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#### Abstract

We prove three-dimensional Worsey-Farin refinements inherit their parent triangulations' shape regularity.


## 1. Introduction

Three-dimensional Worsey-Farin splits were first introduced in 15 to construct low-order $C^{1}$ splines on simplicial triangulations, and they have been extensively studied since then; see for example [12]. Recently it has been shown that smooth piecewise polynomial spaces on Worsey-Farin splits (and related ones) fit into discrete de Rham complexes. [5, 7, 10]. These results are further applied to analyze convergence, stability and accuracy of numerical methods for models of incompressible fluids on theses refinements [3, 4, 11]. Therefore, it is necessary to discuss the properties of these refinements, especially in the context of approximation and stability properties of the corresponding discrete spaces. One critical geometric property for approximation theory is the shape regularity of the underlying mesh.

The shape regularity of Worsey-Farin splits are required to ensure optimal-order and uniform interpolation estimates in [12, Theorem 18.15], [1, Theorem 6.3], [14, Theorem 6.2], and [13, Theorem 8.14]. Stability estimates of a finite element method in [6] defined on Worsey-Farin splits also require regularity of the refined triangulation. The references 12 , Page 515], [1, Remark 14], and [2, Page 54] explicitly conjecture that Worsey-Farin splits of a family of shape regular meshes remain shape regular. However, to the best of our knowledge, a proof of this result has not appeared in the literature. In this note we fill in this gap.

In [12, Lemma 4.20] and [11, Lemma 2.6], the relationship between the shape regularity constant of Powell-Sabin splits and the parent triangulations is shown. Namely, this result is proved by establishing bounds of the angles of each macro triangle. Hence, it is natural to focus on the dihedral angles in the three-dimensional Worsey-Farin case. We first prove the dihedral angles are bounded by quantities that only depend on the shape regularity of the original mesh (see Lemma 2.6 below). Using this result we prove the crucial result that the split points of each face $F$ in the triangulation is uniformly bounded away from $\partial F$; see Lemma 3.3. From this result, the shape regularity of Worsey-Farin refinements is then shown.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the Worsey-Farin refinement of a three-dimensional simplicial mesh and present some notations to better illustrate our main analysis. In Section 3, we show the shape regularity of Worsey-Farin splits is solely determined by the shape regularity of the parent mesh.
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## 2. Preliminaries

2.1. Geometric notations and properties. We first present some basic definitions regarding the geometric properties of a tetrahedron, see [12, Definition 16.1-16.2] for more details.

Given a tetrahedron $T$, we denote by $\Delta_{m}(T)$ the set of $m$-dimensional simplices of $T$. For example, $\Delta_{2}(T)$ is the set of four faces of $T$, and $\Delta_{1}(T)$ is the set of six edges of $T$. Let $\rho_{T}$ be the diameter of the inscribed sphere $S_{T}$ of $T$, which is the largest sphere contained in $T$. We call the center of $S_{T}$ the incenter of $T$, denoted by $z_{T}$, and call the radius of $S_{T}$ the inradius of $T$, equal to $\rho_{T} / 2$. The sphere $S_{T}$ intersects each face $F$ of $T$ at a unique point, $z_{T, F}$. We note that $z_{T, F}$ is the orthogonal projection of the point $z_{T}$ to the plane that contains $F$ (i.e., the vector $z_{T}-z_{T, F}$ is normal to $F$ ). Finally, we let $h_{T}=\operatorname{diam}(T)$.

