $C$ and $p$.

Note that for any cell $C$, the family of sets $E(C, p)$, where $p$ runs over the vertices of $C$, is clearly a spherical mosaic of $S^{d-1}$, and thus, the total area of the members of this family is the surface area $S_{d-1}$ of the sphere. The same statement holds for the family of sets $I(C, p)$, where $C$ runs over the cells containing a given node $p$.

Now, consider a large ball $B$ of space with radius $r$, and denote by $N_c$ and $N_v$ the numbers of cells and nodes of $\mathcal{M}$ in $B$, respectively. Then, for the number $k(r)$ of incident pairs of cells and vertices in $B$ we have

$$\lim_{r \to \infty} k(r) = N_c \bar{v} = N_v \bar{n}.$$ 

The limits of the sums $\omega_I, \omega_E$ of $\Omega_I(C, p)$ and $\Omega_E(C, p)$ (over all pairs of cells $C$ and incident vertices $p$ in $B$) may be written as:

$$\begin{align*}
\lim_{r \to \infty} \omega_I &= N_v S_{d-1} \\
\lim_{r \to \infty} \omega_E &= N_c S_{d-1},
\end{align*}$$

so, for the averages $\bar{\Omega}_I = \lim_{r \to \infty} (\omega_I/k), \bar{\Omega}_E = \lim_{r \to \infty} (\omega_E/k)$ we get

$$\bar{\Omega}_I \bar{n} = \bar{\Omega}_E \bar{v} = S_{d-1}.$$ 

Thus, by (8) we have

$$\bar{\Omega} = \bar{\Omega}_I + \bar{\Omega}_E = \frac{S_{d-1}}{\bar{v}} + \frac{S_{d-1}}{\bar{n}},$$

implying that

$$\bar{h} \bar{\Omega} = S_{d-1}.$$ 

Remark 9. Substituting the value of $S_{d-1}$ into (10), we obtain that for planar mosaics $\bar{h} = \frac{2\pi}{\bar{v}}$, and for mosaics in $\mathbb{R}^3$ $\bar{h} = \frac{4\pi}{\bar{n}}$.

Remark 10. If $d = 2$, then at each vertex we have $\Omega_I(C, p) + \Omega_E(C, p) = \pi$, implying $\bar{\Omega} = \pi$ and this, via equation (10) yields $\bar{h} = 2$.

Remark 11. If $d = 3$, then at each vertex we have $\Omega_I(C, p) + \Omega_E(C, p) \leq 2\pi$, implying $\bar{\Omega} \leq 2\pi$ and this, via equation (10) yields $\bar{h} \geq 2$. We get the same inequality if we substitute the minimal values $\bar{n} = \bar{v} = 4$ into (1). Since these minimal values can not hold simultaneously, in $d = 3$ dimensions we have

$$\bar{h} > 2.$$ 

Remark 12. As we observed, for any node $p$ and any cell $C$ incident to $p$, we have

$$\sum_{C : p \in C} \Omega_E(C, p) = \sum_{C : p \in C} \Omega_I(C, p) = S_{d-1}.$$ 

While the equality

$$\sum_{C : p \in C} \Omega_E(C, p) = S_{d-1}$$

does not hold in general, it does hold in case of hyperplane mosaics.
3.2. Proof of Theorem \[2\]. In the proof we use the next lemma.

Lemma 1. Let \( S \) be the tetrahedron with vertices \( a = (\cos \frac{\alpha}{2}, -\sin \frac{\alpha}{2}, 0), \ b = (\cos \frac{\beta}{2}, \sin \frac{\beta}{2}, 0), \ o = (0, 0, 0) \) and \( m = (0, 0, \mu) \). For \( x \in \{a, b, o, m\} \), let \( \Omega_x \) denote the solid angle of \( S \) at \( x \). Then

\[
\Omega_m = \alpha + 2 \arccos \frac{\mu \sin \frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}} - \pi, \quad \Omega_o = \alpha,
\]

and

\[
\Omega_a = \Omega_b = \arccos \frac{\mu \sin \frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}} + \arccos \frac{\cos \frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}} - \frac{\pi}{2}.
\]

Proof. Note that the solid angle of \( S \) at a vertex \( x \) is equal to the area of the radial projection of \( S \) onto the unit sphere \( x + S^2 \) centered at \( x \). This projection is a spherical triangle, the angles of which are equal to the dihedral angles of \( S \) between pairs of faces meeting at \( x \). It is well known that the area of a spherical triangle, with angles \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \) is equal to the excess angle \( \alpha + \beta + \gamma - \pi \). Thus, to prove Lemma \[1\] it is sufficient to compute the dihedral angles of \( S \). In the following, if \( x, y \) are distinct vertices of \( S \), we denote the dihedral angle of \( S \) at the edge \( xy \) by \( \angle_S(xy) \).

