

Density of Binary Disc Packings: Lower and Upper Bounds

Thomas Fernique

LIPN, Univ. Paris Nord & CNRS

Abstract

We provide, for any $r \in (0, 1)$, lower and upper bounds on the maximal density of a packing in the Euclidean plane of discs of radius 1 and r . The lower bounds are mostly folk, but the upper bounds improve the best previously known ones for any $r \in [0.11, 0.74]$. For many values of r , this gives a fairly good idea of the exact maximum density. In particular, we get new intervals for r which does not allow any packing more dense than the hexagonal packing of equal discs.

1 Introduction

A *disc packing* (or *circle packing*) is a set of interior-disjoint discs in the Euclidean plane. Its *density* δ is the proportion of the plane covered by the discs:

$$\delta := \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{area of the square } [-k, k]^2 \text{ covered by discs}}{\text{area of the square } [-k, k]^2}.$$

If all the discs have the same radius, it has been proven by Tóth [FT43] (see also [CW10]) that the density is at most

$$\delta_1 := \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}} \approx 0.9069,$$

reached for the so-called *hexagonal compact packing*, where discs are centered on a triangular grid (of size twice the disc radius).

With two sizes of discs, the maximal density becomes parametrized by the size ratio $r \in (0, 1)$: we denote it by $\delta(r)$. What does the graph of $r \rightarrow \delta(r)$ look like? This is the issue we are here interested in.

Surprisingly enough, two sizes of discs do not help to pack more densely than δ_1 if the ratio r is too large. In [Bli69], it has indeed been proven that $\delta(r) = \delta_1$ for $r \geq r_B$, where

$$r_B := \sqrt{\frac{7 \tan \frac{\pi}{7} - 6 \tan \frac{\pi}{6}}{6 \tan \frac{\pi}{6} - 5 \tan \frac{\pi}{5}}} \approx 0.74299.$$

This yields a whole interval over which the exact value of $\delta(r)$ is known. Outside this interval, there are 9 specific ratios for which $\delta(r)$ is known. They are the ratios which allow *triangulated binary packings*, that is, packings with two sizes of discs whose contact graphs are triangulated (the vertices of the contact graph of a packing are the disc center, and the edge connect the centers of tangent discs). These ratios are algebraic numbers which have been characterized in [Ken06]. The maximal density for each of them is proven in [BF21] (see also [Hep00, Hep03, Ken04b] for the first cases).

To the best of our knowledge, no other exact value of $\delta(r)$ has been proven. If we cannot obtain an exact value for $\delta(r)$, can we find lower and upper bounds?

For a given r , any packing yields a lower bound. For example, if r is small enough, we can simply insert small discs in the holes of a hexagonal compact packing of large discs to get $\delta(r) > \delta_1$. More interesting, we can get lower bounds over a whole interval of ratios by continuously modifying a packing. It is a particularly fruitful technique if we modify very dense packing (notably the 9 triangulated packings) using the so-called “flipping and flowing method”, first used by Tóth [FT64], see also [CP19, CG20]. In Section 2 we detail lower bounds obtained in this way. These lower bounds seem to be mostly “folk” (see, *e.g.*, [FJFS20, Ken04a]), but we provide here a SageMath worksheet (file `lower_bounds.sage` in supplementary materials) which give explicitly the transformations as well as the corresponding densities. They are depicted in Fig. 1 (green curve).

Finding upper bounds is more challenging. For a given r , it indeed amounts to proving that among the uncountably many packings by discs of size 1 and r , none has density larger than the claimed upper bound. A first milestone was the proof in [Flo60] that $\delta(r)$ is less than the density inside a triangle with mutually tangent discs of size 1, r and r centered on its vertices, see Fig. 1, bottom center. This upper bound was later on enhanced in [Bli69] for large enough r , proving that $\delta(r)$ is less than the density inside the union of a regular heptagon and a regular pentagon, with the heptagon (resp. pentagon) being circumscribed to a large disc (resp. small disc), see Fig. 1, bottom right (the above mentioned constant r_B is the value of r for which this bound reaches δ_1). In Section 3, we explain how we obtain upper bounds by enhancing the computer-aided method used in [BF21] to prove the maximal density of the 9 triangulated packings. In a nutshell, the interval $(0, 1)$ of the possible disc size ratio is divided into sufficiently many small intervals on which a program written in C++ (provided in the supplementary materials) searches by dichotomy an upper bound on the maximum density. The obtained upper bounds improve the previous ones for any $r \in [0.11, r_B]$, except for the few values of r which allow a triangulated binary packing. They are depicted in Fig. 1 (red curve). This has to be considered as the main result of this paper, though it can hardly be stated as a theorem in a classic sense.