The following two propositions are well-known results of tetrahedra. To be self-contained we provide their proofs.
Proposition 2.1. For a tetrahedron $T$, there holds

$$
\rho_{T}=6|T| /\left(\sum_{F \in \Delta_{2}(T)}|F|\right) .
$$

Proof. Consider the refinement of $T$ obtained by connecting the incenter of $T$ to its vertices. The resulting four subtetrahedra fill the volume of $T$, and thus,

$$
|T|=\sum_{F \in \Delta_{2}(T)} \frac{1}{3}|F| \frac{\rho_{T}}{2}
$$

which gives the result.
Proposition 2.2. Given a tetrahedron $T$, let $x$ be any vertex of $T$ and $F_{x}$ be the face of $T$ which is opposite to $x$. Let $P_{x}$ be the plane containing $F_{x}$, then for any point $a \in \operatorname{int}(T)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dist}\left(x, P_{x}\right)>\operatorname{dist}\left(a, P_{x}\right) \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dist}\left(x, P_{x}\right)>\rho_{T} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Since the point $a \in \operatorname{int}(T)$ and $F_{x}$ is a face of $T, a$ and $F_{x}$ form a tetrahedron $T^{\prime} \subset T$. Therefore,

$$
\frac{1}{3}\left|F_{x}\right| \operatorname{dist}\left(x, P_{x}\right)=|T|>\left|T^{\prime}\right|=\frac{1}{3}\left|F_{x}\right| \operatorname{dist}\left(a, P_{x}\right)
$$

which immediately gives (2.1). Let $\ell$ be the line containing $z_{T}$ and $z_{T, F_{x}}$. Let $\ell$ intersect $S_{T}$ at $a \neq z_{T, F_{x}}$. Then $a \in \operatorname{int}(T)$ and $\operatorname{dist}\left(a, P_{x}\right)=\left|\left[a, z_{T, F_{x}}\right]\right|=\rho_{T}$. Hence, (2.2) follows from (2.1).

We will also need the following result that bounds $\operatorname{dist}\left(z_{T, F}, \partial F\right)$ from below using the dihedral angles.
Lemma 2.3. Let $T$ be a tetrahedron, and for each face $F \in \Delta_{2}(T)$, let $z_{T, F}$ denote the orthogonal projection of the incenter of $T$ onto $F$. Let $\alpha_{e}$ be the dihedral angle of $T$ with respect to $e \in \Delta_{1}(T)$. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\min _{F \in \Delta_{2}(T)} \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{T, F}, \partial F\right) \geq \min _{e \in \Delta_{1}(T)} \frac{\rho_{T}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1+\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)}{1-\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)}} . \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$



Figure 1. A representation of the dihedral angle.

Proof. We use the short hand notation depicted in Figure 1. In particular, $z$ denotes the incenter of $T$ and $F_{i} \in \Delta_{2}(T), i=0, \ldots, 3$ denote the faces of $T$. Let $z_{i}$ be the orthogonal projection of $z$ onto the plane containing $F_{i}$ and note that $\left|\left[z, z_{i}\right]\right|=\rho_{T} / 2$. We need to find a lower bound for $\operatorname{dist}\left(z_{k}, \partial F_{k}\right)(k=0, \ldots, 3)$ and without loss of generality we consider the case $k=0$. To this end, let $e_{i}=\partial F_{0} \cap \partial F_{i}, i=1,2,3$ and furthermore let $\ell_{i}$ be the line containing $e_{i}$. Let $\gamma_{i}$ be the plane determined by the points $z, z_{0}$, and $z_{i}$ and let $v_{i}=\ell_{i} \cap \gamma_{i}$. Since $\ell_{i} \perp\left[z, z_{i}\right]$ for $j=0, i$, we have the line $\ell_{i}$ is perpendicular to the plane $\gamma_{i}$, and thus $\ell_{i} \perp\left[v_{i}, z_{j}\right]$ for $j=0, i$. This implies

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(z_{j}, \ell_{i}\right)=\left|\left[z_{j}, v_{i}\right]\right|, j=0, i, \text { and } \alpha_{e_{i}}:=\angle z_{0} v_{i} z_{i}=\angle z v_{i} z_{0}+\angle z v_{i} z_{i}
$$