Clearly, \( \angle_S(oa) = \alpha, \angle_S(0a) = \angle_S(ab) = \frac{\pi}{2}, \) implying \( \Omega_o = \alpha \), and by symmetry, \( \angle_S(ma) = \angle_S(mb) \). The cross-section of \( S \) with the \([x, z]\) coordinate plane is a triangle \( T \) whose vertices are \( o, m \) and the midpoint \( u = (\cos \frac{\alpha}{2}, 0, 0) \) of \( ab \). This triangle has a right angle at \( o \), and its legs are of length \( \mu \) and \( \cos \frac{\alpha}{2} \). Observe that \( \angle_S(ab) \) is the angle of \( T \) at \( u \), and thus, it is equal to

\[
\angle_S(ab) = \arccos \frac{\cos \frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}}.
\]

The exterior unit normal vector of the face \( abm \) of \( S \) is

\[
v_1 = \left( \frac{\mu}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}}, 0, \frac{-\cos \frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}} \right).
\]

The interior unit normal vector of the face \( aom \) is \( v_2 = (\sin \frac{\alpha}{2}, \cos \frac{\alpha}{2}, 0) \). Since \( v_1 \) is the rotated copy of \( v_2 \) around the line of \( am \) with angle \( \angle_S(am) \), \( \angle_S(am) \) is the angle between \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \). The inner product of \( v_1 \) and \( v_2 \) is equal to \( \langle v_1, v_2 \rangle = \cos \angle_S(am) \), and thus, we have:

\[
\angle_S(am) = \angle_S(bm) = \arccos \frac{\mu \sin \frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\alpha}{2}}}.
\]

Now the rest of the solid angles can be computed from the dihedral angles as

\[
\Omega_m = \angle_S(am) + \angle_S(bm) + \angle_S(om) - \pi, \quad \Omega_o = \Omega_b = \angle_S(am) + \angle_S(ab) + \angle_S(aa) - \pi.
\]

Now we prove Theorem \[2\].

Proof of Theorem \[2\] An average cell in the mosaic has \( f \) faces, \( \bar{v} \) vertices and \( \bar{e} = \bar{v} + \bar{f} - 2 \) edges. In our model, we denote the number of cells meeting at a node by
\[ \hat{n} = \hat{n}(\bar{v}, \bar{f}) \]. A face of an average cell has \( \bar{e}_f = \frac{2\bar{e}}{f} \) edges, and, within the cell, the degree of a vertex is \( \bar{v}_e = \frac{2\bar{v}}{e} \).

Based on Definition 3, we imagine an average cell as a polyhedron with ‘regular’ \( \bar{e}_f \)-gons as faces such that the projection of the center of the polyhedron onto the plane of a face coincides with the center of the face. Let us decompose such a cell into tetrahedra whose vertices are two vertices of an edge of the cell, the center of one of the two faces containing this edge, and the center of the cell. Note that in this way we decompose the cell into \( 2\bar{e} \) congruent tetrahedra. Let \( S \) be such a tetrahedron, and let \( ab \) denote the edge, \( o \) the center of the face and \( m \) the center of the cell in \( S \). Let \( \Omega_m \) denote the solid angle of \( S \) at \( m \), and \( \Omega_a \) the solid angle of \( S \) at \( a \). Note that since these tetrahedra are congruent, \( \Omega_m = \frac{4\pi}{2\bar{e}} = \frac{2\pi}{\bar{e}} \), and the solid angle of the cell at \( a \) is \( 2\bar{v}_c \Omega_a \). This angle is equal to \( \frac{4\pi}{\bar{n}} \), implying that \( \Omega_a = \frac{2\pi}{\bar{v}_c} = \frac{2\pi}{\bar{e} \bar{n}} \), from which

\[ 14 \]  
\[ \hat{n} = \frac{\pi \bar{v}}{\bar{e} \Omega_a}. \]

Using Lemma 4 we compute \( \Omega_a \) as a function of \( \bar{e}, \bar{v} \) and \( \bar{f} \). In our computations, for simplicity, we use the notations of Lemma 1. Then we have \( \frac{\bar{v}}{2} = \frac{2\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}} = \frac{\bar{f}}{2} \). Furthermore, we have

\[ \cos \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}} = \cos \frac{\Omega_m + \pi - \alpha}{2} = \frac{\mu \sin \frac{\alpha}{2}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\bar{f}}{2\bar{e}}}}. \]

From this, it follows that

\[ \mu = \frac{\cos \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}} \cos \frac{\bar{f}}{2\bar{e}}}{\sqrt{\sin^2 \frac{\bar{f}}{2\bar{e}} - \cos^2 \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}}}}. \]

Note that \( \sin \frac{\bar{f}}{2\bar{e}} = \cos \left( \frac{\bar{v}}{2} - \frac{\bar{f}}{2\bar{e}} \right) = \cos \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}} \), and thus,

\[ \mu = \frac{\cos \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}} \cos \frac{\bar{f}}{2\bar{e}}}{\sqrt{\cos^2 \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}} - \cos^2 \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}}}}, \]

which implies, in particular, that the expression behind the square root is positive. Now, algebraic transformations yield

\[ \sqrt{\mu^2 + \cos^2 \frac{\bar{f}}{2\bar{e}}} = \frac{\cos \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}} \cos \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}}}{\sqrt{\cos^2 \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}} - \cos^2 \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}}}}. \]

