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Abstract

Motivated by the recent studies of quasi-periodic equilibria of dense packing of diblock and star polymers, this work introduces the Hookean-Voronoi energy, a minimal model for the packing of soft, deformable balls. Considering the planar case, we investigate the equilibrium packings of $N$ deformable circles in a periodic square, deriving a reduced formulation of the system and establish that it has a large, $O(N^2)$, family of ordered “single-string” minimizers. Through numerical investigation of gradient flows from random initial data, we show that for modest values of $N$ the system frequently equilibrates to quasi-ordered states with low energy and large basins of attraction. For larger $N$ the energy of equilibria approach a limiting distribution, shaped by two mechanisms: a proliferation of moderate-energy disordered equilibria that block access of the gradient flow to lower energy quasi-ordered states and a rigid threshold on the maximum energy of stable states that precludes high-energy equilibria. The system frustration, measuring gap between the average equilibrium energy of the gradient flow and the system ground state, increases with $N$ but saturates.

1 Introduction

There has been substantial recent interest in space-filling packings by soft objects that are spherical when unconstrained. These arise naturally from phase separation of classes of amphiphilic diblock polymers whose composition lends an energetic preference to forming spherical micelles. Computational studies, largely based upon models derived from self-consistent mean field theory, have identified a wide range of quasi-periodic structures and periodic structures with large periodicity. This work started with the experimental observation of Frank Kasper $\sigma_6$ phases in sphere forming block copolymers, [13]. In the space-filling arrangement the micelles form dodecagonal quasicrystals, and the authors attributed the disorder to frustration in the macromolecular packing. This was followed by work examining the roles of symmetry breaking and exchange of mass, [14], issues of stability [9], effective descriptions from Voronoi type models [17], and identification of periodic Laves phases with large unit cells, [6]. The study of complex packing phases in diblock copolymers is complicated by the possibility of micelles exchanging mass via transport of the diblock polymer chains. This facilitates symmetry breaking since a diversity of sphere volumes can arise dynamically from variations induced by initial distributions.

More recently complex packing phases have been investigated in Miktoarm star polymers, [1]. Star-shaped polymers have a central core with arms that radiate out symmetrically, Figure 1 (left). These
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molecules form domains from a single polymer molecule, eliminating the possibility of mass exchange. In a dilute setting in the presence of a good solvent they form soft spheres of prescribed radius. When \( N \) star polymers are packed into a domain whose volume is inferior to the natural volume of the \( N \) star-polymers, they compress and roughly form a Voronoi tessellation of the domain. In \( \mathbb{R}^3 \) the only Voronoi tessellation that can be formed from identical shapes is the lattice cube which has degenerate vertices and is not a candidate for energy minimization. Thus it is not surprising that minimizers are quasi-periodic, or have large-period configurations identified computationally by tuning the aspect ratio of a periodic box.

We present a systematic analytical and computational study of a simplified energy defined for \( N \) polymer sites placed in a periodic subset of the plane. We show that the system posses a large collection of ordered equilibria, and establish that for large values of \( N \) the gradient flows of the system from random initial data generically converge to states that have a significant measure of disorder and an associated energy that is above the ground state. That is, in the bulk the system is disordered and energetically frustrated.

The model energy combines a Voronoi partition of the domain with a Hookean formulation of elastic energy to arrive at a minimal model, the Hookean-Voronoi energy, for the packing of \( N \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \) identical star polymers. We consider a rectangular domain \( \Omega_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^2 \) with aspect ratio \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \) and area \( N \) and construct classes of ordered, hexagonal tessellations that are equilibria of the gradient flow. For each \( N \) and \( \alpha \) there are \( O(N^2) \) such ordered tessellations. We identify sharp conditions on \( N \) and \( \alpha \) under which the class of ordered equilibria contains a regular hexagon tiling. While intuition may suggest that the hexagonal tessellations should have low energy we present numerical evidence that the minimum energy of the ordered tessellations is very sensitive to both \( N \) and \( \alpha \) and can be significantly higher than the ground state energy. Significantly, the fraction of the total phase space that is occupied by the basin of attraction of the ordered equilibria and even partially ordered equilibria, depends sensitively upon the values of \( N \) and \( \alpha \). For large values of \( N \), the probability of random initial data converging to an ordered Voronoi tessellation becomes vanishing small. Indeed equilibrium generically have defects, that is Voronoi regions that are not six sided, and the numerical study suggests that the number of defects scales linearly with system size \( N \).

Most surprisingly, the average energy per Voronoi region increases with \( N \), and apparently saturates as the probability distribution of equilibrium energies converges to a limiting distribution. The simulations suggest that there is sharp cut-off on the maximum energy that a stable equilibrium can possess. However the vanishing of the basins of attraction of the ordered equilibria suggest that the number of moderately defect-filled stable equilibria grows significantly faster than the number of ordered equilibria, and the basins of attraction of these moderately disordered equilibria fill space. The ordered equilibria, and even low-energy states with isolated defects, are rendered inaccessible to the gradient flow and the system is frustrated. Indeed, this simple system shows that ordered equilibria may not be good predictors of bulk (large domain) behavior and that the bulk properties of the system can be sensitive to features, such as aspect ratio, of the finite domain from which they are extrapolated.

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 the Hookean-Voronoi energy is presented and its equilibria are characterized in terms of max-center points that are analogous to, but different than, centroids of the Voronoi regions. In section 3 we construct the “single-string” families of ordered equilibria and characterized the site number \( N \) and aspect ratio \( \alpha \) which admit tessellations by regular hexagons. In section 4 we present the results of the numerical simulations and address the large \( N \) behaviour of the system.
2 The Hookean-Voronoi Energy

We consider a collection of $N$ sites, each representing a star polymer or other deformable object with spherical symmetry. The sites are used to form a Voronoi partition of the rectangular domain $\Omega_\alpha \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ with aspect ratio $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. The domain is taken to be a rectangular $\Omega_\alpha = [0, \sqrt{N\alpha}] \times [0, \sqrt{N/\alpha}]$, normalized to have unit average area per site. We impose periodic boundary conditions, and the domain is equivalent to the torus, $T_\alpha := \mathbb{R}^2/\Omega_\alpha$. We assume a simple Hookean spring energy in which the arms have resistance to compression. The $N$ sites are denoted $\mathbf{x} := (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_N) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}$, with each $\mathbf{x}_i \in \Omega_\alpha$. The Voronoi partition of $\Omega_\alpha$ divides it into regions with disjoint interior $\{V_j\}_{j=1}^N$, where $V_j$ is composed of the region of $\Omega_\alpha$ comprised of the points whose distance on $T_\alpha$ to $\mathbf{x}_j$ is not bigger than the toroidal distance to any other site. With this notation the Hookean-Voronoi energy takes form

$$E_{HV}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^N \int_0^{2\pi} |r_j(\theta) - r_\ast|^2 d\theta,$$

(2.1)

where $r_j$ is the distance on $T_\alpha$ from $\mathbf{x}_j$ to $\partial V_j$ along the ray making angle $\theta$ to the positive $x_1$ axis, Figure 1 (right). The quantity $r_\ast$ denotes the equilibrium length of each polymer arm of the star polymer. The energy models the compression of each polymer arm as a spring with unit Hooke’s law constant and assumes a uniform density of polymer arms with respect to angle. Since Voronoi regions are convex the radii $\{r_j\}_{j=1}^N$ are well defined and the Hookean-Voronoi energy is well-posed.

Figure 1: (left) A depiction of a “miktoarm” star polymer, with arms radiating from a central core, reprinted with permission from [2]. (right) Voronoi diagram generated from $N = 5$ sites $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_5\}$ on a periodic domain. The radius $r_1$ to $\partial V_1$ at angle $\theta$ relative to site $\mathbf{x}_1$ is depicted by a blue arrow.

It is instructive to reformulate the Hookean-Voronoi energy in terms of the average radius of the Voronoi region, $V_j$, with respect to its site $\mathbf{x}$, defined as

$$\tau_j(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} r_j(\theta) d\theta.$$  

(2.2)
Expanding the square in (2.1) and using the polar-coordinate formula for region area

\[ E_{HV}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \int_{0}^{2\pi} (r_j^2(\theta) - 2r_j r_*(\theta) + r_*^2) \, d\theta, \]

\[ = \sum_{j=1}^{N} (2|V_j| - 4\pi r_* r_j + 2\pi r_*^2), \]

where \(|V_j|\) denotes the area of \(V_j\). Since the areas of the Voronoi regions sum to the domain size \(|\Omega_\alpha| = N\), we arrive at the expression

\[ E_{HV}(x) = 2N \left( 1 + \pi r_*^2 \right) - 4\pi r_* \sum_{j=1}^{N} r_j. \]  

(2.3)

Up to a constant, the Hookean Voronoi energy depends only upon the sum of the average radii of the Voronoi sets. It is tempting to correlate the average radii with perimeter, suggesting it is not bounded from above. However Jensen’s inequality provides an upper bound on the average radius.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let \(V\) be a convex domain with a rectifiable boundary. Then for any \(\bar{x} \in V\) the average radius of \(V\) with respect to center \(\bar{x}\) is well posed and satisfies

\[ \pi r^2 \leq |V|. \]  

(2.4)

**Proof.** Since \(V\) is convex the ray leaving \(\bar{x}\) at angle \(\theta\) has a unique intersection with \(\partial V\) and hence \(r = r(\theta; \bar{x})\) is well-defined. Jensen’s inequality applied to convex function \(s \mapsto s^2\) implies

\[ \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} r(\theta) \, d\theta \right)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{0}^{2\pi} r^2(\theta) \, d\theta = \frac{|V|}{\pi}. \]  

(2.5)

From the definition of \(\bar{r}\), this is equivalent to (2.4). \(\Box\)

**Remark 2.2.** The result (2.4) is a form of “inverse” isoperimetric inequality. For any convex domain which encloses a specified area, the average radius is maximized for the circle with the site \(\bar{x}\) taken to be the circle’s center. This motivates the introduction of the averaged isoparametric reciprocal

\[ \rho_0(V; \bar{x}) := \frac{\pi \bar{r}^2}{|V|} \leq 1, \]  

(2.6)

which resembles the reciprocal of the standard isoperimetric ratio of area to the square of the perimeter.