Next, note the properties $\left[z, z_{j}\right] \perp\left[z_{j}, v_{i}\right]$ for $j=0, i$ and $\left|\left[z, z_{j}\right]\right|=\rho_{T} / 2$ imply that the triangles $\left[z, v_{i}, z_{0}\right]$ and $\left[z, v_{i}, z_{i}\right]$ are congruent (see Figure 1b). Consequently, $\angle z v_{i} z_{0}=$ $\angle z v_{i} z_{i}=\alpha_{e_{i}} / 2$ and so

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{dist}\left(z_{0}, \ell_{i}\right)=\left|\left[z_{0}, v_{i}\right]\right|=\frac{\rho_{T} / 2}{\tan \left(\alpha_{e_{i}} / 2\right)}=\frac{\rho_{T}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1+\cos \left(\alpha_{e_{i}}\right)}{1-\cos \left(\alpha_{e_{i}}\right)}} \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The result now follows after using $\operatorname{dist}\left(z_{0}, \partial F_{0}\right) \geq \min _{1 \leq i \leq 3} \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{0}, \ell_{i}\right)$.
2.2. Worsey-Farin splits. Let $\mathcal{T}_{h}$ be a three-dimensional triangulation without hanging nodes. We recall the construction of the Worsey-Farin refinement of $\mathcal{T}_{h}$ in the following definition [9, 12, 15.
Definition 2.4. The Worsey-Farin refinement of $\mathcal{T}_{h}$, denoted by $\mathcal{T}_{h}^{w f}$, is defined by the following two steps:
(1) Connect the incenter $z_{T}$ of of each tetrahedron $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$ to its four vertices;
(2) For each interior face $F=\overline{T_{1}} \cap \overline{T_{2}}$ with $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$, let $m_{F}=L \cap F$ where $L=$ [ $z_{T_{1}}, z_{T_{2}}$ ], the line segment connecting the incenter of $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$; meanwhile, for a boundary face $F$ with $F=\bar{T} \cap \partial \Omega$ with $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$, let $m_{F}$ be the barycenter of $F$. We then connect $m_{F}$ to the three vertices of the face $F$ and to the incenters $z_{T_{1}}$ and $z_{T_{2}}$ (or $z_{T}$ for the boundary case).


Figure 2. Computing dihedral angles.
We see that this two-step procedure divides each $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$ into 12 subtetrahedra; we denote the set of these subtetrahedra by $T^{w f}$.

The result [12, Lemma 16.24] ensures that the three-dimensional Worsey-Farin refinement is well-defined; in particular, the line segment connecting the incenters of neighboring tetrahedra intersects their common face.

Definition 2.5. We define the shape regularity constant of the triangulation $\mathcal{T}_{h}$ as

$$
c_{0}=\max _{T \in \mathcal{T}_{h}} \frac{h_{T}}{\rho_{T}}
$$

It is well-known that shape regularity of a mesh leads to bounded dihedral angles. To be self-contained, we present a proof here.
Lemma 2.6. Fix $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$, and let $\alpha_{e}$ denote the dihedral angle of $T$ with respect to $e \in \Delta_{1}(T)$. We then have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)\right| \leq \sqrt{1-c_{0}^{-2}} \quad \forall e \in \Delta_{1}(T) \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Write $T=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$, consider the edge $e=\left[x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$, and let $\ell$ be the line containing $e$; see Figure 2. Let $A$ be the orthogonal projection of $x_{1}$ onto the plane $\gamma$ containing the face $\left[x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$, and let $B$ be the point on $\ell$ such that $\left[x_{1}, B\right] \perp \ell$. Note that $\left[x_{1}, B\right] \perp \ell$ and $\left[x_{1}, A\right] \perp \ell$ implies $[A, B] \perp \ell$. Since $\left|\left[x_{1}, A\right]\right| \geq \rho_{T}$ by Proposition 2.2 and $\left|\left[x_{1}, B\right]\right| \leq h_{T}$, the dihedral angle of $e$ satisfies

$$
\sin \left(\alpha_{e}\right)=\frac{\left|\left[x_{1}, A\right]\right|}{\left|\left[x_{1}, B\right]\right|} \geq \frac{\rho_{T}}{h_{T}} \geq c_{0}^{-1} .
$$

Therefore, we have $\left|\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)\right|=\sqrt{1-\sin ^{2}\left(\alpha_{e}\right)} \leq \sqrt{1-c_{0}^{-2}}$.