Thus,

\[ \Omega_a = \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}} + \arccos \frac{\cos \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}}}{\cos \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}}} - \frac{\pi}{2} = \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}} + \arcsin \frac{\cos \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}}}{\cos \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}}} - \frac{\pi}{2}. \]

Combining this with (14) yields

\[ 15 \]
\[ \hat{n} = \frac{2\pi \bar{v}}{2\bar{e} \arcsin \frac{\cos \frac{\bar{v}}{2\bar{e}}}{\cos \frac{(2\bar{v}-2\bar{e})}{2\bar{e}}} - (\bar{e} - \bar{v}) \pi}. \]

Now, the formula in Theorem 2 is an immediate consequence of (15) and the identity \( \bar{e} = \bar{v} + \bar{f} - 2 \).
Before stating a supplement of Theorem 1, recall that by a result of Steinitz [10, 11], there is a convex polyhedron with \( v \) vertices and \( f \) faces if and only if \( v \geq 4 \), and \( 4 + \frac{1}{2}v + 2 \leq f \leq 2v - 4 \), or equivalently, \( 4 + \frac{1}{2}(v - 4) \leq f \leq 4 + 2(v - 4) \).

**Proposition 1.** Define the function

\[
\hat{n}(t, \tilde{v}) = \frac{2\pi \tilde{v}}{2(\tilde{v} + \bar{f} - 2) \arcsin \left( \frac{\cos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2} \right)}{\cos \left( \frac{\pi}{2} + \frac{\pi}{2} \right)} \right) - (\bar{f} - 2)\pi}
\]

as in Theorem 2 where \( \tilde{v} > 4 \), and \( \bar{f} = 4 + t(\bar{v} - 4) \) for some \( \frac{1}{2} \leq t \leq 2 \). Then \( \hat{n}(t, \tilde{v}) \) is a strictly decreasing function of \( t \) for all values \( \tilde{v} > 4 \).

**Proof.** Let \( \bar{e} = \tilde{v} + 4 + t(\bar{v} - 4) - 2 = (t + 1)\bar{v} + 2 \leq 4\bar{v} \), and observe that the conditions in Proposition 1 for \( \tilde{v} \) and \( t \) are equivalent to \( \frac{3}{2}\bar{v} \leq \bar{e} \leq 3\bar{v} - 6 \).

An elementary computation yields that

\[
\frac{\partial \hat{n}(t, \tilde{v})}{\partial t} = \frac{2\pi \tilde{v}(\bar{v} - 4) F}{G},
\]

where

\[
G = \bar{e} \left( \frac{\pi}{2} - 2 \arcsin \frac{\cos x}{\cos y} \right) \cos y \sqrt{\cos^2 y - x - y \sin(x - y) - (x - y) \sin(x + y)} \right),
\]

and

\[
F = \bar{e} \left( \pi - 2 \arcsin \frac{\cos x}{\cos y} \right) \cos y \sqrt{\cos^2 y - x - y \sin(x - y) - (x - y) \sin(x + y)} \right),
\]

Note that under our conditions, the above partial derivative of \( \hat{n} \) is negative if \( F \) is negative on the domain \( \tilde{v} > 4, \frac{3}{2}\bar{v} \leq \bar{e} \leq 3\bar{v} - 6 \).

Using algebraic transformations, we obtain that

\[
(16) \quad F = 2\bar{e} \left( \left( \frac{\pi}{2} - \arcsin \frac{\cos x}{\cos y} \right) \cos y \sqrt{\cos^2 y - x - y \sin(x - y) - (x - y) \sin(x + y)} \right),
\]

where \( x = \frac{\pi}{2} \) and \( y = \frac{(\bar{v} - 2)\pi}{2\bar{e}} \). Here, the inequalities \( \tilde{v} > 4 \) and \( \frac{3}{2}\bar{v} \leq \bar{e} \leq 3\bar{v} - 6 \) are equivalent to the inequalities \( \frac{\pi}{6} \leq x \leq \frac{\pi}{3} \) and \( \frac{\pi}{6} \leq y < \pi \). Thus, we prove that the expression on the right-hand side of (16) is negative on this domain. Simplifying this expression, we have

\[
(17) \quad F = 2\bar{e} \sin(x - y) ((A - B) \sin(x + y) - y),
\]

where

\[
A = \frac{\pi}{2} - \arcsin \frac{\cos x}{\cos y} = \arcsin \sqrt{1 - \frac{\cos^2 x}{\cos^2 y}}, \quad B = \frac{x - y}{\sin(x - y)}.
\]

To estimate the values of \( A \) and \( B \), we use the fact that the function \( z \mapsto \frac{z}{\sin z} \) is strictly increasing on the interval \( 0 < z < \frac{\pi}{2} \). Our inequalities imply that \( 0 < x - y < \frac{\pi}{6} \), \( 0 < \arcsin \sqrt{1 - \frac{\cos^2 x}{\cos^2 y}} < \arcsin \frac{2}{3} \), and \( x \leq 2y \). From the first
two inequalities it follows that $A - B \leq 0.123$. Substituting this and the third inequality into (17), we obtain

$$F < 2\tilde{c}\sin(x - y)y \left( 0.369\frac{\sin(3y)}{3y} - 1 \right) < 0,$$

proving Proposition 1.