### 2.1 Voronoi Notation and Symmetry

The gradient of the Hookean-Voronoi energy can be simplified using the symmetries of the Voronoi partition. For a given Voronoi partition we denote the total number of unique vertices of the regions by \(M = M(x)\), and enumerate them \(\{\bar{v}_j\}_{j=1}^{M}\). However, for each individual Voronoi region, \(V_i\), its \(m_i\) vertices are also given a double-subscript notation \(\{\bar{v}_{i,1}, \ldots, \bar{v}_{i,m_i}\}\), enumerated in the second index so that the vertices lie counter-clockwise about \(\bar{x}_i\), with \(\bar{v}_{i,1}\) making the smallest non-negative angle with the positive \(x\)-axis. For \(i = 1, \ldots, N\) and \(j = 1, \ldots, m_i\) we denote the angle made by vertex \(\bar{v}_{i,j}\), site
\[ \vec{x}_i \text{ and the positive } x\text{-axis by } \varphi_{i,j}. \] These satisfy \( 0 \leq \varphi_{i,1} < \varphi_{i,2} < \cdots < \varphi_{i,m_i} \). We also introduce the vectors
\[ \vec{d}_{i,j} := \vec{v}_{i,j} - \vec{x}_i, \quad \vec{l}_{i,j} := \vec{v}_{i,j+1} - \vec{v}_{i,j}, \]
where here and below the vertex \( j \) is understood to be taken mod \( m_i \). These respectively represent the vertex-site and counterclockwise vertex-vertex vectors, see Figure 2. The set of near-neighbors of \( \vec{x}_i, \mathcal{N}(\vec{x}_i) \), includes the sites whose Voronoi sets share an edge with \( V_i \), or more precisely the sites whose Voronoi regions share precisely two distinct vertices with \( V_i \). Specifically two sites whose Voronoi regions intersect at a single vertex are not near neighbors.

Voronoi tessellations possess a key symmetry. The vector between two near neighbor sites is perpendicularly bisected by the edge that the two regions share. The vector from \( \vec{x}_i \) to the near neighbor \( \vec{x}_j \) that lies on the perpendicular to edge with vector \( \vec{l}_{i,j} \) is denoted \( \vec{y}_{i,j} := \vec{x}_j - \vec{x}_i \). The site vector \( \vec{y}_{i,j} \) is perpendicularly bisected by the corresponding edge. This implies that the quadrilateral region with vertices given by the two neighboring sites \( \vec{x}_i \) and \( \vec{x}_k \), and their vertices is a kite whose area is denoted \( A_{i,j} \). Indeed the triangle with vertices \( \vec{x}_i, \vec{v}_{i,j}, \vec{v}_{i,j+1} \) is equivalent to the triangle formed by the same two vertices and associated near-neighbor \( \vec{x}_k \), see shaded region in Figure 2 (left). We call this the kite-symmetry of the Voronoi regions. The area of the kite is given by the cross product,
\[ |A_{i,j}| = \left| \vec{y}_{i,j} \times \vec{l}_{i,j} \right| = \left| \vec{l}_{i,j} \right| \left| \vec{y}_{i,j} \right|. \tag{2.7} \]

Figure 2: Sample of Voronoi cells with shared vertex \( \vec{v} \) labeled with key vectors. Relative vertex vectors \( \vec{d} \), Voronoi edges as perpendicular bisectors, and the kite region formed between sites \( \vec{x}_i \) and \( \vec{x}_k \) are shown (left). The edge vectors \( \vec{l} \) are drawn adjacent to the edge, showing the opposing directions between neighboring sites due to the counterclockwise orientation (right).

2.2 The Gradient Flow

While the average radius can be expressed in a closed form, (6.6), it is more informative to calculate the gradient of the Hookean-Voronoi energy directly. The vertices of the Voronoi regions, collectively enumerated as \( v = v(\vec{x}) \), depend upon the choice of sites. In all cases the vertices are a continuous function of the sites, [7]. A vertex \( \vec{v} \) is non-degenerate if the three sites that are closest to it are at the
same distance, \( \rho(\vec{v}) > 0 \), and all other sites are strictly further away. In this case the tessellation is said to be Delaunay and vertices depend smoothly upon the site locations.

**Lemma 2.3.** A non-degenerate vertex depends smoothly upon the sites.

**Proof.** A non-degenerate vertex \( \vec{v} \) and its distance \( \rho > 0 \) are defined as the solution of the system

\[
\|\vec{v} - \vec{x}_j\|^2 = \rho^2,
\]

for \( j = j_1, j_2, j_3 \) which denote the indices of the three sites closest to \( \vec{v} \). This system can be written as \( F(\vec{v}, \rho; \vec{x}_{j_1}, \vec{x}_{j_2}, \vec{x}_{j_3}) = 0 \), with the Jacobian of \( F \) at \((\vec{v}, \rho)\) taking the form

\[
\nabla_{\vec{v}, \rho} F = 2 \begin{pmatrix}
(\vec{v} - \vec{x}_{j_1})^T & \rho \\
(\vec{v} - \vec{x}_{j_2})^T & \rho \\
(\vec{v} - \vec{x}_{j_3})^T & \rho
\end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{3x3}.
\]

So long as \( \rho > 0 \) and \( \{\vec{x}_{j_1}, \vec{x}_{j_2}, \vec{x}_{j_3}\} \) are not collinear, then \( \det \nabla_{\vec{v}, \rho} F \neq 0 \). If \( \vec{v} \) is non-degenerate then the three sites are distinct and equal distance from \( \vec{v} \). Hence they cannot be collinear and the Jacobian is invertible. Since \( F \) is smooth function of all of its arguments, the implicit function theorem implies that \( \vec{v} \) and \( \rho \) depend smoothly upon the sites in some neighborhood. \( \square \)

This gives us the following result.

**Proposition 2.4.** The Hookean-Voronoi energy is a continuous function of the sites, \( \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{2N} \). If each of the sites \( \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) \) is non-degenerate, then the Hookean-Voronoi energy lies in \( C^3([\Omega_a]^{2N}) \).

**Proof.** The Hookean-Voronoi energy is a smooth function of the sites \( \mathbf{x} \) and the vertices \( \mathbf{v} \). If each vertex is non-degenerate, then the vertices are smooth functions of the sites, and the result follows. \( \square \)

The gradient of the energy naturally arises from the variation of the average radius due to two effects: the variation of site \( \vec{x}_i = (\vec{x}^{(1)}_i, \vec{x}^{(2)}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \) within a fixed domain \( V_i \), and the variation of the domain \( V_i \) due to motion of the vertices, \( \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v} \). Correspondingly, for any function \( f : \mathbb{R}^{2N} \times \mathbb{R}^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \) of the sites \( \mathbf{x} \) and the vertices \( \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) \) we express the derivative with respect to \( \vec{x}_i \) in the form

\[
\frac{D_{\vec{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v})}{2x1} = \tilde{\partial}_{\vec{x}_i} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) + \sum_{\vec{v} \in \mathbf{v}} (\partial_{\vec{x}_i} \vec{v})^T \partial_{\vec{v}} f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{v}) \tag{2.8}
\]

Here \( D_{\vec{x}_i} \) denotes the partial Jacobian of \( f \) with respect to \( \vec{x}_i \) with \( f \) viewed as function only of \( \mathbf{x} \) with \( \mathbf{v} \) eliminated through the relation \( \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{v}(\mathbf{x}) \). The “fixed-vertex” Jacobian \( \partial_{\vec{x}_i} \) denotes a partial Jacobian of \( f \) with respect to \( \vec{x}_i \) with \( \mathbf{v} \) fixed, \( \partial_{\vec{v}} f \) denotes the usual partial Jacobian of \( f \) with respect to \( \mathbf{v} \) with \( \mathbf{x} \) fixed, and \( \partial_{\vec{x}_i} \) is the usual partial Jacobian of a function of \( \mathbf{x} \) only. With this notation the gradient flow takes the form

\[
\frac{d\mathbf{x}}{dt} = -D_{\mathbf{x}} E_H(\mathbf{x}) = -\begin{bmatrix}
D_{\vec{x}_1} E_H(\mathbf{x}) \\
\vdots \\
D_{\vec{x}_N} E_H(\mathbf{x})
\end{bmatrix}, \tag{2.9}
\]

subject to initial data.
The kite-symmetry of the Voronoi diagram leads to a simplification of the gradient due to a cancellation of terms arising from the variation of the vertices. We take $D_{\vec{x}_k}$ of equation (2.3) and bring the $\partial \vec{v}$ derivatives into the integral to obtain

$$D_{\vec{x}_k} E_{HV} = -4\pi r_* \sum_{i=1}^N \left( \partial_{\vec{x}_k} \vec{r}_i + \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} (\partial_{\vec{x}_k} \vec{v}_{i,j})^T \partial \vec{v}_{i,j} r(\theta)d\theta \right).$$ (2.10)

The function $\vec{r}_i$ depends upon $\vec{x}_k$ only if $i = k$, and the sum over $r_i$ reduces to a single term. Using the kite-wise formulas $r_{i,j} = r_{i,j}(\theta, \vec{v}_{i,j}, \vec{v}_{i,j+1}, \vec{x}_i)$ for $r_i$ in (6.1) the integrals can be broken into sums over edges of $V_i$, for which the $\partial \vec{v}$ terms reduce to two per side,

$$D_{\vec{x}_k} E_{HV} = -4\pi r_* \left( \partial_{\vec{x}_k} r_k + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \int_{\varphi_{i,j+1}}^{\varphi_{i,j}} (\partial_{\vec{x}_k} \vec{v}_{i,j})^T \partial \vec{v}_{i,j} + (\partial_{\vec{x}_k} \vec{v}_{i,j+1})^T \partial \vec{v}_{i,j+1} \right) r_{i,j}(\theta)d\theta).$$

The double sum vanishes due to the kite-symmetry. To see this we relabel the $K$ edges in the Voronoi diagram as $\{\vec{l}_\ell\}_{\ell=1}^K$. The two sites in the associated kite are labeled $\vec{x}_{\ell+}$ and $\vec{x}_{\ell-}$ with site $\vec{x}_{\ell+}$ having the larger $x$-coordinate or larger $y$-coordinate if the $x$-coordinates are equal. The vertices that terminate the edges of $\vec{l}_\ell$ are labeled $\vec{v}_{\ell\pm}$ respecting the counter-clockwise orientation about $\vec{x}_{\ell+}$. The radius functions $r_{i,j}$ on each kite are relabeled $r_{\ell\pm}$ to align with their site $\vec{x}_{\ell\pm}$. The angle end-points of $r_{\ell+}$ are labeled $\varphi_{\ell\pm}$ while the $\theta$ dependence of $r_{\ell-}$ is linearly translated so that its end-points are also $\varphi_{\ell\pm}$. This is possible as the two halves of the kite are isomorphic. The double sum is regrouped into a single sum over the Voronoi domain edges,

$$D_{\vec{x}_k} E_{HV} = -4\pi r_* \left( \partial_{\vec{x}_k} r_k + \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\ell=1}^K \int_{\varphi_{\ell-}}^{\varphi_{\ell+}} r_{\ell+} (\partial_{\vec{x}_k} \vec{v}_{\ell+})^T \partial \vec{v}_{\ell+} + (\partial_{\vec{x}_k} \vec{v}_{\ell-})^T \partial \vec{v}_{\ell-} \right) d\theta).$$