## 3. Analysis of the shape regularity of Worsey-Farin splits

In this section, we prove the main result of this note. We prove that the Worsey-Farin refinement $\mathcal{T}_{h}^{w f}$ is shape regular provided the parent triangulationn $\mathcal{T}_{h}$ is shape regular. To be more precise, the following theorem will be proved:


Figure 3. A representation of the Worsey-Farin splits.

Theorem 3.1. There exists a constant $c_{1}>0$ only depending on $c_{0}$, the shape regularity constant of $\mathcal{T}_{h}$ given in Definition 2.5 such that

$$
\max _{K \in \mathcal{T}_{h}^{w f}} \frac{h_{K}}{\rho_{K}} \leq c_{1} .
$$

For an explicit formula of $c_{1}$, see (3.4) and (3.1).
3.1. Local geometry. To prove the above theorem, we need to consider two cases: interior and boundary faces of $\mathcal{T}_{h}$. The case of boundary faces is simpler, so we first focus on the interior faces. For that case, it is sufficient to consider two adjacent elements of the mesh $\mathcal{T}_{h}$. To this end, let $T_{1}, T_{2} \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$ be two tetrahedra that share a common face $F_{0}$. We write $T_{1}=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right], T_{2}=\left[x_{1}, x_{3}, x_{4}, x_{5}\right]$, so that the common face is $F_{0}=\left[x_{1}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$. We further set $F_{1}=\left[x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$, and let $z_{i}$ be the incenter of $T_{i}, i=1,2$ (see Figure 3a). For $i=1,2$, we denote by $z_{i, 0}$ the orthogonal projections of $z_{i}$ onto the plane containing the face $F_{0}$ (see Figure 3b). Likewise the orthogonal projection of $z_{1}$ onto the plane containing the face $F_{1}$ is denoted by $z_{1,1}$ (see Figure 1a). We denote the split point of the face $F_{0}$ by $m_{0}$, i.e., $m_{0}$ is the intersection of the line $\left[z_{1}, z_{2}\right]$ and $F_{0}$.
3.2. The position of split points and bounded dihedral angles. The following proposition shows the relation between the split point $m_{0}$ and the projections $z_{i, 0}, i=1,2$ of the incenter on the face $F_{0}$.
Proposition 3.2. The orthogonal projections $z_{i, 0}(i=1,2)$ lie in the interior of $F_{0}$, and the split point $m_{0}$ lies on the line segment $\left[z_{1,0}, z_{2,0}\right]$. Furthermore, we have

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(m_{0}, \partial F_{0}\right) \geq \min _{i=1,2} \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{i, 0}, \partial F_{0}\right)
$$

Proof. The proof of [12, Lemma 16.24] shows that $m_{0}$ lies on the line segment $\left[z_{1,0}, z_{2,0}\right]$ and that $z_{i, 0}(i=1,2)$ lie in the interior of $F_{0}$.

Let $\ell_{i}, i=1,2,3$ denote the lines that contain the three edges of $F_{0}$. Because $m_{0}$ lies on the interior of the line segment $\left[z_{1,0}, z_{2,0}\right]$, there exists a constant $\theta \in(0,1)$ such that
$m_{0}=\theta z_{1,0}+(1-\theta) z_{2,0}$. Then by constructing similar triangles, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dist}\left(m_{0}, \partial F_{0}\right) & =\min _{1 \leq i \leq 3} \operatorname{dist}\left(m_{0}, \ell_{i}\right) \\
& =\min _{1 \leq i \leq 3}\left(\theta \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{1,0}, \ell_{i}\right)+(1-\theta) \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{2,0}, \ell_{i}\right)\right) \\
& \geq \theta \min _{1 \leq i \leq 3} \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{1,0}, \ell_{i}\right)+(1-\theta) \min _{1 \leq i \leq 3} \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{2,0}, \ell_{i}\right) \\
& =\theta \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{1,0}, \partial F_{0}\right)+(1-\theta) \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{2,0}, \partial F_{0}\right) \\
& \geq \min _{i=1,2} \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{i, 0}, \partial F_{0}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Combining Lemma 2.3. Lemma 2.6 and Proposition 3.2, we have the following lemma which describes the position of split points. We also include the case for boundary faces.