**Remark 13.** Note that by Proposition 1, for any value $\tilde{v} \geq 4$, $\hat{n}(t, \tilde{v})$ attains all values between $\hat{n}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \tilde{v}\right)$ and $\hat{n}(2, \tilde{v})$.

### 3.3. Proof of Theorem 3

**Proof.** Table 1 proves Theorem 3.

**Remark 14.** Although the point set representing these 60 mosaics, as well as the definition of $\bar{h}$, is symmetrical with respect to the line $\tilde{v} = \bar{n}$, the errors of our approximation are not; the same asymmetry can be observed also in Figure 1. The origin of this asymmetry is rooted in the asymmetry of our model, or equivalently, the formula of Theorem 2 which expresses $\hat{n}$ with the descriptors $\bar{v}, \bar{f}$ of the cells. However, our model can be extended to a symmetrical construction in the following way.

Applying our model for the dual mosaic corresponds to the ‘dual’ of our model, in which we estimate, in the same way as we did in the proof of Theorem 2, the value of $\tilde{v}$ as a function $\hat{v}$ depending on the average numbers of edges and cells that contain a given node. This permits us to define the quantity $\bar{h}'$ using $\hat{v}$ and $\bar{n}$. Then, to approximate the mosaic we may use the one of the two models for which $|\bar{h} - \hat{h}|$ and $|\bar{h} - \hat{h}'|$ is smaller.

Using the symmetrical approximation model, Figure 1 would be symmetrical, the errors in Table 1 would be symmetrical and the bounds on average and maximal error would also be reduced to 1.6% and 7%, respectively. While definitely offering aesthetic advantages, the symmetrical model is more complex so we choose to use the original, asymmetric approximation in the main body of the paper.

### 4. Non-Euclidean mosaics

Mosaics, convex mosaics, and all notions described in Subsection 1.1, excluding the notions of average degrees of cells and vertices, can be defined in a natural way for spherical and hyperbolic spaces as well. For spherical space, this includes average degrees as well; because of the compactness of the space it is even possible to avoid the usual limit argument applied to compute these values in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

On the other hand, defining average values in hyperbolic space seems problematic. Indeed, it is well known that under rather loose restrictions, in a packing of congruent balls in $\mathbb{H}^d$, the number of balls intersecting the boundary of a hyperbolic ball $B$ of large radius is not negligible compared to the number of balls contained in $B$. This phenomenon is explored in more details, for instance, in [4], and can be generalized for the numbers of cells of a mosaic in a natural way.

A straightforward solution to this problem is to examine only regular mosaics, in which the degree of every cell, and the degree of every vertex is equal, which offers...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name of mosaic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>e (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cubic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>rectified cubic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>truncated cubic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cantitruncated cubic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>cantitruncated cubic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>rectitruncated cubic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>alternated cubic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>cantic cubic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>runcic cubic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>runcicant cubic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>bitruncubic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>omnitruncubic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>quarter cubic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>truncated/bitruncated square prismatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>snub square prismatic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>triangular prismatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>trichagonal prismatic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>truncated hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>rhombo-hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>snub-hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>truncated trichagonal prismatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>elongated triagonal prismatic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>gyrated alternated cubic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>gyroelongated alternated cubic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>elongated alternated cubic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>gyrated triangular prismatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>gyroelongated triangular prismatic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Poisson-Voronoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>15.91</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hyperplane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Name of mosaic</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>h</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>e (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>dual of cubic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>dual of rectified cubic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>dual of truncated cubic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>dual of cantitruncated cubic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>dual of rectitruncated cubic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>dual of omnitruncubic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>dual of cubic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>dual of omnitruncubic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>dual of runcic cubic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>dual of bitruncubic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>dual of omnitruncubic</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>dual of quarter cubic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>dual of truncated/bitruncated square prismatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>dual of snub square prismatic</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>dual of triangular prismatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>dual of hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>dual of Trichagonal prismatic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>dual of truncated hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>dual of rhombo-hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>dual of snub-hexagonal prismatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>dual of truncated triagonal prismatic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>dual of elongated triangular prismatic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>dual of gyroelongated alternated cubic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>dual of gyroelongated alternated cubic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>dual of elongated alternated cubic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>dual of gyroelongated triangular prismatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>dual of gyroelongated triangular prismatic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Dual of Poisson-Voronoi: Poisson-Delaunay</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Dual of Hyperplane: Hyperplane</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Uniform convex honeycombs, their duals, Poisson-Voronoi, Poisson-Delaunay and Hyperplane random mosaics and the approximation error $e$ (given in equations 1, 3, 4) by Platonic mosaics. Average error is 1.996%, maximal error is 10.8%.
a natural definition for $\bar{n}$ and $\bar{v}$. We do this in Subsection 4.1. To circumvent this problem in a more general way, we use the geometric interpretation of harmonic degree for mosaics in $\mathbb{R}^d$, appearing in Subsection 3.1; this interpretation, in particular, provided a different proof of the fact that harmonic degree is 2 for every planar Euclidean mosaic.