Here we have introduced the function

$$r_\ell := (r_{\ell+} + r_{\ell-})(\theta, \vec{v}_{\ell+}, \vec{v}_{\ell-}, \vec{x}_{\ell+}, \vec{x}_{\ell-}),$$

which inherits properties from the kite symmetry. In particular

$$\partial \vec{v}_{\ell\pm} r_\ell : \vec{l}_\ell = 0,$$

since moving either vertex $\vec{v}_{\ell\pm}$ in the direction parallel to $\vec{l}_\ell$ does not change the distances $r_{\ell\pm}$ of $\vec{l}_\ell$ to $\vec{x}_{\ell\pm}$, respectively. Moreover, as the two triangles in the kite are isomorphic, the function

$$t \in \mathbb{R} \mapsto r_\ell(\theta; \vec{v}_{\ell+} + tl_{\ell+}, \vec{v}_{\ell-}, \vec{x}_{\ell+}, \vec{x}_{\ell-}),$$

has even parity about $t = 0$, hence its derivative at $t = 0$ is zero. Similar arguments with perturbations to $\vec{v}_{\ell-}$ allow us to deduce that

$$\partial \vec{v}_{\ell\pm} r_\ell : \vec{l}_\ell^T = 0.$$

Since $\vec{l}_\ell$ and $\vec{l}_\ell^T$ span $\mathbb{R}^2$, the vectors $\partial \vec{v}_{\ell\pm} r_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^2$ are zero, and the integrands in $D_{\vec{x}_k} E_{HV}$ are identically zero. The $\vec{x}_k$-gradient of the Hookean-Voronoi energy reduces to

$$D_{\vec{x}_k} E_H = -4\pi r_* \partial_{\vec{x}_k} \vec{r}_k,$$ (2.11)
for \(k = 1, \ldots, N\). The Hookean-Voronoi gradient flow reduces to

\[
\frac{dx}{dt} = 4\pi r_* \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\partial_{\bar{x}_1} \bar{r}_1(x; v) \\
\vdots \\
\partial_{\bar{x}_N} \bar{r}_N(x; v)
\end{array} \right].
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)

The gradient depends only upon the constant-vertex derivatives of the average radii. The flow remains fully coupled since the motion of each site shifts the vertices, thereby impacting the neighboring site’s motion. This formulation shows that \(x\) is an equilibrium if and only if each site \(\bar{x}_i\) is a critical point of the average radius of its domain \(V_i\). We examine this in the following sub-section.

### 2.3 Max-centers and Equilibrium

The reduced form of the gradient of \(E_{HV}\) motivates the introduction of the max-center of a convex domain.

**Definition 2.5.** For a fixed, bounded, convex region \(V \subset \mathbb{R}^2\) with a piece-wise smooth boundary. The max-centers of \(V\) are the elements of

\[
\arg \max_{\bar{x} \in V} \bar{r}(\bar{x}).
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)

These are the points \(\bar{x} \in V\) that maximize the average radius of region \(V\).

For a domain \(V\) with a piecewise linear boundary, the max-center is unique.

**Proposition 2.6.** Let \(V\) be convex with a piecewise linear boundary, then the average radius \(\bar{r}(\bar{x}; V)\) is strictly concave function of \(\bar{x}\). In particular \(\bar{r}\) has a unique critical point which is a maximum and \(V\) has a unique max-center.

**Proof.** We show that \(\bar{r} : V \mapsto \mathbb{R}_+\) is a strictly concave function of \(\bar{x}\) and hence has a unique maximum. The integrand of \(\bar{r}\) is continuous with respect to \(\bar{x} \in V\) but is not \(C^1(V)\). We adapt the notation of section 2.2, by setting \(V = V_i\) for some \(i\). Taking the fixed-vertex partial \(\partial_{\bar{x}_i}\) of (2.2), we may exchange the order of one derivative with the integral, yielding

\[
\partial_{\bar{x}_i} \bar{r}_i(|x|) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \partial_{\bar{x}_i} r_i(\theta) d\theta = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \int_{\phi_{i,j}}^{\phi_{i,j+1}} \partial_{\bar{x}_i} r_{i,j}(\theta) d\theta.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (2.14)

The \(\partial^2_{\bar{x}_i}\) fixed-vertex Hessian of \(\bar{r}_i\) does not commute with the full integral and must be taken in the component-wise formulation

\[
\partial^2_{\bar{x}_i} \bar{r}_i = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \left[ \partial_{\bar{x}_i} r_{i,j}(\phi_{i,j+1})(\partial_{\bar{x}_i} \phi_{i,j+1}) - \partial_{\bar{x}_i} r_{i,j}(\phi_{i,j})(\partial_{\bar{x}_i} \phi_{i,j}) \right] + \int_{\phi_{i,j}}^{\phi_{i,j+1}} \partial^2_{\bar{x}_i} r_{i,j}(\theta) d\theta. \hspace{1cm} (2.15)
\]
for \( k = j, j + 1 \) where we used \( \tilde{d}_{i,j} + \tilde{l}_{i,j} = \tilde{d}_{i,j+1} \) to derive the last equality. From the definition of \( \varphi \) we have

\[
\partial_{x_i}\varphi_{i,j} = -\frac{\tilde{d}_{i,j}^2}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j}|^2}.
\] (2.16)

Substituting these expressions into (2.14) we express the fixed-vertex hessian of \( \bar{r}_i \) as a sum of \( m_i \) rank-one terms,

\[
\partial_{x_i}^2 \bar{r}_i = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{i=1}^{m_i} \tilde{r}_{i,j} \cdot \left( \frac{(\tilde{d}_{i,j+1})^T}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}|} - \frac{(\tilde{d}_{i,j})^T}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j}|} \right).
\] (2.17)

For any term in the summation

\[
\text{tr}(\partial_{x_i}^2 \bar{r}_{i,j}) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \tilde{l}_{i,j} \cdot \left( \frac{\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}|} - \frac{\tilde{d}_{i,j}}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j}|} \right),
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{2\pi} |\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}|^2 \left( \frac{\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}|} - \frac{\tilde{d}_{i,j}}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j}|} \right),
\] (2.18)

\[
= -\frac{1}{2\pi} |\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}|^2 \left( 1 - \frac{\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j+1}|} \cdot \frac{\tilde{d}_{i,j}}{|\tilde{d}_{i,j}|} \right) < 0.
\]

Each matrix \( \partial_{x_i}^2 \bar{r}_{i,j} \) is rank one and negative semi-definite, and their ranges \( \tilde{l}_{i,j} \) span \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) since they are the edges of \( V_i \) and cannot be linearly dependent. For any non-zero vector \( \bar{w} \in \mathbb{R}^2 \), the bilinear form

\[
\bar{w}^T [\partial_{x_i}^2 \bar{r}_i] \bar{w} = \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} \bar{w}^T [\partial_{x_i}^2 \bar{r}_{i,j}] \bar{w} \leq 0,
\]

and equals zero if and only \( \bar{w} \) is in the kernel of each of \( \partial_{x_i}^2 \bar{r}_{i,j} \). Since their ranges span, this is not possible, hence the matrix \( \partial_{x_i}^2 \bar{r}_i \) is negative definite. Thus the Hessian of \( \bar{r}_i \) is uniformly negative on the compact set \( V_i \) and \( \bar{r}_i \) has a unique maximum.

\[ \square \]

2.4 Max-center and Centroidal energies

We denote the max-center of each Voronoi region \( V_i \) by \( \bar{x}_{i,*} \). From Proposition 2.6 the max-center is unique and depends upon the sites only through their determination of the vertices, \( \bar{x}_{i,*} = \bar{x} \) (\( \varphi(x) \)). Moreover the max-center is the unique solution of \( \partial_{x_i} \bar{r} = 0 \) for \( \bar{x} \in V_i \). Consequently \( x \) is an equilibrium of the Hookean-Voronoi gradient flow (2.12) if and only if it solves \( x = x_*(x) \). We denote the Hessian of the full energy \( E_{HV} \) by

\[ H = D_x^2 E_{HV}. \]

On the torus the Hookean-Voronoi energy is invariant up to translation of \( x \) by

\[ e_j := (\bar{e}_j, \ldots, \bar{e}_j, \ldots, \bar{e}_j) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}, \]

for \( j = 1, 2 \) where \( \bar{e}_1 = (1, 0) \) and \( \bar{e}_2 = (0, 1) \) are the canonical unit vectors. The Hessian generically has a two-dimensional kernel corresponding to these two translational invariants. An equilibrium of the system with a non-degenerate Voronoi decomposition is stable if the Hessian at \( x = x_* \) is strictly positive

\[ y^T H(x_*) y \geq \nu(x_*) |y|^2, \] (2.19)
for all \( y \) orthogonal to the kernel \( \{e_1, e_2\} \). When these conditions are satisfied we call \( \nu(x_*) > 0 \) the coercivity of \( E_{HV} \) at \( x_* \). When \( x \) is close to \( x_*(x) \), the Hookean-Voronoi energy satisfies the relation

\[
E_{HV}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x - x_*(x))^T H(x_*)(x - x_*(x)) + O( |x - x_*|^3 ).
\]  

(2.20)

A tempting simplification is to replace \( H(x_*) \) with the identity matrix and drop the error terms. This yields the “max-center” energy

\[
E_{MC}(x) := \frac{1}{2} |x - x_*(x)|^2,
\]

(2.21)

so named in analogy to the centroidal energy frequently associated to Voronoi tessellations. The global minima of the max-center energy is zero, and is achieved precisely when the sites \( x \) lie at the max-centers \( x_* \). In particular all equilibria, including local minima or saddles of \( E_{HV} \), are global minimizers of \( E_{MC} \). However non-global minima and saddle points of the max-center energy cannot be critical points of \( E_{HV} \). Indeed from its construction the max-center energy is not a Lyapunov functional for the Hookean-Voronoi flow, as it converts saddle points of \( E_{HV} \) to global minima of \( E_{MC} \).