A byproduct of these lower and upper bounds can be stated as a theorem:




Figure 1: Lower bound (green curve) and upper bound (red curve) on $\delta(r)$. The blue dots and lines indicate where lower and upper bounds coincide (the dots correspond to the 9 triangulated packings, the lines to the intervals I_i 's in Th. 1). The best previous upper bound is indicated by the black dotted curve. See also zooms in Fig. 9, 10, 11 and 12.

Theorem 1 *One has $\delta(r) = \delta_1$ for any r in*

$$\underbrace{[0.4445, 0.4532]}_{I_1} \cup \underbrace{[0.4917, 0.5145]}_{I_2} \cup \underbrace{[0.5666, 0.6270]}_{I_3} \cup \underbrace{[0.6468, 1)}_{I_4}$$

and $\delta(r) > \delta_1$ for any r in

$$\underbrace{(0, 0.4378]}_{J_1} \cup \underbrace{[0.5165, 0.5510]}_{J_2} \cup \underbrace{[0.6276, 0.6456]}_{J_3}.$$

The endpoints of the intervals I_1 , I_2 , I_3 and I_4 are exact numerical values obtained by computer. The endpoints of the intervals J_1 , J_2 and J_3 are approximations (which shorten the intervals) of algebraic numbers whose minimal polynomials are explicitly computed in the file `lower_bounds.sage`. The union of the I_i 's and J_i 's covers more than 93% of $(0, 1)$, so that the question of which disc size ratios allow a packing which is more dense than the hexagonal compact packing of equal discs is solved for most of the ratios. The possibilities of extending these intervals to cover the whole $(0, 1)$ is discussed in Section 4.

2 Lower bounds by flipping and flowing

2.1 Principle

To date, all disc packings that have been proven to maximize density are found to have a triangulated contact graph, i.e. maximum number of contacts between discs [FT43, BF21, Fer19, Bli69]. This backs up the rule of thumb that the more contact between discs in a packing, the denser it is. However, a triangulated contact graph is only possible for some very particular sizes of discs. This is where *flipping and flowing* comes into play. The principle is, starting from a particularly dense packing, to continuously modify the ratio of disc sizes while trying to keep as much contact between discs as possible, in the hope of decreasing the density as little as possible. The term "flowing" refers to the continuous modification of disc sizes. The term "flipping" refers to the particular (but frequent) case where the transformation connects two packings whose graphs are triangulated and differ by one or more *flips*, i.e. an edge shared by two triangles is replaced by an edge which connects the two other vertices of the triangles.

2.2 The flows

Figures 2–7 describe flows between (or from) especially dense packings. The ratios r_i 's and a_i 's are algebraic ratios whose exact values can be found in the file `lower_bounds.sage`. These packings are all triangulated, except those for $r \in \{r_a, r_b, r_c\}$ in Fig. 7. They are all periodic and described by their fundamental domains. The density is depicted (red curve), with the horizontal axe corresponding to the density δ_1 of the hexagonal compact packing. This yields the lower bound depicted in Fig. 1.




Figure 2: The flow $0 \leftrightarrow r_8 \leftrightarrow r_4 \leftrightarrow r_1 \leftrightarrow 1$.

Remark 1 One checks that when the flow on the right of r_7 and the one on the left of r_6 cross, for $r \approx 0.3154$, the density is higher about 0.0076% than $\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}$.




Figure 3: The flow $0 \leftrightarrow r_8 \leftrightarrow r_7 \leftrightarrow r_3 \leftrightarrow 1$.

The bottom of the red valley between r_7 and r_6 in Fig. 1 is thus (very slightly) above the horizontal black line.

Remark 2 For $r \leq r_8$, a small disc can fit in the holes of a hexagonal compact packing of large discs. This yields more and more dense packings when r goes towards 0, see e.g. [UST04]. The density is actually expected to be rather wild in this range of ratio.