In Subsection 4.2 we generalize this geometric interpretation for mosaics in $S^2$ or $H^2$, and show that for spherical mosaics it coincides with the original definition of harmonic degree. Finally, we show that this value is less than 2 for any spherical mosaic, and it is at least 2 for any hyperbolic mosaics, using any reasonable interpretation of average.

### 4.1. Non-Euclidean regular honeycombs in $S^d$, $H^d$ for $d = 2, 3$

Here we show that in $d = 2$ dimensions, Euclidean mosaics separate regular spherical mosaics from regular hyperbolic mosaics on the $[\bar{n}, \bar{v}]$ plane.

While Plato’s original idea of filling the Euclidean space with regular solids proved to be incorrect, if we relax the condition that the embedding space has no curvature then all Platonic solids may fill space by what we call a regular honeycomb. We briefly review these mosaics to show how they are represented in our notation and how their harmonic degrees are spread.

Let $M$ be a honeycomb in a space of constant curvature of dimension $d$. A sequence $F_0 \subset F_1 \subset \ldots \subset F_d$, where $F_i$ is an $i$-dimensional face of $M$, is called a flag of $M$. We say that $M$ is regular, if for any two flags of $M$ there is an element of the symmetry group of $M$ that maps one of them into the other one. In particular, if $M$ is a regular planar mosaic, then the cells of $M$ are congruent regular $p$-gons, and at each node, an equal $q$ number of edges meet at equal angles. In this case $\{p, q\}$ is called the Schl"afli symbol of $M$. It is well known that up to congruence, for any values $p, q \geq 3$, there is a unique regular mosaic with Schl"afli symbol $\{p, q\}$. This mosaic is spherical if $p = 3$ and $q = 3, 4, 5$ or if $q = 3$ and $p = 3, 4, 5$, Euclidean if $\{p, q\} = \{3, 6\}, \{4, 4\}, \{6, 3\}$, and hyperbolic otherwise. We note that the five regular spherical honeycombs correspond to the five Platonic polyhedra. The Schl"afli symbol of a higher dimensional mosaic can be defined recursively: it is $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_d\}$ if the Schl"afli symbol of its cells are $\{p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{d-1}\}$ (which must correspond to a regular spherical mosaic), and the intersection of $M$ with any sufficiently small sphere centered at a node of $M$ is the regular spherical mosaic $\{p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_d\}$.

In $d = 2$ dimensions the $\bar{h} = 2$ curve defines a partition of the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ grid on the $[\bar{n}, \bar{v}]$ plane with the constraints $\bar{n}, \bar{v} \geq 3$. For a regular mosaic with Schl"afli symbol $\{p, q\}$, set $\bar{v} = p$, $\bar{n} = q$, or equivalently, $\bar{h} = \frac{pq}{p+q}$. Then an elementary computation (determining the sign of the quantity $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{2}$ for all integers $p, q \geq 3$) shows that grid points on the $\bar{h} = 2$ line correspond to regular Euclidean mosaics, grid points with $\bar{h} < 2$ correspond to regular spherical mosaics and grid points with $\bar{h} > 2$ correspond to regular hyperbolic mosaics.

In $d = 3$ dimensions the $\bar{h} = 4$ curve defines a partition of the $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ grid on the $[\bar{n}, \bar{v}]$ plane in a similar sense, although here only a finite number of grid points correspond to regular mosaics. We summarize these in Table 2.
As we can observe, the harmonic degree \( \bar{h} \) of a mosaic appears to carry information both on the dimension and the curvature of the embedding space: \( \bar{h} = \text{constant} \) curves separate convex mosaics embedded in spaces with the same curvature sign but different dimension and vice versa, they also separate regular mosaics embedded in spaces with the same dimension but different sign of curvature. Knowing one of those parameters seems to permit us to obtain the other, based on the mosaic’s harmonic degree.

### 4.2. Non-Euclidean general face-to-face mosaics on \( S^2 \) and \( H^2 \)

Our goal is to extend the geometric interpretation of the harmonic degree to convex face-to-face mosaics on \( S^2 \) and \( H^2 \). First we describe how the duals of spherical mosaics can be constructed. To do this, first we compute the harmonic degree of spherical mosaics directly.

**Remark 15.** Clearly, projecting a convex polyhedron \( P \) from an interior point to a sphere concentric to this point yields a spherical mosaic. Furthermore, in a spherical mosaic any two cells intersect in one edge, one vertex or they are disjoint. Using these properties it is easy to show that the edge graph of any spherical mosaic is 3-connected and planar; such an argument can be found, e.g. in the proof of [1, Claim 9.4]. By a famous theorem of Steinitz [11], every 3-connected planar graph is the edge graph of a convex polyhedron. Thus, up to combinatorial equivalence, we may regard a spherical mosaic as the central projection on \( S^2 \) of a convex polyhedron \( P \) containing the origin in its interior. This representation permits us to define the dual of a spherical mosaic associated to \( P \) as the mosaic associated to its polar convex polyhedron \( P^o \).