In the sequel we argue that the replacement of the Hookean Voronoi Energy with the max-center energy represents a significant loss of information contained in the distribution of the energies of the Hookean Voronoi equilibria. Indeed the max-center energy is a better approximation of the gradient-squared Hookean Voronoi energy, defined by

\[
E_{GS-HV}(x) := \frac{1}{2} |D_x E_{HV}(x)|^2.
\]

Energies of this form have been suggested in the context of saddle-point search methods, [10]. For \( x \) near \( x_* \) the gradient square energy has the approximation

\[
E_{GS-HV}(x) = \frac{1}{2} |H(x_*)(x - x_*)|^2 + O( |x - x_*|^3 ).
\]

At this level of approximation \( E_{GS-HV} \) relates to \( E_{rHV} \) through the replacement of \( H(x_*) \) in (2.20) with \( H^2(x_*) \). This has a significant impact on gradient flow dynamics near these critical points as it flips the signs of all negative eigenvalues of the Hessian. However a subsequent replacement of \( H^2(x_*) \) with the identity does not introduce any sign-flips, making it plausible that the max-center energy and the gradient-squared energy give qualitatively similar gradient flow dynamics when the sites are near their max-centers.

The relation of the Hookean-Voronoi, max-center, and the gradient squared Hookean-Voronoi energy have analogs with the centroidal energy. Indeed the volumetric Voronoi energy, defined by

\[
\mathcal{F}_{VV}(x) := \sum_{i=1}^{N} \int_{V_i} |y - \bar{x}_i|^2 dy,
\]

is minimized at \( x \) iff the sites \( x \) lie at the centroids, \( x_c \) of the Voronoi regions, see Proposition 3.1 & 3.2 of [7]. This suggests the introduction of the centroidal energy

\[
\mathcal{F}_C(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \| \bar{x}_{i} - \bar{x}_{c,i} \|^2,
\]

where \( \bar{x}_{c,i} \) is the centroid of the Voronoi region \( V_i \). The centroidal Voronoi energy relates to the volumetric Voronoi energy in much the same way that the max-center energy relates to the Hookean Voronoi
energy. The centroidal energy is more closely related to the gradient-squared volumetric Voronoi energy than to the volumetric Voronoi energy.

Generically the centroid and the max-center of a convex set are not equal, but are often quite close. It is relatively simple calculation to determine the centroid of a domain, and the centroidal energy has attracted significant attention for their use in mesh generation, [7] and image processing, [8]. Recently strategies for the efficient computation of centroidal Voronoi gradient flows, including approaches to enhance the rate of convergence to equilibria have been presented, [11].

3 Ordered Equilibria

A Voronoi tessellation is ordered if all of the Voronoi regions are isomorphic to each-other. From symmetry considerations the collection of sites that produced ordered tessellations is invariant under the gradient flow, since each Voronoi region is indistinguishable form the others they remain isometric under the gradient flow. Consequently the motion an ordered tessellation can be reduced to that of a single site moving towards the evolving max-center of its evolving region. The Euler characteristic relates the number of faces $N$, edges $K$, and vertices $M$ of the Voronoi tessellation

$$N - K + M = \xi,$$

where $\xi$ is the Euler characteristic of the underlying domain. The Euler characteristic of a torus is zero. For an ordered tessellation, the number of vertices per site, $m$ is fixed. Since each edge joins two sites, we have $K = mN/2$. Assuming non-degeneracy of vertices, each vertex joins three edges, hence $M = mN/3$. The Euler characteristic reduces to the relation $N(1 - m/6) = 0$ and we deduce that a non-degenerate ordered tessellation has hexagonal regions with 6 edges and 6 vertices.

3.1 Single-String Voronoi Tessellations

The single-string tessellations are a subset of the ordered tessellations that are critical points of the Hookean Voronoi energy. These are associated to closed, straight-lines geodesics of the torus $\mathbb{T}_\alpha$. In the plane, the geodesic can be extended to a line in $\mathbb{R}^2$, which may be shifted to pass through (0, 0). A closed geodesic corresponds to a line that passes through one of the lattice points $\{(s_1\sqrt{N\alpha}, s_2\sqrt{N/\alpha})\}_{s \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ corresponding to the $\Omega_\alpha$-periodic images of the upper-right corner of $\Omega_\alpha$. The line then forms a periodic orbit in $\Omega_\alpha$. The single-string site vector $x$ is formed by placing $N$ equally-spaced points along the straight periodic orbit. Indeed, fixing lattice point index $s = (s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, then without loss of generality $s_1, s_2 \neq 0$ and $\gcd(s_1, s_2) = 1$, and for $j = 1, \ldots, N$ the site $\tilde{x}_j$ of $x$ is given by

$$\tilde{x}_j = \left(j s_1 \frac{\sqrt{N\alpha}}{N} \mod \sqrt{N\alpha}, j s_2 \frac{\sqrt{N/\alpha}}{N} \mod \sqrt{N/\alpha}\right)^T.$$
Figure 3: Construction of a single-string tessellation for $\alpha = 1$. (left) A closed, straight-line geodesic of the equal-radius torus $T_1$ divided into $N = 10$ sub-units. (right) The mapping of the ten points onto $\Omega_1$ (red lines), and the associated single-string Voronoi tessellation.

By the symmetry of the construction, the collection of vectors $\{\vec{y}_{i,j}\}$ from site $\vec{x}_i$ to the sites of its near-neighbors are the same. Since these vectors define the Voronoi regions, each Voronoi region is isometric. For each $N$ and $\alpha$ the number of single-string Voronoi tessellations is finite, as it cannot exceed the number of coprime pairs $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ with $1 \leq s_1, s_2 \leq N$.

**Proposition 3.1.** For each $N \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and each aspect ratio $\alpha$, the single-string Voronoi tessellations correspond to sites that are equilibria of the Hookean-Voronoi gradient flow (2.12).

**Proof.** We show that $x = x_*$. For the single-string construction each Voronoi region is a fixed rigid translation of each other under any vector that points from site to site. Since these vectors have a $\pi$ rotation symmetry, each region is invariant under rotation by $\pi$ about its defining site. This symmetry maps the associated max-center from $\vec{x}_i$ to its $\pi$ rotation image $2\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_i$. Since the max-center is unique, the max-center and its $\pi$-rotation image must be the same, hence $\vec{x}_i = \vec{x}_i$.

### 3.2 Regular Hexagonal Voronoi Tessellations

Regular hexagonal tessellations are a special case of single-string tessellations. For a regular hexagon, $V_{\text{hex}}$, of unit area the average radius satisfies

$$\bar{r}_{\text{hex}} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{6\sqrt{3}}{31/4} \arctanh \left( \frac{1}{2} \right),$$

with the corresponding energy

$$E_{\text{hex}} := 2(1 + \pi r_*^2) - 4\pi r_* \bar{r}_{\text{hex}}. \quad (3.1)$$

For a regular hexagonal tessellation, the sites lie on a triangular lattice. We fix a site at the origin and introduce the Eisenstein integers generated by the cube root of unity,

$$\mathbb{Z}[\omega] \subset \mathbb{C}, \quad \omega = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}}, \quad i = \sqrt{-1}.$$  

The Eisenstein integers form a lattice in $\mathbb{C}$ corresponding to centers of a tiling by regular hexagons with area $\sqrt{3}/2$. There exists a regular hexagonal tiling of a periodic domain $\Omega_{\alpha}$ iff the vertices of $\Omega_{\alpha}$ correspond to Eisenstein integers $\{0, z, z', z + z'\} \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ with $z, z'$ orthogonal. In this case $\Omega_{\alpha}$ must be a conformal transformation of the smallest rectangular domain $\Omega_{\text{hex}}$ with vertices $\{0, 1, (1 + 2\omega), 2 + 2\omega\}$. The following result yields a constructive enumeration of the possible aspect ratios $\alpha$ of periodic domains that admit a regular hexagonal tiling with $N$ regions.
\textbf{Proposition 3.2.} Let \( N \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \) be even. Write \( N = PQ \), with \( P, Q \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \) where \( P \) is the product of all the prime factors \( p \) of \( N \) that satisfy \( p \equiv 2 \mod 3 \). The aspect ratios of a rectangular domains that have a tessellation by \( N \) regular hexagons is precisely

\[ A_{\text{hex}}(N) = \left\{ \frac{N}{2a^2b} \sqrt{3} \mid \forall a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_+ : a \mid \frac{N}{2b}, b \mid Q \right\}. \tag{3.2} \]

\textbf{Remark 3.3.} By convention the domains \( \Omega_\alpha \) have aspect ratio \( \alpha \in (0, 1] \). To respect this convention we replace an element \( \alpha \in A_{\text{hex}} \) with its reciprocal, \( \alpha^{-1} \), if \( \alpha > 1 \). This corresponds to rotating \( \Omega_\alpha \) by \( \pi/2 \).

\textbf{Proof.} A general conformal transformation that maps \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) to itself, transforms \( \Omega_{\text{hex}} \) onto \( \Omega_\alpha \) where the vertices take the form

\[ \{0, \, g\gamma, \, h\gamma(1 + 2\omega), \, (g + h + 2h\omega)\gamma\}, \]

with \( \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) and \( g, h \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \). To avoid double counting, we require that \( \gamma/k \not\in \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) for any \( k \in \mathbb{Z}, k \geq 2 \). The region \( \Omega_\alpha \), has aspect ratio \( \alpha = h|1 + 2\omega| = h\sqrt{3}/g \). Since it is comprised of \( N \) hexagons of size \( \sqrt{3}/2 \) it has area \( |\Omega_\alpha| = N\sqrt{3}/2 \). The transformed domain has area \( |g\gamma||h\gamma(1 + 2\omega)| = gh\sqrt{3}|\gamma|^2 \).

Equating these two yields the constraint

\[ gh|\gamma|^2 = \frac{N}{2}. \]

In particular, \( N \) must be even. Without loss of generality \( h \) can be chosen in the form \( h = N/(2g|\gamma|^2) \), where we require that \( (2g|\gamma|^2) \mid N \). The Eisenstein integers, \( \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \), are a unique factorization domain. The Eisenstein primes enjoy the following dichotomy, [4]: an element \( \pi \in \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) is an Eisenstein prime if and only if one of two mutually exclusive conditions hold,

1. \(|\pi|^2 \) is a prime and \( \pi \not\equiv 2 \mod 3 \)
2. \( \pi \) is the product of a unit \( \{\pm 1, \pm \omega, \pm \omega^2\} \) and a prime integer \( p \equiv 2 \mod 3 \).