2.3 Computation

To compute the density along a flow, we use the fact that contacts between discs in the packings yield quadratic equations in the coordinates of disc centers and the ratio r . Each flow that we will consider then corresponds to a one-dimensional polynomial system formed by such equations. This allows to compute the positions of discs, thus the density, when r varies. The complete calculations are provided in the supplementary material `lower_bound.sage`, which is a SageMath worksheet[Dev19]. The main tool is the simple function `stick((x1,y1,r1),(x2,y2,r2),r3)`, which takes the coordinates $x1,y1$ of a disc D_1 of radius $r1$, the coordinates $x2,y2$ of a disc D_2 of radius $r2$, a real $r3$ and returns the coordinates $x3,y3$ of one of the disc D_3 of radius $r3$ which is tangent to D_1 and D_2 such that D_1 sees D_3 on the left of D_2 .

Consider, for example, the periodic binary packing whose fundamental domain is depicted on Fig. 8, left. Discs are numbered and we arbitrarily set the positions of the two first discs such that they are tangent:

$$d0=(0,0,1)$$

$$d1=(2,0,1)$$

We then stick one by one the three following discs:




Figure 4: The flow $0 \leftrightarrow r_9 \leftrightarrow r_6 \leftrightarrow 1$.




Figure 5: Flowing around r_5 . Among the numerous way to flow for $r < r_5$, this is the one which seems to decrease the least the density.

```
d2=stick(d0,d1,r)
d3=stick(d2,d1,1)
d4=stick(d2,d3,1)
```

This allows to compute the density in the fundamental domain:

```
d=(2+2*r^2)/((d4[1]+(d3[1]-d1[1]))*d1[0])
```

This yields for the density the expression

$$\frac{\pi(r^2 + 1)(r + 1)^4}{16(r + 2)\sqrt{r + 2}r\sqrt{r}}.$$

All the considered cases are similar, except two which are slightly more complex. The first case is the periodic binary packing whose fundamental domain




Figure 6: Flowing around r_2 (the fundamental domain tiles like scales). The flow can be extended to $r = 1$ but we get only 6 out of 7 discs of the hexagonal compact packing (the missing one is marked by an X).

is depicted on Fig. 8, right. It corresponds, in the previous subsection, to the flow on the right of r_6 . In this case, it is not possible to describe the packing by sticking discs one by one to two previous discs. To get around this problem, we define a multivariate polynomial ring over \mathbb{Q} whose variables are the coordinates of the disc centers, the disc ratio r and the density d :

$K.\langle x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, x_3, y_3, x_4, y_4, x_5, y_5, r, d \rangle = \mathbb{Q}[\]$

We then add the equations which describe the disc contacts or symmetries of the packing (each polynomial must be equal to zero):

```
eqs=[y1,
x1-2*x2,
x1+x2-(x3+x4+x5),
y1+y2-(y3+y4+y5),
x3^2+y3^2-(1+r)^2,
(x4-x3)^2+(y4-y3)^2-(r+r)^2,
(x4-x5)^2+(y4-y5)^2-(r+r)^2,
(x3-x5)^2+(y3-y5)^2-(r+r)^2,
(x4-x1)^2+(y4-y1)^2-(1+r)^2,
(x2-x5)^2+(y2-y5)^2-(1+r)^2,
(x1-2*x3)^2+(y3+y3)^2-(r+r)^2,
d*x1*y2-(1+6*r^2)]
```

We then compute the ideal defined by these equations and eliminate all the variables but r and d :




Figure 7: The flow $r_9 \leftrightarrow r_c \leftrightarrow r_b \leftrightarrow r_a \leftrightarrow 1$.




Figure 8: Disc numbering to analyze flows.

```
I=ideal(K,eqs)
J=I.elimination_ideal([x1,y1,x2,y2,x3,y3,x4,y4,x5,y5])
P=QQ[r,d](J.gens()[0])
```

This yields a polynomial of degree 9 in r and 6 in d . Actually, we can remove a factor which would correspond to a density larger than 1. We get an irreducible polynomial of degree 2 in d^2 whose coefficients are polynomials in r . This allows to get a closed-form expression for the density:

$$\frac{\pi(6r^2 + 1)\sqrt{47r^4 + 84r^3 + 54r^2 + 12r + 3 - (7r^3 + 13r^2 + 9r + 3)\sqrt{45r^2 - 6r - 3}}}{\sqrt{6}(r^4 + 12r^2 + 12r + 3)}.$$

The second case corresponds, in the previous subsection, to the flow on the left of r_5 . It is similar, except that we eventually get a polynomial in degree 6 in d^2 : we cannot derive a closed-form expression, but an implicit plot is possible.