Lemma 3.3. Recall that $m_{F}$ is the split point of $F$ constructed by the Worsey-Farin split defined in Definition 2.4. For any face $F$ of $\mathcal{T}_{h}$,

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(m_{F}, \partial F\right) \geq c_{2} \min _{\substack{T \in \mathcal{T}_{h} \\ F \in \Delta_{2}(T)}} h_{T},
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{2}:=\min \left\{\mathfrak{c}_{2},\left(3 c_{0}\right)^{-1}\right\}, \quad \mathfrak{c}_{2}:=\left(2 c_{0}\right)^{-1} \sqrt{-1+\frac{2}{1+\sqrt{1-c_{0}^{-2}}}} . \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. (i) $F$ is an interior face. In this case $F \in \Delta_{2}(T)$ and $F \in \Delta_{2}\left(T^{\prime}\right)$ for some $T, T^{\prime} \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\operatorname{dist}\left(z_{T^{\prime}, F}, \partial F\right) \geq \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{T, F}, \partial F\right)$. Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 3.2 tell us that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{dist}\left(m_{F}, \partial F\right) & \geq \operatorname{dist}\left(z_{T, F}, \partial F\right) \\
& \geq \min _{e \in \Delta_{1}(T)} \frac{\rho_{T}}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1+\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)}{1-\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)}}=\min _{e \in \Delta_{1}(T)} \frac{\rho_{T}}{2} \sqrt{-1+\frac{2}{1-\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)}} .
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right) \geq 0$, then $\frac{2}{1-\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)} \geq 2$, and if $\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right) \leq 0$, then $\frac{2}{1-\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)}=\frac{2}{1+\left|\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)\right|} \geq \frac{2}{1+\sqrt{1-c_{0}^{-2}}}$ by Lemma 2.6. Consequently,

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(m_{F}, \partial F\right) \geq \min _{e \in \Delta_{1}(T)} \frac{\rho_{T}}{2} \sqrt{-1+\frac{2}{1-\cos \left(\alpha_{e}\right)}} \geq \mathfrak{c}_{2} h_{T}
$$

(ii) $F$ is a boundary face. Let $T=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$ and $F=\left[x_{1}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$, and consider an arbitrary $e \in \Delta_{1}(F)$ with $\ell$ denoting the line containing $e$. Without loss of generality we assume $e=\left[x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$ and adopt the notation in the proof of Lemma 2.6. see Figure 2. Because $m_{F}$ is the barycenter of $F$, we have

$$
\frac{1}{3}|F|=\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{dist}\left(m_{F}, \ell\right)|e| .
$$

Moreover, clearly

$$
\left.|F|=\frac{1}{2}|e| \right\rvert\,\left[x_{1}, B\right] .
$$

And therefore, since $\left|\left[x_{1}, B\right]\right| \geq\left|\left[x_{1}, A\right]\right|>\rho_{T}$, (where we used (2.2) and the right triangle $\left[x_{1}, A, B\right]$ ) we get

$$
\operatorname{dist}\left(m_{F}, \ell\right)=\frac{1}{3}\left|\left[x_{1}, B\right]\right| \geq \frac{1}{3} \rho_{T} \geq\left(3 c_{0}\right)^{-1} h_{T}
$$

Since $e \in \Delta_{1}(F)$ was arbitrary the result follows.
3.3. Proof of Theorem 3.1, Now we are ready to use Lemma 3.3 to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $K \in \mathcal{T}_{h}^{w f}$, and let $T \in \mathcal{T}_{h}$ such that $K \in T^{w f}$. We write $T=$ [ $x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}$ ], and assume, without loss of generality, that $e:=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]$ is an edge of both $T$ and $K$. Let $F \in \Delta_{2}(T)$ such that the split point $m_{F}$ is a vertex of $K$. In particular, $e \in \Delta_{1}(F)$ and $K=\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, m_{F}, z_{T}\right]$, where $z_{T}$ is the incenter of $T$. We futher denote by $\ell$, the line containing the edge $e$.