This motivates the prime factorization of \( N \) in the form

\[ N = PQ = \left( p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2} \cdots p_i^{a_i} \right) \left( q_1^{b_1} q_2^{b_2} \cdots q_j^{b_j} \right), \]

for some exponents \( a_k, b_k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \) where the prime numbers \( p_k \equiv 2 \mod 3 \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, i \), and \( q_k \not\equiv 2 \mod 3 \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, j \). The constraint \( \gamma/k \not\in \mathbb{Z}[\omega] \) implies that the Eisenstein primes that factor \( \gamma \) cannot satisfy condition 2. We deduce that

\[ |\gamma|^2 = |\pi_1^{\phi_1}|^2 |\pi_2^{\phi_2}|^2 \cdots |\pi_k^{\phi_k}|^2 = \left( q_1^{c_1} q_2^{c_2} \cdots q_j^{c_j} \right), \]

for exponents \( c_k \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \) that satisfy \( 0 \leq c_k \leq b_k \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, j \). In particular we may choose \( g \) to be any divisor of \( N/(2|\gamma|^2) \). Eliminating \( h \) from the expression for aspect ratio we find the aspect ratios that admit a tiling by regular hexagons take the form

\[ A_{\text{hex}} = \left\{ \frac{N\sqrt{3}}{2g^2|\gamma|^2} \mid \forall g \mid \frac{N}{2|\gamma|^2}, \forall |\gamma|^2 \mid Q \right\}. \]

Relabeling, we choose \( b = |\gamma|^2 \) that divides \( Q \) and \( a = g \) that \( a \) divides \( N/(2b) \), which yields (3.2). \[ \square \]
Remark 3.4. For $N = 36$, then $N = 2^2 \cdot 3^2$, so that $Q = 3^2$, with divisors $b = \{1, 3, 9\}$. For each of the three choices of $b$ the divisors of $N/(2b)$ are

$$a_1 = \{1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 18\}, a_3 = \{1, 2, 3, 6\}, a_9 = \{1, 2\}.$$  

From (3.2), the set of admissible aspect ratios reduces to 6 unique elements, which after taking reciprocals where necessary, take the form

$$A_{hex}(36) = \sqrt{3} \left\{ \frac{1}{54}, \frac{1}{18}, \frac{1}{27}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{9}, \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$  

To facilitate comparisons of energy between different $N$ and $\alpha$ we introduce the volumetric excess energy (VEE) of a tessellation and a region within the tessellation. The first is computed by dividing the tessellation energy $E_{HV}(x)$ by $|\Omega_\alpha| = N$, to obtain an average energy per unit area, and subtracting the energy of a regular hexagon of unit area, $E_{hex}$.

$$\text{VEE}(x) := \frac{E_{HV}(x)}{N} - E_{hex}. \quad (3.3)$$

The volumetric excess energy of an individual Voronoi region $V_i$ with average radius $\bar{r}_i$ is defined as

$$\text{VEE}(V_i) := 2(|V_i| + \pi r_i^2) - 4\pi r_i \bar{r}_i - E_{hex}. \quad (3.4)$$

Figure 4: (left) The aspect ratios $\alpha$ for which $\Omega_\alpha$ supports a tiling by $N$ regular hexagons. (right) VEE of all single-string equilibria for $N = 84$ and $\alpha$ at intervals of $10^{-2}$ in $[0.3, 1]$. The values $(0.3, 1] \cap A_{hex}(84) = \left\{ \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{14}, \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9}, \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{7}, \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{18}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right\}$, corresponding to regular hexagonal tessellations are indicated by a green dot.

With this notation the VEE of a tessellation is the average of the VEE of its regions, so that each can be compared on the same scale. Figure 4 (right) shows the VEE < 10 of all the single-string tessellations of $\Omega_\alpha$ for $N = 82$ and $\alpha \in [0.3, 1]$. The minimum ordered VEE at value of $\alpha$ is achieved as the minimum of the VEE of these discrete families of single-string equilibria which vary smoothly in $\alpha$. For fixed $N$, the single-string equilibria can be decomposed into families parameterized by aspect
ratio $\alpha$. Each family has a VEE that is roughly parabolic in $\alpha$, and minimized at a particular value $\alpha = \alpha^*$. The green dots indicate the $\alpha$ for which the VEE of zero is attained at a regular hexagonal tessellation.

4 Defects and Frustration in Disordered Equilibria

For moderate values of site number $N$, we investigate the role of site number and aspect ratio $\alpha$ in determining the probability that a random initial configuration of sites converges to an ordered or a disordered equilibrium through the gradient flow of the Hookean Voronoi energy.

The motion of the sites under the gradient flow can induce changes in the edge count $m_i$ of a Voronoi region via the formation of a degenerate vertex with more than three edges. This generically arises through a “vertex collision” in which an edge shrinks to zero length, bringing two vertices together, eliminating one vertex and one edge from the graph. Given a tessellation that is locally composed of 6-sided regions, the generic vertex collision arises when deformation of the site vector $\mathbf{x}$ creates two pair of 5- and 7-sided regions, as presented in Figure 5. Under deformation an edge separating two six-sided sites, labeled $\vec{x}_1$ and $\vec{x}_1'$, shortens to bring its two vertices together, forming a single degenerate vertex with four edges that is the corner of sites $\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_1', \vec{x}_2, \vec{x}_2'$. Continuing with the deformation of the sites, the degenerate vertex may split into two vertices by forming a new edge that separates the regions of $\vec{x}_2$ and $\vec{x}_2'$. This process changes the four six-sided regions into two five-sided and and two seven-sided.

![Figure 5](image_url)

Figure 5: A vertex collision that generates two pair of 5- and 7-sided defect regions from a tessellation of 6-sided regions. The sites of 5-, 6-, and 7- sided regions are indicated by pentagons, circles, and stars respectively, while sites with 6 edges and a degenerate vertex are indicated by open circles.

Vertex collisions can occur among regions with arbitrary numbers of sides, generically adding one side to each of the $\vec{x}_1 - \vec{x}_1'$ regions and subtracting one vertex from each of the $\vec{x}_2 - \vec{x}_2'$ regions.

**Definition 4.1.** We say that a site and its region are a defect if each of the region’s vertices are non-degenerate and the region does not have 6 sides.

In computations we take $r_s = 4$. Although this value is immaterial to the outcomes of the simulations, its choice impacts the time scales of relaxation and the range of values of VEE of stable equilibria.
4.1 Computational equilibria

The gradient flow is implemented through a second order predictor-corrector scheme. The SciPy library is employed to compute the Voronoi diagram from a set of points. The gradient is computed via (2.12) using a second-order midpoint method and an embedded first-order (Euler’s) method to obtain an error estimate for the adaptive step size, with initial step size \( \delta_{\text{step}} \). Writing the gradient flow in the form \( y'(t) = f(t, y) \), we have increments

\[
 k_1 = f(t_n, y_n), \quad k_2 = f(t_n + \delta_{\text{step}}, y_n + \delta_{\text{step}}k_1).
\]

The second order update \( y_{n+1} \) and error estimate \( \epsilon \) take the form

\[
 y_{n+1} = y_n + \frac{\delta_{\text{step}}}{2} (k_1 + k_2), \quad \epsilon = \frac{\delta_{\text{step}}}{2} (k_1 + k_2) - k_1.
\]

The step size is updated using the rule

\[
 \delta_{\text{step}} \rightarrow \delta_{\text{step}} \sqrt{\frac{10^s}{\|\epsilon\|_2^2}}, \quad s = \min\{-3, -2 + \log_{10} \|f(t_n, y_n)\|_2\}
\]

We establish a stopping criteria that determines if a simulation of the gradient flow is sufficiently close to a stable equilibrium. For each putative computational equilibrium \( \mathbf{x}_e \) we compute the hessian

\[
 H(\mathbf{x}_e) := D^2_x(\mathbf{x}_e),
\]

and determine its spectrum. We remove the two dimensional kernel, spanned by the translational vectors \( \{\mathbf{e}_1, \mathbf{e}_2\} \), and determine the minimum eigenvalue on the space perpendicular to the kernel. When this quantity is positive, it is labeled \( \nu(\mathbf{x}_e) \), motivated by the coercivity defined in (2.19). The stopping condition is that

\[
 \frac{\|D_x(\mathbf{x}_e)\|_2}{\nu(\mathbf{x}_e)} \leq \delta_{\text{eq}}, \quad (4.1)
\]

for \( \delta_{\text{eq}} \ll 1 \) chosen suitably small. The motivation is that for \( \mathbf{x} \) near \( \mathbf{x}_e \) we have the expansion

\[
 D_x(\mathbf{x}) = D_x(\mathbf{x}_e) + H(\mathbf{x}_e)(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_e) + R,
\]

where the remainder \( R \sim \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_e\|_2^2 \). If \( \mathbf{x} \) is an exact equilibrium then

\[
 \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_e - H^{-1}(D_x(\mathbf{x}_e) + R) =: F(\mathbf{x}), \quad (4.2)
\]

where we may adjust \( \mathbf{x} \) so that \( \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_e \) is orthogonal to the translational modes. Then for some \( c > 0 \) depending upon a bound of \( D^3 \) in a neighborhood of \( \mathbf{x}_e \), we have the estimate

\[
 \|H^{-1}(D_x(\mathbf{x}_e) + R)\|_2 \leq \delta_{\text{eq}} + \frac{c}{\nu} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_e\|_2^2.
\]

Returning this result to (4.2) we have the bound

\[
 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_e\|_2 \leq \delta_{\text{eq}} + \frac{c}{\nu} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_e\|_2^2.
\]

This shows that any equilibrium of the system that lies inside the ball of radius \( \alpha/c \) centered at \( \mathbf{x}_e \) in fact lies within the smaller ball of radius \( \delta_{\text{eq}} \). Rigorous statements on this problem can be made,
see Theorem 2.2 of [5], including existence of exact equilibrium. We treat this issue informally in this work, taking $\delta_{eq} = 10^{-5}$. We say that a site-vector $x$ is a computational equilibrium, and denote it by $x_e$, if it satisfies this stopping condition for the gradient flow.

As an example, we consider the computational equilibrium $x_e$ corresponding to $N = 200$ and $\alpha = 1$ which has 16 pairs of 5-7 defects. The associated Voronoi tessellation is presented in Figure 6 (top-left). The equilibrium has $\text{VEE}(x_e) = 3.497 \times 10^{-2}$, and its constituent Voronoi regions are colored according to their VEE, which range from 1.65 (light) achieved at a 5-sided defect to $-1.68$ (dark) achieved at a 7-sided defect. This range of values is typical of a disordered equilibria. The spectrum of the Hessian of $E_{HV}$ at $x_e$ is computed numerically, and the smallest 40 eigenvalues are shown in Figure 6 (top-right). The two zero eigenvalues correspond to the kernel of the Hessian and are spanned by the translational modes $\{e_1, e_2\}$. The coercivity $\nu(x_e) = 0.21975$ is defined by the smallest non-zero eigenvalue. The existence of an exact equilibrium within $O(\delta_{eq})$ of $x_e$ is supported by six simulations of the gradient flow corresponding to initial data that are random perturbations of $x_e$ with $\|x(0) - x_e\|_2 = 10^k$ for $k = -4, -3, -2, -1, 0$, and 0.5. As depicted in Figure 6 (bottom), each of the orbits corresponding to the smallest 5 perturbations relax back to $x_e$ with identical exponential rates. The
orbit corresponding to the largest perturbation diverges to a different equilibrium.