3 Upper bounds via localizing potentials

3.1 Principle

The strategy used is similar to the one detailed in [BF21], but taken to a greater degree of automation. The main lines of the strategy used in [BF21] are the following (in essence, it resembles the one used by Hales to prove Kepler’s conjecture, nicely exposed in [Lag02]). With any given packing is associated a partition of the space into uniformly bounded cells. The density usually varies through cells and we are interested in the average density. Each cell shares its density (actually a function of) among discs within a uniformly bounded distance. An upper bound on the total weight received by each disc is obtained. This local upper bound for each disc in turn yields a global upper bound on the density of the whole packing. The details are very technical and are not reproduced here: this paper is thus not at all self-containing. Only the modifications are detailed (and the C++ code to perform the checking).

3.2 Parametrization

The first difference with [BF21] is that since coronas exist only for very specific values of r , the base vertex potentials are generally not completely characterized (there are two degrees of freedom). Here, we consider the base vertex potential V_{1rr} and V_{11r} as parameters and carefully fix their value. Assume r is fixed and as well as a candidate upper bound δ on the maximum density of the packings of discs of size 1 and r . For $\varepsilon > 0$ (we took $\varepsilon = 0.001$), compute the four-dimensional polytope $\mathcal{P}(r, \delta, \varepsilon)$ which consists of the points (x, y, z, t) such that if we set

$$V_{1rr} = x, \quad V_{11r} = y, \quad m_1 = z, \quad m_r = t,$$

then the vertex inequality is ensured around any vertex and the local inequality is ensured for any ε -tight triangle. We have to choose a point in this polytope. The rest of the check is sensitive to this choice, which is therefore delicate. We proceeded as follows (see function `set_xy_generic()` in the file `parameters_xy.cpp`). First, we set the ratio m_1/m_r to a ”reasonable” value by intersecting the polytope with the hyperplane

$$\frac{z}{t} = \frac{\max\{z \mid (x, y, z, t) \in \mathcal{P}(r, \delta, \varepsilon)\}}{\max\{t \mid (x, y, z, t) \in \mathcal{P}(r, \delta, \varepsilon)\}}.$$

We then take either the barycenter of the vertices of the obtained polytope if $r > 0.55$, or a vertex of this polytope which minimizes m_1 otherwise. The x and y coordinates of this point are used to set V_{1rr} and V_{11r} . Once V_{1rr} and V_{11r} are fixed, everything goes as in [BF21] to check whether δ actually bounds from above the maximum density of the packings of discs of size 1 and r .

3.3 Proving $\delta(r) = \delta_1$

Here, we explain how $\delta(r) = \delta_1$ is proven for r in the intervals I_1 , I_2 , I_3 and I_4 of Theorem 1. The C++ code used to prove this can be found in the file `upper_bound_HCP.cpp`. The only difference with [BF21] is that we have to check that the candidate maximal density δ_1 holds not only for a given ratio r , but for a whole continuum of ratios. We partitioned the I_i 's in many small subintervals. We then use interval arithmetic, with each subinterval defining a value r . The smaller a subinterval is, the better the precision on r (and thus in the subsequent computations) is. For sufficiently small subintervals, the precision on the upper bound for $\delta(r)$ is sufficient to ensure $\delta(r) \leq \delta_1$. To find these subinterval, we proceed by dichotomy over each I_i 's, bisecting each interval while the precision does not suffice to conclude. Table 1 gives, for each interval, the total number of subintervals into which it was eventually divided and the execution time on our Laptop (i5-7300U CPU 2.60GHz).

| Interval | subintervals | execution time |
|----------|--------------|----------------|
| I_1 | 259 | 30 min. |
| I_2 | 318 | 20 min. |
| I_3 | 379 | 32 min. |
| I_4 | 845 | 20 min. |

Table 1: Interval, number of subintervals and execution time.

3.4 Upper bound on $\delta(r)$

Here, we explain how the upper bound on $\delta(r)$ was obtained for any $r \in (0, 1)$. The C++ code used to prove this can be found in the file `upper_bound.cpp`.