We again adopt the notation in the proof of Lemma 2.6 and refer to Figure 2, Note that $\left[x_{1}, A\right]$ is normal to the plane $\gamma$ containing $\left[x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right]$, in particular, $\left[x_{1}, A\right] \perp\left[A, x_{2}\right]$. Thus $|e|=\left|\left[x_{1}, x_{2}\right]\right|>\left|\left[x_{1}, A\right]\right|>\rho_{T}$ by (2.2). Now we have $h_{K} \leq h_{T}, \rho_{T}<|e| \leq h_{T}$ and, by Lemma 3.3, the volume $K$ is

$$
\begin{align*}
|K| & =\frac{1}{3} \frac{\rho_{T}}{2} \times\left|\left[x_{1}, x_{2}, m_{F}\right]\right|=\frac{1}{12} \rho_{T}|e| \operatorname{dist}\left(m_{F}, \ell\right) \\
& \geq \frac{1}{12} \rho_{T}^{2} \operatorname{dist}\left(m_{F}, \partial F\right) \geq \frac{c_{2}}{12} \rho_{T}^{2}\left(\min _{\substack{T^{\prime} \in \mathcal{T}_{h} \\
F \in \Delta_{2}\left(T^{\prime}\right)}} h_{T^{\prime}}\right) \geq \frac{c_{2}}{12} \rho_{T}^{3} \geq \frac{c_{2}}{12 c_{0}^{3}} h_{T}^{3} \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

Here we also used

$$
\min _{\substack{T^{\prime} \in \mathcal{T}_{h} \\ F \in \Delta_{2}\left(T^{\prime}\right)}} h_{T^{\prime}} \geq|e|>\rho_{T}
$$

Additionally, each face of $K$ is contained in a circle with radius $h_{K} / 2$, and thus we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{F \in \Delta_{2}(K)}|F| \leq \sum_{F \in \Delta_{2}(K)} \frac{\pi h_{K}^{2}}{4}=\pi h_{K}^{2} \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Consequently, with Proposition 2.1, (3.2) and (3.3), we have

$$
\rho_{K}=\frac{6|K|}{\sum_{F \in \Delta_{2}(K)}|F|} \geq \frac{c_{2} h_{T}^{3}}{2 \pi c_{0}^{3} h_{K}^{2}} \geq \frac{c_{2} h_{K}}{2 \pi c_{0}^{3}} .
$$

Thus, setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
c_{1}=\frac{2 \pi c_{0}^{3}}{c_{2}} \tag{3.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have $\frac{h_{K}}{\rho_{K}} \leq c_{1}$. Because $K \in \mathcal{T}_{h}^{w f}$ was arbitrary, we conclude $\max _{K \in \mathcal{T}_{h}^{w f}} \frac{h_{K}}{\rho_{K}} \leq c_{1}$.

## 4. Conclusion

We have settled a conjecture concerning the shape regularity of a Worsey-Farin refinement of a parent triangulation. As described in the introduction, this is a crucial bound to obtain approximation results for splines; see for example [12, Theorem 18.15]. However, based on initial numerical calculations, the constant $c_{1}$ in Theorem 3.1 that relates the shape regularity of the parent triangulation (i.e., $c_{0}$ ) and its Worsey-Farin refinement is most likely not sharp. In particular, the theorem suggest that $c_{1}$ scales like $c_{0}^{5}$ which could be quite large even for
a good quality parent triangulation. We hope that this work leads to further investigations and sharper estimates will emerge.
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