In two dimensions, spherical mosaics may be characterized by the angle excess associated with their cells which is equal to the solid angle subtended by the cell or, alternatively, the spherical area of the cell. Let \( \mathcal{M} \) be a convex mosaic on \( S^2 \) with \( N_v \) nodes and \( N_c \) cells. Since \( \mathcal{M} \) is a tiling of \( S^2 \), the average area of a cell is \( \Omega_C = \frac{4\pi}{N_c} \). Similarly, the average area of a cell in the dual mosaic is \( \Omega_N = \frac{4\pi}{N_v} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID.</th>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Node</th>
<th>Space</th>
<th>( \bar{n} )</th>
<th>( \bar{v} )</th>
<th>( \bar{h} )</th>
<th>Schläfli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>cube</td>
<td>octahedron</td>
<td>Euclidean</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>( {4,3,4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>icosahedron</td>
<td>dodecahedron</td>
<td>Hyperbolic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>( {3,5,3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>dodecahedron</td>
<td>icosahedron</td>
<td>Hyperbolic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td>( {5,3,3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cube</td>
<td>icosahedron</td>
<td>Hyperbolic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>( {4,3,5} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>dodecahedron</td>
<td>octahedron</td>
<td>Hyperbolic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>( {5,3,4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>tetrahedron</td>
<td>tetrahedron</td>
<td>Elliptic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>( {3,3,3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>octahedron</td>
<td>cube</td>
<td>Elliptic</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>( {4,3,4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>cube</td>
<td>octahedron</td>
<td>Elliptic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>( {4,3,3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>tetrahedron</td>
<td>octahedron</td>
<td>Elliptic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.375</td>
<td>( {3,3,4} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>dodecahedron</td>
<td>tetrahedron</td>
<td>Elliptic</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>( {5,3,3} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>tetrahedron</td>
<td>icosahedron</td>
<td>Elliptic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td>( {3,3,5} )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** Regular honeycombs in \( d = 3 \) dimensions
Definition 4. For any spherical mosaic $M$, we call the quantity $\bar{\mu}(M) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Omega_e + \Omega_n}{\Omega_c}$ the harmonic angle excess of $M$.

Proposition 2. The harmonic degree of any convex, face-to-face mosaic $M$ on $S^2$ is

\begin{equation}
\bar{h}(M) = 2 - \bar{\mu}(M).
\end{equation}

Proof. Let $N_c$ and $N_v$ denote the numbers of cells and nodes of $M$, and let $\bar{v}$ and $\bar{n}$ denote the average degree of a cell and a node, respectively. Then the number of adjacent pairs of cells and nodes of $M$ is equal to

\begin{equation}
\bar{v}N = \bar{n}N_v.
\end{equation}

Let $\alpha_{ij}$ denote the angle of the cell $C_i$ at the vertex $v_j$ if they are adjacent, and let $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. We compute the sum $\sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij}$ in two different ways. First, note that $\sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij} = \sum_j \sum_i \alpha_{ij} = 2\pi N_v$. On the other hand, the area of any cell $C_i$ is equal to the angle sufficit of $C_i$, or more specifically, area($C_i$) = $\sum_j \alpha_{ij} - (\deg(C_i) - 2)\pi$, where $\deg(C_i)$ is the number of vertices of $C_i$ (see Subsection 1.1).

Since $\sum_j \deg(C_i) = 4\pi N_v$, it follows that $\sum_{i,j} \alpha_{ij} = 4\pi + \bar{v}N_c\pi - 2N_v\pi$. This implies the equality

\begin{equation}
2N_v = \bar{v}N_c - 2N_v + 4.
\end{equation}

Now, (18) follows from (19), (20) and the equation $\bar{\mu} = \frac{4}{N_v + N_e}$ (which follows from Definition 4). $\square$

Corollary 1. The harmonic degree of any face-to-face convex mosaic $M$ of $S^2$ is

$\bar{h}(M) < 2$.

While it does not seem feasible to extend the definition of $\bar{h}$ for mosaics in $H^2$ in a straightforward way, the geometric interpretation of this quantity in Subsection 4 permits us to find a variant of Corollary 1 also in this case.

Let $M$ be a convex face-to-face mosaic in any of the planes $\mathbb{R}^2$, $S^2$ or $H^2$. Let $C$ be a cell of $M$ with $v$ vertices. Let $p_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, v$ be the vertices of $C$, and fix an arbitrary point $q \in \text{int} C$. Let $L_j$ denote the sideline of $C$ passing through the vertices $p_j$ and $p_{j+1}$, and let $R_j$ denote the ray starting at $q$ and intersecting $L_j$ in a right angle. The convexity of $C$ implies that the rays $R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_v$ are in this cyclic order around $q$. Let $\Omega(C, p_j)$ denote the angle of the angular region which is bounded by $R_{j-1} \cup R_j$ and whose interior is disjoint from all the rays $R_j$. Furthermore, let $\Omega_1(C, p_j)$ denote the interior angle of $C$ at $p_j$. Now we define the quantity

$\bar{\Omega}(C) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^v (\Omega(C, p_j) + \Omega_1(C, p_j))}{v} = \frac{2\pi + \Lambda(C)}{v}$,

where $\Lambda(C)$ is the sum of the interior angles of $C$.