The main difference with the previous section is that we do not have any more candidate density. We only know that it is between δ_1 and the Florian upper bound [Flo60]. We proceed by dichotomy on the candidate density. Namely, we maintain two variables δ_{inf} and δ_{sup} , such that the proof that we have an upper bound on the exact maximal density succeeds for δ_{sup} but fails for δ_{inf} . We start with δ_{inf} slightly less than δ_1 and δ_{sup} equal to the Florian upper bound. At each step, we check whether the proof works for $\frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\text{inf}} + \delta_{\text{sup}})$ and update δ_{inf} and δ_{sup} accordingly. We stop when $\delta_{\text{sup}} - \delta_{\text{inf}}$ is smaller than a fixed precision, namely 0.0001. We finally output δ_{sup} : it is an upper bound on the maximal density (and the best that we get by our method, up to the fixed precision).

As in the previous subsection, we have to do this for a whole continuum of ratios. However, we cannot proceed by dichotomy on ratios because we do not have a halting criterion. Indeed, whatever the precision on r , the dichotomy on the density will return an upper bound. Since the better the precision on r , the better this upper bound, we want to subdivide $(0, 1)$ interval as small as possible, with the limiting factor being the computation time.

Actually, we found it more relevant to compute upper bound only for regularly spaced discrete values of r using maximal precision. Indeed, since the

maximal density is regular (see below), this gives a fair idea of which bounds could be obtained without limitation on the computation time. The regularity of the maximal density can be formalized as follows:

Proposition 1 *For $x < y$ in $[0, 1]$, the maximal density satisfies*

$$\frac{|\delta(y) - \delta(x)|}{|y - x|} \leq \frac{\pi}{y^2\sqrt{3}}.$$

The proof of this proposition is given in Appendix A. In particular, the maximal density is $\frac{\pi}{a^2\sqrt{3}}$ -Lipshitz over any interval $[a, b] \subset (0, 1]$. Table 2 gives the step and execution time on each connected component of the complement of $I_1 \cup I_2 \cup I_3 \cup I_4$ (the intervals on which the maximal density has been proven to be δ_1). A list of values can be found in the supplementary materials (file `trace_upper_bound.txt`), see also Fig. 9, 10 and 11 for a zoom of Fig. 1.

| Interval | step ε | execution time |
|------------------|--------------------|----------------|
| [0.6269, 0.6469] | 0.0001 | 42 min. |
| [0.5145, 0.5666] | 0.0001 | 98 min. |
| [0.4532, 0.4917] | 0.0001 | 97 min. |
| [0.106, 0.445] | 0.001 | 16h. |

Table 2: Interval, separation between discrete values of r and execution time.

4 Discussion

Figures 9, 10, 11 and 12 depicts lower and upper bound on the maximal density over each interval of interest. The upper bounds are depicted by red points and the lower bound by a green curve.

The black points indicate the candidate upper bound that we get after the first pass only, that is, after checking that the parameter polytope is not empty. These points give a lower bound on the best upper bound that we can hope to obtain with our method, if we knew how to choose the parameters in an optimal way. Be careful: this lower bound is not necessarily achievable (this is in particular the case when the black points are under the green curve, i.e., under the lower bound proved on the maximum density). Nevertheless, these points highlight the ratios for which the difference with the upper bound actually proven is large. For these ratios, we can hope to improve the upper bound by choosing the parameters more finely. The upper bound turns out to be very sensitive to the choice of parameters in the polytope, which is therefore a delicate exercise (especially since it is done automatically here because of the very large number of different ratios considered). In particular, these black points show that the largest intervals over which one can expect our method to prove that the maximal density is δ_1 are only slightly larger than the I_i 's in Theorem 1, namely:

$$[0.4398, 0.4644], \quad [0.4862, 0.5182], \quad [0.5624, 0.6285], \quad [0.6455, 1].$$




Figure 9: Between I_3 and I_4 , that is, for $r \in [0.6269, 0.6469]$. The upper bound (red points) is quite close to the lower bound (green curve). We conjecture that the lower bound is tight on this interval. For $r_1 \approx 0.6375$, the lower bound reaches its maximum and has been proven to be tight [BF21].