4.2 Distributions of Disordered Equilibrium

The Hookean-Voronoi energy possesses a large collection of stable equilibria with a broad distribution of VEE whose structure depends sensitively upon $N$ and $\alpha$. To investigate this set and their basins of attraction under the gradient flow we generate bins $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(N, \alpha, S)$ composed of $S$ computational equilibria of the Hookean-Voronoi gradient flow generated by initial sites $\mathbf{x}(0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2N}$ that are randomly uniformly distributed in $\Omega_\alpha^N$. We denote the average of a quantity $F$ over the bin by $\langle F \rangle_B$. We consider six moderate values $N = \{61, 67, 73, 81, 84, 100\}$ and vary the aspect ratio in increments of 0.01 for $\alpha \in [0.3, 1]$, forming $6 \times 71$ bins each with $S = 5000$ simulations. Each bin is partitioned into two disjoint sub-bins, one of ordered equilibria, $\mathcal{B}_o$ for which all average radii of the associated Voronoi tessellation are equal to within the fixed tolerance $\delta_{\text{ord}} := 10^{-8}$. The complement is the disordered bin, $\mathcal{B}_d$. While the value of $\delta_{\text{ord}}$ is small, every tessellation identified as disordered has at least one pair of defects. For the disordered tessellations the number of Voronoi regions that are not 6-sided are identified – this is the defect number $D(\mathbf{x}_e)$ of the computational equilibrium $\mathbf{x}_e$. To each ordered sub-bin $\mathcal{B}_o(N, \alpha, S)$ all associated single-string equilibria are added. For each $N$ and $\alpha$ the minimum VEE of $\mathbf{x}_e \in \mathcal{B}_o(N, \alpha, S)$ and the minimum and maximum VEE over $\mathcal{B}_d$ are identified. These quantities, called the minimum ordered and minimum and maximum disordered VEE respectively, are presented in Figure 7 as graphs over $\alpha \in [0.3, 1]$ for $N = 67, N = 73$, both primes, and $N = 84 = (2^2) \cdot (3 \cdot 7)$.

Figure 7: The minimum volumetric excess energy for ordered (orange) and disordered (blue-solid) equilibria, and maximum VEE for stable disordered (blue-dotted) computational equilibria from $\mathcal{B}(N, \alpha, 5000)$ for $N = 67, 73, 84$ (left to right). The green dots on the $N = 84$ minimum ordered VEE curve indicate the set $\mathcal{A}_\text{hex}(84)$ of regular hexagonal tilings.

The minimum and maximum disordered VEE are relatively constant with respect to $\alpha$ while the minimum ordered VEE is much more sensitive. For the six values of $N$ considered the maximum disordered VEE ranges between 0.048–0.063 and the minimum disordered VEE is even flatter, residing in the range 0.015–0.024. This lower value insensitive to the bin size, unchanged for $S$ between 500 and 5000. The maximum disordered VEE increases by about 5% as the bin size $S$ increases from 500 to 5000 and stable disordered states with high VEE and small basins of attraction are realized. For the six values of $N$ the minimum ordered VEE ranges from 0–0.0597 with the high value achieved at $\alpha = 0.425$ and $N = 67$. Figure 4 (right) shows that the minimum ordered VEE is formed from
families of single-string equilibria with cusp at values of $\alpha$ for which the role of ordered minimizer is exchanged. The range of the ordered minimum VEE shown in Figure f:VEE is dramatic for the prime values $N = 67$ with a sharp peak at $\alpha = 0.425$ and $N = 73$ with peaks at $\alpha = 0.4$ and $\alpha = 0.65$. Conversely, the more factorable value $N = 84 = 2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 7$ has a minimum ordered VEE with a more modest range with 5 values of $\alpha$ which support a regular hexagonal tiling with VEE = 0 for $\alpha \in (0.3, 1] \cap \mathcal{A}_{\text{hex}}(84) = \left\{ \frac{3\sqrt{3}}{14}, \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{9}, \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{7}, \frac{7\sqrt{3}}{18}, \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right\}$, corresponding to regular hexagonal tessellations. The minimum VEE remains low yielding only a single, minor peak of 0.024 at $\alpha = 0.58$.

Figure 8: (top) The probability of disorder (purple curve right-axis) and difference between minimum VEE for ordered and disordered states (green curve left-axis) for the cases $N = 73$ (left) and $N = 84$ (center) gathered from $\mathcal{B}(N, \alpha, 5000)$ for each value of $\alpha$. (bottom) Scatter plot of the difference between minimum ordered VEE and minimum disordered VEE and the probability of disorder from $\mathcal{B}(N, \alpha, 5000)$ over each value of $\alpha \in [0.3, 1]$ and $N$ as listed.

For a given $N$ and $\alpha$, the probability of disorder (POD) denotes the probability an initial data with randomly distributed sites converges to an equilibrium which has a disordered tessellation. This was tabulated $N = 73$ and $N = 84$, showing that its value correlates strongly to the difference between the minimum ordered and the minimum disordered VEE. In Figure 8 (top), when the minimum ordered VEE exceeds the disordered VEE by more than $2 \times 10^{-3}$ (green curve – left axis), then the POD approaches 100% (purple curve right-axis). This observation is further substantiated by the scatter plot of POD verses the difference in the minimum ordered and disordered VEE depicted in Figure 8 (bottom) for each $\alpha \in [0.3, 1]$ and the selected values of $N$. The basins of attraction of disordered
equilibria are preponderant for these $N$ when the difference in minimum VEE exceeds $10^{-2}$. Each bin of stable computational equilibria contains a wide range of VEE. This is illustrated through the “anti-cumulative” VEE distribution $\mathcal{D} : \mathbb{R} \mapsto [0,1]$, defined as the percentage of stable equilibria whose VEE exceed a given value. The anti-cumulative VEE distribution is expressed in terms of a non-negative probability density $f_D$, as

$$\mathcal{D}(s; N, \alpha) := \int_s^\infty f_D(t; N, \alpha) \, dt. \quad (4.3)$$

The distribution $f_D$ is approximated from the bins $\mathcal{B}(N, 1, 5000)$ for each of the values of $N$ presented in Figure 8 (right). This reveals significant structure generated by low energy equilibria with broad basins of attraction that induce sharp drops in $f_D$. Conversely, at higher values of VEE there is a continuous decline in $f_D$ arising from a proliferation of equilibria with smaller basins of attraction.

For $N = 61$ the equilibria with large basins of attraction occur at two values of VEE below 0.02, collectively attract roughly 85% of all initial data. These two jumps are followed by a flat region that manifests no basins of attraction, and then for VEE $> 0.03$ by a cascade of equilibria with distinct VEE, in excess of 200, that have marginal basins of attraction. The predominance of low energy equilibria as attractors of the flow, weakens as $N$ increases. For all six values of $N$ the collective size of the basins of attraction of stable equilibria decay rapidly with VEE, with $f_D$ converges rapidly to zero for VEE greater than 0.05. The size of the basins of attraction of the dominant equilibria varies substantially with $N$. For $N = 73$ the basins of attraction are highly fractured. Indeed, the dominant equilibria have VEE $\sim 0.02$ and 0.025, and collectively attract only 35% of the simulations. The balance of roughly 600 distinct equilibria have VEE mostly larger than 0.025 and individually attract less than 1% of the simulations but collectively serve as end-states for over 60% of the orbits. For $N = 73$ and $\alpha = 1$ the probability of disorder is approximately 100%, Figure 8 (left), so the fractured basins of attraction correspond to disordered equilibria.

The dependence of the number of distinct computational equilibria contained in $\mathcal{B}(N, \alpha, 5000)$ is
presented as a function of $\alpha \in [0.3, 1]$ in Figure 9 (right). To prevent over counting equilibria that are translations or $\pi$ rotations of each other, the $N$ average radii of the Voronoi tessellation of each computational equilibrium are ordered by increasing size to form the ordered average radii vector $\bar{r} \in \mathbb{R}^N$, see Figure 10 (right). These vectors are compared, and the associated equilibria are labeled as distinct if the $l^2$-norm of the difference of their ordered average radii vectors differ by more than $\delta_{\text{dist}} = 10^{-5}$. The vector $\bar{r}$ is a good proxy for distinctness as it determines the Hookean-Voronoi energy and is invariant under symmetric transformations of the underlying sites. The sensitivity of the basins of attraction of equilibria is highlighted by the fact that for each of the 6 values of $N$ the number of distinct computational equilibria within $B(N, \alpha, 5000)$ varies by more than a factor of 2 over the range of $\alpha$.
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Figure 10: (left) Relation of VEE and defect number $D$ determined from $B(400, 1, 2500)$. The linear fit determines the slope $\zeta(N, 1)$ and the ground-state $\zeta_0(N, 1) = 0.502 \times 10^{-2}$. (right) The ordered average radii $\bar{r}$ for the four $N = 400$ tessellations shown in Figure 11 (a-top left, b-top right) and (c-bottom left, d-bottom right). The dotted horizontal line is the average radius of a regular hexagon of unit area, $\bar{r}_{\text{hex}} = 0.5637$.

Disordered Voronoi tessellations are composed of regions $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^N$ with a range of average radii. Significantly, the simulations show an absolute correlation between disorder and defects: all disordered tessellations contained at least one pair of defective regions. Presented in Figure 5, the passage from a disordered but non-defective tessellation to a defective one requires a vertex collision. This places a clear threshold between ordered tessellations and defective ones, and no equilibria are found in this gap. It is informative to correlate the number defects $D = D(x_e)$ with the VEE of the tessellation. These values were tabulated for $B(400, 1, 2500)$ and presented as a scatter plot in Figure 10 (left). While there is significant variation in VEE at a fixed number of defects, there is a strong, approximately linear, correlation between the $D$ and VEE,

$$\text{VEE}(x_e) = \zeta_0(N, \alpha) + \zeta_1(N, \alpha)D(x_e).$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.4)

The slope $\zeta_1$ characterizes the average gain in VEE per defect, with a best linear fit given by the value $\zeta_1(400, 1) \approx 0.0487 \times 10^{-2}$. The value $\zeta_0(N, \alpha)$ is called the “ground-state” VEE arising as the
extrapolation of $VEE$ from a defect filled tessellation to a zero-defect tessellation. Remarkably the ground-state $\eta_0$ has little correlation with minimum ordered $VEE$.

Figure 11: (top) The bin $B(400,1,2500)$ yielded 78 tessellations with $D = 26$ defects. These two represent the lowest and the highest $VEE$ among this set. (bottom) The two tessellations from the bin with (left) the lowest number, $D = 4$, and (right) the highest number, $D = 62$, of defects.