Observe that if $M$ is a Euclidean mosaic, then the weighted average value of $\bar{\Omega}(C)$, with the weight equal to $v$, over the family of all cells of $M$ coincides with $\bar{\Omega}$.

Next, assume that $M$ is a spherical mosaic. Let the cells of $M$ be $C_i$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N_c$, and let $N_v$ and $N_e$ be the number of nodes and edges of the mosaic, respectively. If the degree of $C_i$ is $v_i$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{N_c} v_i = 2N_v$, and by Euler’s formula,
We have shown that for face-to-face, convex mosaics on \( S^2 \), we have \( \bar{h} = 2 - \mu \) (cf. (18)). Thus, for these mosaics we have \( \bar{h} = \frac{2\pi}{\bar{\Omega}} \), extending Theorem 1 for 2-dimensional spherical mosaics.

Finally, consider the case that \( M \) is a hyperbolic mosaic. Let \( C_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots \) denote the cells of \( M \), and let \( v_i \) denote the degree of \( C_i \). As in the spherical case, by the area formula for hyperbolic polygons, we have that \( \bar{\Omega}(C_i) = \pi - \text{area}(C_i) / v_i \) for all values of \( i \). For any nonnegative function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R} \), we may define the harmonic degree of \( M \) with respect to \( f \) as

\[
\bar{h}_f = \lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{2\pi \sum_{i=1}^k f(i)v_i}{\sum_{i=1}^k f(i)v_i \bar{\Omega}(C_i)}
\]

where the inequalities \( \bar{\Omega}(C_i) < \pi, i \in \mathbb{N} \) imply \( \bar{h}_f \geq 2 \). Note that since any measure on a countable set is atomic, the above formula exhausts all reasonable possibilities for defining harmonic degree.

5. Summary and some open questions

5.1. Hyperplane mosaics. If \( M \) is generated by dissecting \( \mathbb{R}^d \) with \( (d-1) \)-dimensional hyperplanes then it is called a hyperplane mosaic \([9]\). The harmonic degree of a hyperplane mosaic is known to be

\[
\bar{h} = 2^{(d-1)}.
\]

In this case the associated Platonic mosaic is real (the cubic grid) and we have \( \hat{h} = \bar{h} \). This motivates some interesting problems, in particular:

**Question 1.** Is it true that \( \bar{h} = 2^{d-1} \) is an upper bound for any \( d \)-dimensional convex mosaic? In particular, what is the infimum and the supremum of \( \bar{h} \) over the family of 3-dimensional convex face-to-face mosaics?

**Question 2.** Is it true that there are no convex face-to-face mosaics of different dimensions, but with equal harmonic degree?

**Problem 1.** Characterize the set of positive real numbers that are not equal to the harmonic degree of any convex face-to-face mosaic, in any dimensions.

5.2. Non face-to-face mosaics on \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) and \( S^2 \). In subsection 5.1 we will formulated questions relating the dimension \( d(M) \) of a convex mosaic \( M \) to its harmonic degree \( \bar{h}(M) \). In particular in Question 2 we ask whether the map \( \bar{h} \to d \) could be unique in case of face-to-face mosaics.

In the current subsection would like to point out that the answer to this question would be negative if we also admitted non face-to-face mosaics. According to the convention introduced in Subsection 1.1 the degree of a node is equal to the number

\[
N_v + N_c = N_e + 2, \text{ yielding } \bar{\mu} = \frac{4}{N_v + N_c - 2}.
\]
of vertices coinciding at that node, both for face-to-face and non face-to-face convex mosaics.

In $d = 2$ dimensions we already stated that for face-to-face mosaics we have $\bar{h} = 2$ [9, Theorem 10.1.6], which is equivalent to

$$\bar{n} = \frac{2\bar{v}}{\bar{v} - 2}. \tag{22}$$

If we admit non face-to-face mosaics and we sum the internal angles over all cells and also sum the same angles as nodal angles over all nodes then [22] generalizes to

$$\bar{n} = \frac{2\bar{v}}{\bar{v} - p - 1}, \tag{23}$$

where $p$ is the proportion of the regular nodes in the family of all nodes, where we call a node regular if it is the vertex of every cell it belongs to. As we can see, in 2 dimensions convex mosaics have two free parameters and they form a compact, 2D subset of the $[\bar{n}, \bar{v}]$ parameter plane as illustrated in Figure 2. By computing the harmonic degree $\bar{h}$ over the admissible domain marked on Figure 2(a) we find that $1.33 \leq \bar{h} \leq 2$. Since in $d = 1$ dimensions we have $\bar{h} = 1$, this does not contradict our conjecture, however, it indicates that non face-to-face mosaics may