In and , we used the term “artefact”. By this, we mean a peak in the upper bound which is though to be well above the exact maximal density. Such peaks appear for ratios such that the disks fit together particularly well around one disc. Indeed, the method developed in [BF21] is rather “local”: it distributes the densities between each disc and its close neighbors and bounds from above the resulting average density. However, these locally dense arrangements may not combine well on a more global scale, leading to packings in the whole plane that are actually much less dense than the obtained upper bound. Figure 13 illustrates the case $r = 0.48$.

To get around this problem, it will probably be necessary to modify the method to make it less local, i.e., to distribute the densities on a larger scale. This unfortunately makes the method even more complex.

A Proof of Prop. 1

Proof. Recall that the maximal density can be approached arbitrarily close by the density of a periodic packing. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$.

First, consider a periodic packing of discs of radii y and 1 and density at least $\delta(y) - \varepsilon$. Assume its fundamental domain has area A and contains p discs




Figure 10: Between I_2 and I_3 , that is, for $r \in [0.5145, 0.5666]$. For $r_3 \approx 0.5332$ and $r_2 \approx 0.5451$, the lower bound reaches two local maxima and has been proven to be tight [BF21]. For $r \leq r_2$, the upper bound (red points) are quite close to the lower bound (green curve). We conjecture that the lower bound is tight on this interval. For $r \geq r_2$ the lower and upper bounds diverge. The difference between black and red dots is moreover relatively large between 0.552 and 0.558, suggesting (but not proving) that the choice of parameters could be optimized. We do not exclude the possibility that the lower bound is not optimal, i.e. that a better flow could be defined to the right of r_2 (remind Fig. 6).

of radius y and q discs of radius 1. Hence

$$\frac{p\pi y^2 + q\pi}{A} \geq \delta(y) - \varepsilon.$$

By replacing each disc of radius y by a smaller disc of radius x with the same center, we get a packing of discs of radii x and 1 whose density is

$$\frac{p\pi x^2 + q\pi}{A}.$$

Since this density is, by definition, less or equal than $\delta(x)$, we have

$$\delta(y) - \varepsilon \leq \frac{p\pi y^2 + q\pi}{A} \leq \delta(x) + \frac{p\pi(y^2 - x^2)}{A} = \delta(x) + \frac{p\pi(x+y)}{A}(y-x).$$




Figure 11: Between I_1 and I_2 , that is, for $r \in [0.4532, 0.4917]$, there is a sort of “mysterious island”. The lower bound is indeed δ_1 over this whole interval: no packing more dense than the hexagonal compact packing is known. The difference between red and black points suggest that the choice of parameters could be optimized, but does not leave any hope of reducing the upper bound to δ_1 over the whole interval. Our conjecture is that the lower bound is tight, that is, this mysterious island is an artefact of our method. This possible “artefact” is discussed in more detail in the text.

In the initially considered packing, the fraction of A covered by the discs of radius y is at most $\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}$, the maximal density of a packing by equal discs. Hence

$$\frac{p\pi y^2}{A} \leq \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}.$$

This yields

$$\delta(y) - \varepsilon \leq \delta(x) + \frac{\pi(x+y)}{2y^2\sqrt{3}}(y-x) \leq \frac{\pi}{y^2\sqrt{3}}(y-x).$$

Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives the first half of the claimed inequality.

Conversely, consider a periodic packing of discs of radii x and 1 and density at least $\delta(x) - \varepsilon$. Assume its fundamental domain has area A and contains p discs of radius x and q discs of radius 1. Hence

$$\frac{p\pi x^2 + q\pi}{A} \geq \delta(x) - \varepsilon.$$




Figure 12: On the left of I_1 , that is, $r \in [0.106, 0.445]$. The lower bound has been proved to be tight on its local maxima at $r_8 \approx 1547$, $r_7 \approx 0.2808$, $r_6 \approx 0.3292$, $r_5 \approx 0.3861$ and $r_4 \approx 0.4142$ [BF21]. We conjecture that it still holds on a neighborhood of these ratios. We also conjecture that the lower bound is tight at its local maximum at $r_b \approx 0.3691$. This is less clear around $r_c \approx 0.2168$. Upper and lower bound are quite different in the valleys between peaks of the lower bound. This can be due to artefacts (this is our hypothesis - see text) or to unknown dense packings.