The relation (4.4) casts light on the minimum and maximum disordered $VEE$ of Figure 7. For fixed $N$ the range of $VEE$ of disordered tessellations is relatively constant, roughly from $0.015 - 0.06$. The minimum disordered $VEE$ typically corresponds to equilibria with few defects, with the maximum disordered $VEE$ having many defects. However the absence of defects can be energetically costly, raising the minimum ordered $VEE$ to levels comparable to those of the maximum disordered $VEE$. The system can extract a high price for order, which can be relaxed by a modest injection of disorder. The relationship between order and energy in $B(400,1,2500)$ is presented in Figure 11. The top row shows the equilibria in that bin with $D = 26$ defects, while the bottom row shows the tessellations corresponding to the two equilibria with the lowest and the highest $VEE$. Each Voronoi region is shaded according to its $VEE$, with dark shading (lower $VEE$) corresponding to larger regions with more edges and lighter shading (higher $VEE$) corresponding to smaller regions with fewer edges. The equilibria with the lowest $VEE$ from the $D = 26$ group has its defects arranged in an ellipse formed by alternating 5- and 7-sided defect pairs. The ellipse forms a boundary dividing the domain into two
parts populated with similar hexagons. The D = 26 equilibria with the highest VEE has a tessellation in which its defects are arranged in isolated pairs of 5-7 defects and one chain of 6 defects. Each of its defects reside in a background of hexagonal regions which have non-trivial variation in their VEE.

The bottom row of Figure 11 presents the tessellations corresponding to the lowest, D = 4, and highest D = 62 number of defects in \( \mathcal{B}(400,1,2500) \). Given the range in VEE between the equilibria with four defects and VEE = 0.0049 and the equilibrium with 62 defects and VEE = 0.0351, it is surprising that the gradient flow is unable to combine the many defect pairs in the higher energy equilibrium. The equilibria with large numbers of defects possess an array of chains of 5 − 7 defects of various lengths. With a large number of defects the combinatorial possibilities for chain lengths is considerable. However defect numbers D above 15% of \( N \) are seldom observed, most likely because the corresponding equilibria are unstable, and susceptible to vertex collisions that reduce defect numbers. This raises a fundamental question about the tolerance of defects in the Hookean-Voronoi gradient flow and the average energy that they contribute to its equilibria, in particular in the large \( N \) limit.
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Figure 12: The probability density for the first- and second-near neighbors from \( \mathcal{B}(400,1,2500) \) over tessellations with defect number D = 6 (blue) and D = 60 (orange).

The impact of defect number on structure of the tessellation can be examined through the first and second near-neighbor probability density. This quantity tabulates the probability that a near-neighbor site (first-near neighbor) or the near-neighbors of a near-neighbor site (second-near neighbors) appear at a particular distance from the given site. These density functions are presented in Figure 12 for tessellations from \( \mathcal{B}(400,1,2500) \) with defects D = 6 and D = 60. Each probability distribution has three principle peaks at distances \( d = 1.1, 1.8, \) and 2.2. However the quasi-ordered tessellations with \( D = 6 \) have much higher and narrower peaks than the more disordered tessellations with \( D = 60 \). Indeed the width-at-half-max is roughly 5 times greater in the second and third peaks of \( D = 60 \) compared to \( D = 6 \). This shows the long-range impact of defect number on disorder within the tessellation.
4.3 Large $N$ limits

The ubiquity of defects observed $B(400, 1, 2500)$ motivates the introduction of the frustration $F$, of a bin $B(N, \alpha, S)$ defined as the product of the energy per defect and the expected number of defects,

$$\mathcal{F}(B(N, \alpha, S)) = \zeta_1(N, \alpha) \langle D \rangle_B. \quad (4.5)$$

The frustration represents the energy gap between the average value $\langle \text{VEE} \rangle_B$ and the ground-state $\zeta_0$, defined in (4.4). Like the VEE, frustration is averaged over $N$, representing a contribution per Voronoi domain to $\langle \text{VEE} \rangle_B$ from the defects that the gradient flow is unable to eliminate. In particular we have the relation

$$\langle \text{VEE} \rangle_B = \zeta_0 + \mathcal{F}. \quad (4.6)$$

Figure 13: (left) For $\alpha = 1$, the average defects $\langle D \rangle_B$ computed from $B(N, 1, 2500)$ for $N = 100, \ldots, 400$. The best linear fit to $\langle D \rangle_{B(N)}$ for $N \geq 100$ has slope $\eta_1(1) \approx 0.088$. (right) The average $\langle \text{VEE} \rangle_B$ decomposed into the ground-state $\zeta_0(N, 1)$ and the frustration $\mathcal{F}(N, 1)$. The minimum ordered VEE is presented as disconnected dots.

The asymptotic behaviour of these three quantities at large $N$ gives considerable insight into the role of defects. The roughly linear relation between VEE and defect number $D$ at fixed $N = 400$ might seem to suggest that $\langle D \rangle_B$ remains bounded with growing $N$. To determine this relation we formed the the bins $B(N, 1, 2500)$ for $N = 100, \ldots, 400$ and determined the average number of defects, $\langle D \rangle_{B(N, 1, 2500)}$. Presented in Figure 13 (left), this average defect count is well approximated by the linear relation

$$\langle D \rangle_{B(N, \alpha, S)} \sim \eta_1(\alpha)N - \eta_0,$$

for $N \gg 1$. For $\alpha = 1$ the best linear fit yields a proportionality $\eta_1(1) = 0.088$ suggesting that between $8 - 9\%$ of Voronoi regions in a given equilibria are defects for $\alpha = 1$ at large $N$. Figure 13 (right), compares the ground-state energy $\zeta_0$, the frustration $\mathcal{F}$, their sum $\langle \text{VEE} \rangle_B$, and the minimum ordered VEE. The ground-state energy decreases with $N$ while the frustration grows. Their sum, the bin-averaged energy remains largely constant. This is consistent with a saturating frustration and suggests that in a large $N$ limit, taking expectation weighted by size of basin of attraction, the expected ratio of
cells which are defects converges to a fixed value and moreover these defects make a non-zero volumetric contribution to the expected system energy. This suggests that the ground state energy is not broadly accessible, having a vanishing basin of attraction. Yet more surprising, the minimum ordered VEE does not correlate with the ground-state $\zeta_0$. These simulations show that the minimum ordered VEE can exceed the average $\langle \text{VEE} \rangle_B$ by up to a factor of 4, and can also be zero when a regular hexagonal tiling is admissible. A wide range of minimal ordered VEE has been numerically observed out to $N = 5000$. If there is convergence in the large $N$ limit for minimum ordered energy, it is significantly slower than that observed for the disordered states. This suggests that care should be taken in extrapolating between special ordered equilibria and disordered states in these packing problems.
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Figure 14: (top-left) The averaged tessellation probability densities $\langle f_P \rangle_{[N-5,N+5]}$ for values of $N$ as indicated, as determined from $B(N, 1, 2500)$ for $N = 100, \ldots, 400$. (top-right) The density for the averaged anti-cumulative tessellation distribution $\langle f_{\text{acDi}} \rangle_{[390,400]}$ (solid black) together with the densities for each of the anti-cumulative tessellation distributions $f_{\text{D}}(N)$, for $N = 390, \ldots, 400$ (dashed lines). The densities for distributions $\text{D}(392)$ and $\text{D}(397)$ are indicated via solid, colored lines for comparison. (bottom) The $l^2$ relative error between the sliding average $\langle f_{\text{D}} \rangle_{[N-5,N+5]}$ and $f_{\text{D}}(N)$ for $N = 105 \ldots 395$. The graph $y = 10120 \cdot N^{-2.35}$ (red line) is provided for reference.

To quantify the convergence to a bulk-like state in the large $N$ limit we form the probability densities $f_P(N, \alpha)$ associated to the probability $P(N, \alpha, S)$ that a random initial data converges to an equilibria of prescribed VEE. The densities $f_P(N, 1)$ are approximated from the bins $B(N, 1, 2500)$ for $N = 100, \ldots, 400$. To observe convergence, for a given value $N = N_0$ we construct the sliding average of the probability densities over the window of 11 different values of $N = N_0 - 5, \ldots, N_0 + 5$. 
The associated probability measure is denoted $\langle \mathcal{P} \rangle_{[N_0-5,N_0+5]}$ and its density is called the averaged probability density and denoted $\langle f_P \rangle_{[N_0-5,N_0+5]}$. As presented in Figure 14, the averaged probability densities tend towards a uni-modal distribution as $N$ increases from 250 to 395. For $N \leq 355$ the averaged probability density has a broader top on its main peak, whose central value decreases slightly with increasing $N$. Significantly, for values of $N < 320$, in particular represented by $N = 255$, the averaged densities show oscillations with strong peaks for VEE in the range $0.2 - 1.5 \times 10^{-2}$. These correspond to attraction of low-energy, low-defect count equilibria. The attractivity of these low energy equilibria is suppressed for larger values of $N$. This corresponds to a shift of probability density away from equilibria with lower VEE, and lower defect numbers, towards equilibria with higher defect numbers and with VEE centered around $2.5 \times 10^{-2}$. This suggests that for larger values of $N$ the higher defect equilibria proliferate, forming a basin of attraction maze that is increasingly difficult for the gradient flow to navigate in order to find the low defect (semi-ordered) equilibria. This is supported by the observation that 2461 out of the 2500 equilibria in $B(400, 1, 2500)$ received a single hit, with the most frequently visited equilibria receiving 4 hits. The proliferation of high-defect equilibria shields the low defect equilibria, and their basins of attraction shrink as a proportion of the total state space.

In a second, competing effect, the maximum value of VEE observed for a stable equilibria at a given $N$ and $\alpha$ becomes lower at larger $N$. The shift away from both low energy and higher energy equilibria squeezes the averaged probability density from below and above, pushing it towards a uni-modal shape. Comparing Figure 9 (left) and Figure 14 (top-left) shows that the highest observed energy of a stable equilibrium drops from VEE $\approx 5.0 \times 10^{-2}$ for $N < 100$ to values below $4 \times 10^{-2}$ for $N > 300$. The trend is monotonic in $N$ but seems to saturate. Indeed in Figure 14 (top-left) each of the averaged probability densities decays rapidly to zero for VEE $> 3.5 \times 10^{-2}$. The extent of the convergence at large $N$ is examined through the anti-cumulative distribution $D(N,1)$ and the associated sliding averages, $\langle f_D \rangle_{[N-5,N+5]}$ of its density. In Figure 14 (top-right) these averaged anticumulant densities for $N = 390, \ldots, 400$ are compared to $f_D(N)$. For these values of $N$ the $f_D$ is relatively smooth, the drops found for the $N < 100$ in Figure 9 (left) have been replaced with a continuous decline. For the larger values of VEE the density $f_D$ is relatively independent of $N$, with only a 1% difference between $f_D$ for any of the values of $N$ and its average over the window. This is confirmed in Figure 14 (right), which shows that the $L^2$ relative error between $f_D(N)$ and its sliding average decays to less than 1% for $N > 350$. A log-log linear fit of this decay suggests that the anti-cumulative distribution and its sliding average satisfy

$$\| f_D(N) - \langle f_D \rangle_{[N-5,N+5]} \|_{L^2} \leq C N^{-\beta},$$

where the value $\beta = 2.35$, yields the best linear fit.