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{mosaic.png}
\caption{(a) Parameter plane for planar mosaics. The $p = 1$ line corresponds to face-to-face mosaics. Grey shaded area marks the descriptors of all admissible mosaics in the plane. (b) Example of a special 3D mosaic with $\bar{h} < 2$. Solid line: odd layer, dotted line, even layer. Both layers correspond to the planar mosaic in panel (a) at $(\bar{n}, \bar{v}) = (2, 4)$. (c) Parameter plane for spherical mosaics in $d = 2$ dimensions. All mosaics shown with $N_c + N_v \leq 200$, $N_c$ denoting the number of cells, $N_v$ denoting the number of nodes. Mosaics on the $\bar{v} = 3$ and $\bar{n} = 3$ lines correspond to simple and simplicial polyhedra, respectively. Observe how mosaics accumulate on the line corresponding to face-to-face Euclidean mosaics.}
\end{figure}
admit lower harmonic degrees than face-to-face mosaics. Figure (2) (b) shows an example of a non face-to-face mosaic in \( d = 3 \) constructed as alternated, shifted layers of a brick-wall-type planar mosaic. At every node just 2 vertices meet so we have \( \bar{n} = 2 \) and each cell is a cuboid yielding \( \bar{v} = 8 \). This results in a value \( \bar{h} = 1.6 \) which is certainly below the maximal value of \( \bar{h} = 2 \) for planar mosaics. This example illustrates that the conjecture is not true if non face-to-face mosaics are also admitted.

**Remark 16.** Using the proof of Proposition 2, the generalization of formula (23) to 2D spherical mosaics is straightforward:

\[
\bar{v} = \frac{(2 - \bar{\mu})\bar{n}}{\bar{n} + \bar{\mu} - 1 - p}.
\]

### 5.3. Conclusions.
In this paper we proposed to represent mosaics in the space \([\bar{n}, \bar{v}]\) of average nodal and cell degrees and we introduced the harmonic degree \( \bar{h} \), constant values of which appear as curves in this space. We pointed out that these curves appear to have special significance: in \( d = 2 \) dimensions all convex, face-to-face mosaics appear as points of the \( \bar{h} = 2 \) curve and a compact domain can be associated to non face-to-face mosaics. We showed that in case of 2D spherical mosaics \( \bar{h} \) differs only in a constant from the suitably averaged angle excess and this explains why points associated with 2D regular mosaics on manifolds with constant curvature are separated by the \( \bar{h} = 2 \) line.

The most interesting geometric interpretation of \( \bar{h} \) appears to be Theorem 1, stating that the harmonic degree is the inverse of the averaged sum of two angles associated with polar domains, one of which is the internal angle of a cell at a vertex of the cell. While this sum is constant in 2D (resulting in \( \bar{h} = 2 \)), in 3D there exist a broad range in which it may fluctuate. Nevertheless, we found that for a set of 60 mosaics (which included all uniform honeycombs as well as random mosaics) the actual fluctuation is very small and the harmonic degree of all investigated mosaics was in the range \( 3.3 \leq \bar{h} \leq 4 \). We showed that this interpretation of \( \bar{h} \) remains valid for Euclidean mosaics in arbitrary dimensions as well as 2D spherical mosaics. The link established in Theorem 1 between the harmonic degree \( \bar{h} \) and the average total angle \( \bar{\Omega} \) illustrates that the combinatorial and metric properties of convex mosaics are closely related.

Under the assumption that vertex and cell degrees as well as angles are represented by their average values, we constructed the Platonic approximation of an Euclidean mosaic. In \( d = 3 \) dimensions Platonic approximations are real mosaics if \( [\bar{f}, \bar{v}] = [6, 8] \), otherwise they are virtual geometric constructions. Nevertheless, they appear to approximate real mosaics remarkably well. In the averaged sense, if \( \bar{v}, \bar{f} \) are considered in the admissible range for convex polyhedra, the associated Platonic mosaics predict the approximation \( \hat{h} \) of the harmonic degree in the range \( 3.2 \leq \hat{h} \leq 4 \), very close to the range observed for the 60 mosaics. Moreover, the maximum of the individual error computed for these mosaics was below 11%.

Based on these observations we formulated some general questions related to convex mosaics. It appears as though the harmonic degree of any \( d \)-dimensional face-to-face convex mosaic is bounded from above by the value \( \bar{h} = 2^{d-1} \), associated with \( d \)-dimensional hyperplane mosaics. It also appears as though the dimension of
a face-to-face, convex, Euclidean mosaic could be determined based on the harmonic degree of that mosaic. We posed these observations as open questions.

Whether or not Platonic mosaics contribute to the vindication of Plato’s original views about the Universe is certainly not a mathematical question. Nevertheless, we hope that these geometric constructions may help to reveal some of the secrets which inspired Plato: the geometric patterns in which convex polyhedra may or may not fill space without gaps.
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