By scaling the whole packing by y/x , we get a packing of discs of radii y and $y/x > 1$ whose fundamental domain has area $A \times (y/x)^2$. Then, by replacing each disc of radius y/x by a smaller disc of radius 1 with the same center, we get a packing of discs of radii y and 1 whose density is

$$\frac{p\pi y^2 + q\pi}{A(y/x)^2} = \frac{p\pi x^2}{A} + \frac{q\pi x^2}{Ay^2}.$$

Since this density is, by definition, less or equal than $\delta(y)$, we have

$$\delta(x) - \varepsilon \leq \frac{p\pi x^2 + q\pi}{A} = \frac{p\pi y^2 + q\pi}{A(y/x)^2} + \frac{q\pi}{A} - \frac{q\pi x^2}{Ay^2} \leq \delta(y) + \frac{q\pi(x+y)}{Ay^2}(y-x).$$

In the initially considered packing, the fraction of A covered by the discs of




Figure 13: Discs of radius 1 and 0.48. The large disc can be surrounded by discs to form a pattern which is locally quite optimal in terms of density (three leftmost patterns). This is also the case, to a lesser extent, of the small discs (three rightmost patterns). However, it seems impossible to combine these patterns to form a dense packing in the plane. We can indeed start from one of these patterns, but the more we add discs, the less the local patterns can resemble those represented here.

radius 1 is at most $\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}$, the maximal density of a packing by equal discs. Hence

$$\frac{q\pi}{A} \leq \frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{3}}.$$

This yields

$$\delta(x) - \varepsilon \leq \delta(y) + \frac{\pi(x+y)}{2y^2\sqrt{3}}(y-x) \leq \delta(y) + \frac{\pi}{y^2\sqrt{3}}(y-x).$$

Taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ gives the second half of the claimed inequality. \square

References

- [BF21] N. Bédaride and Th. Fernique. Density of binary disc packings: the 9 compact packings. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 2021.
- [Bli69] G. Blind. Über Unterdeckungen der Ebene durch Kreise. *Journal für die Reine Angewandte Mathematik*, 236:145–173, 1969.
- [CG20] R. Connelly and S. J. Gortler. Packing disks by flipping and flowing. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 2020.
- [CP19] R. Connelly and M. Pierre. Maximally dense disc packings on the plane. preprint, arxiv:1907.03652, 2019.
- [CW10] H.-C. Chang and L.-C. Wang. A Simple proof of Thue’s theorem on circle packing. preprint, arxiv:1009.4322, 2010.
- [Dev19] The Sage Developers. *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 8.6)*, 2019. <http://www.sagemath.org>.
- [Fer19] Th. Fernique. A Densest ternary circle packing in the plane. preprint, arxiv:1912.02297, 2019.

- [Fer20] Th. Fernique. Density of binary disc packings: playing with stoichiometry. preprint, arXiv:2006.14232, 2020.
- [FJFS20] E. Fayen, A. Jagannathan, G. Foffi, and F. Smalenburg. Infinite-pressure phase diagram of binary mixtures of (non)additive hard disks. *The Journal of chemical physics*, 152:204901, 2020.
- [Flo60] A. Florian. Ausfüllung der Ebene durch Kreise. *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo*, 9:300–312, 1960.
- [FT43] L. Fejes Tóth. Über die dichteste Kugellagerung. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 48:676–684, 1943.
- [FT64] L. Fejes Tóth. *Regular figures*. International Series in Monographs on Pure and Applied Mathematics. Pergamon, Oxford, 1964.
- [Hep00] A. Heppes. On the densest packing of discs of radius 1 and $\sqrt{2} - 1$. *Studia Scientiarum Mathematicarum Hungarica*, 36:433–454, 2000.
- [Hep03] A. Heppes. Some densest two-size disc packings in the plane. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 30:241–262, 2003.
- [Ken04a] T. Kennedy. https://www.math.arizona.edu/~tgk/pack_two_discs/density.html, 2004. Accessed: 2020-11-17.
- [Ken04b] T. Kennedy. A Densest compact planar packing with two sizes of discs. preprint, arxiv:0412418, 2004.
- [Ken06] T. Kennedy. Compact packings of the plane with two sizes of discs. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 35:255–267, 2006.
- [Lag02] J. C. Lagarias. Bounds for local density of sphere packings and the Kepler conjecture. *Discrete and Computational Geometry*, 27:165–193, 2002.
- [UST04] O. U. Uche, F. H. Stillinger, and S. Torquato. Concerning maximal packing arrangements of binary disk mixtures. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 342:428–446, 2004.