Further information is gleaned from the anti-cumulative distributions of the Voronoi regions that comprise the Voronoi tessellations. This reveals the spread of VEE associated to the individual regions within a tessellation. We form the distribution density for $f_V(D)$ which describes the anti-cumulative distribution of Voronoi regions for bin $B$ when averaged over equilibria with $D$ defects. This is compared to $f_V$, the anti-cumulative distribution density formed from the entire bin. Figure 15 (left) presents the defect-prescribed distribution density $f_V(D)$ for $B(400, 1, 2500)$ and $D = 4, \ldots, 62$, and compares it to $f_V$. The range of $f_V$ is substantially larger, by approximately a factor of 50 than the range of $f_D$, as can be observed from the change in horizontal scale between Figures 9 and 15. This highlights a remarkable feature: the $f_V$ has strong support in the region $\text{VEE} < 0$. There are many Voronoi regions whose average radius is larger than that of the reference regular hexagon. It is only in the average over
a tessellation that the VEE becomes positive, and then only by a small fraction of the variation in VEE between constituent Voronoi regions. Indeed the shape of the $f_V(D)$ density provides a measure of the departure of a given tessellation from an ordered state. The $f_V$ for a single ordered tessellation is a step function, dropping from 1 down to 0 at the VEE of the single shape that generates the tessellation. Clearly, for $\mathcal{B}(N,1,2500)$ as $D$ increases, the averaged $f_V(D)$ moves away from the Heaviside of an ordered tessellation. Indeed, already for $D = 4$ the $D_V$ density shows significant difference from a Heaviside profile.

![Figure 15: Anti-cumulative distribution density $f_V(D)$ over Voronoi regions, binned by the number of defects $D = 4 \ldots 62$ (dashed) from $\mathcal{B}(400,1,2500)$. The lowest, $D = 4$, and the highest, $D = 62$, defect distributions are solid and colored. The distribution $f_V$ for the entire bin is solid black. (right) The probability densities for the averaged probability distributions $\langle f_P \rangle_{[390,400]}$ generated from $\mathcal{B}(N,\alpha,2500)$ by averaging over $N = 390, \ldots, 400$, for each of the indicated values of $\alpha$.](image)

The possible existence of a limiting density $P_\infty$ obtained from $P(N,\alpha)$ as $N \to \infty$, requires an investigation into the dependence on domain aspect ratio $\alpha$. In the large $N$ regime the majority of sites are anticipated to be sufficiently “far away” from $\partial\Omega_\alpha$ to arrive at a “bulk” state. However for small aspect ratios, the distance to boundary is generically smaller. Figure 15 (right) shows the probability densities for the averaged $P$ generated from $\mathcal{B}(N,\alpha,2500)$ for $N = 390, \ldots, 400$ for each of $\alpha = 0.3,0.4,\ldots,1.0$. For $\alpha = 0.7,0.8,0.9,1.0$ each probability density is roughly uni-modal with similar oscillations at low the values of VEE. For $\alpha \leq 0.5$ the central peak shifts left and broadens, while the low energy equilibria are suppressed. The upper bound on VEE of stable equilibria is robustly independent of $\alpha$. This suggests that the impact of the boundary is still felt for $N = 400$. For a given aspect ratio $\alpha$ the distance to the boundary can be measured by $d_\theta := \sqrt{N\alpha}$. For $\alpha = 0.3$ and $N = 400$, the value $d_\theta \approx 10.9$ is comparable to that for $\alpha = 1$ and $N = 120$. From Figure 13 (right) the $\alpha = 1$ and $N = 120$ bin does not display convergence to a bulk limit. This suggests an investigation with larger values of $N$ to support the $\alpha$ dependence of the large $N$ limit.
5 Discussion and Conjectures

This work establishes that the Hookean-Voronoi energy generates a complex landscape of with a broad range of equilibria. We have examined the stable equilibria, the density of their defects and the sizes of their basins of attraction grouped according to the energy level. For smaller values of site number $N$, particularly $N < 150$, these distributions are very sensitive to both the number of sites $N$ and to the aspect ratio $\alpha$ of the rectangular domain. For these value the basins of attraction are generically dominated by several low-energy equilibria which attract a significant portion of the total phase space. As $N$ increases a growing collection of stable, high-defect-number equilibria form small basins of attraction that increasingly dominate, and fracture, the phase space. These higher energy equilibria exploit their numerical superiority to crowd out the lower energy equilibria, decreasing their share of the total phase space that they attract and raising the system frustration. On the other hand, an upper limit in VEE appears above which all equilibria are unstable. This upper limit decreases with increasing $N$, approaching a limit that establishes a sharp cut-off on the density of stable equilibria at higher VEE for larger $N$. These two effects push the probability density of the equilibrium energy distribution into a uni-modal curve which seems to define the ‘bulk state’ of the system. Indeed, for $\alpha = 1$, the density functions for the anti-cumulative distribution of energy profiles have converged to within 1% in $L^2$ relative error of their sliding average for $N > 350$.

For $N$ near 400, the probability density for the equilibrium energies are comparable for $\alpha \geq 0.7$ but differ significantly for domain aspect ratios $\alpha < 0.7$. These lower aspect ratio domains retain a largely unimodal equilibrium energy distribution, however their peak is both broader and shifted to lower energy. This suggests that the average volumetric excess energy, $\langle \text{VEE} \rangle_{B(400,\alpha,S)}$ is lower for smaller aspect ratios. This seem counter-intuitive as the lower aspect ratio can be seen as a constraint, lowering the packing options available to the system. This is a second example of the more bulk-like system, here the one with the higher aspect ratio, experiencing a higher degree of frustration.

It is natural to consider the impact of thermal annealing – the temporally limited addition of white noise to the gradient flow to eject the system from local minima so that it can find lower energy minima. This is a standard method to eliminate some of a system’s frustration. As can be inferred from Figure 6 (bottom), the minimum energy to destabilize an equilibrium, is approximately $\frac{1}{2} \nu(x_e) \| x(0) - x_e \|_2^2 \approx 10^{-1}$. This value is one order of magnitude larger than the variation between the VEE of the disordered equilibria, which is roughly $2 \times 10^{-2}$. This rough estimate of the energy barrier between minima is in agreement with numerical simulations which find “escape energies” of $\text{VEE} \approx 2 \times 10^{-1}$ for $N = 400$ equilibria with $\text{VEE} \leq 3 \times 10^{-2}$. The escape energy decreases slightly for equilibria with VEE near the upper limit of $4.5 \times 10^{-2}$. This suggests that annealing would require insertion of energy at a level that lifts the system above the energy of the maximum stable states. Subsequent removal of the annealing perturbations would merely lead the system to relax back onto the energy landscape dominated by disordered equilibrium. In this sense the Hookean Voronoi system may resemble a spin glass, a frustrated system in which energy barriers also dominate variation between local minima, [15, 16].

Several fundamental questions remain. The first is the observation that an equilibrium can be disordered only if it has defects. In the more than $10^6$ simulations conducted in this study, defect free equilibria only arose from ordered tessellations, indeed only from single-string equilibria. This motivates the twin conjecture that ordered equilibria only arise from the single string tessellations and that stable equilibrium are either ordered or have defects. Ordered tessellations can be continuously perturbed
into disordered ones, but introducing a defect into a defect-free tessellation requires pushing the system through a vertex collision. This introduces a gap between ordered and disordered equilibrium. This gap may be related the lack of correlation between the ground state energy $\zeta_0$ and the minimum energy of the ordered (single string) packings. This emphasizes the observations that ordered states are not good proxies for system behavior, especially at large values of $N$.

A second question is to determine if the VEE is always positive. This is equivalent to asking if the average energy of the regions in a tessellation is bounded below by the energy of the regular hexagon of unit area. In all simulations this is the case, with zero VEE attained only for tessellations by regular hexagons. Nonetheless, the distributions of VEE present in any disordered tessellation always includes regions with substantially negative VEE. It is only in the average over the whole tessellation that the VEE is positive. Establishing this conjecture requires eliminating the existence of defect-filled equilibria with negative VEE, a substantially more challenging task than showing that ordered tessellations have non-negative energy.

The third and most fundamental question raised by this study concerns the large $N$ or “bulk” limit of the Hookean-Voronoi energy. The numerical studies presented suggests that $P(N, \alpha)$ approaches a universal large $N$ limit, at least for $\alpha$ near 1, and that this limit supports a non-zero ground state $\zeta_0$ and a fixed degree of frustration $F$. Indeed the system seems to experience a higher level of frustration, per unit cell, as the number of cells increases. The limiting bulk behavior seems to arise from a combinatorial domination of moderate-defect equilibria over low-defect, quasi-ordered equilibria, and a mechanism that drives instability in higher energy equilibria. This affords some similarity to the arctic circle behavior familiar in domino tilings, [12, 3]. A rigorous justification of a bulk limit in the Hookean Voronoi system may require novel combinatorial and probabilistic arguments.
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Appendix

6.1 Calculation of the Average Radius

The average radius can be calculated in closed form. For each region $V_i$ the integrand $r_i = r_i(\theta)$ in (2.2) is continuous on $[0, 2\pi]$ and smooth in $\theta$ on the sub-interval $\{[\varphi_{i,j}, \varphi_{i,j+1}]\}_{i=1}^{m_i}$, where for $j = m_i$ we denote $\varphi_{i,m_i+1} = \varphi_{i,1} + 2\pi$. For each $i = 1, \ldots, N$ we decompose the average radius $\bar{r}_i$ defined in (2.2) into the sum of $\bar{r}_{ij}$ over $j = 1, \ldots, m_i$ defined through

$$\bar{r}_{i,j} := \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\varphi_{i,j}}^{\varphi_{i,j+1}} r_{i,j}(\theta) \, d\theta. \quad (6.1)$$

The terms $\bar{r}_{i,j} = \bar{r}_{i,j}(\vec{x}_i, \vec{v}_{i,j}, \vec{v}_{i,j+1})$ denote the contribution to the average radius of region $V_i$ from the triangle formed by site $\vec{x}_i$ and vertices $\vec{v}_{i,j}$ and $\vec{v}_{i,j+1}$. For $\theta \in [\varphi_{i,j}, \varphi_{i,j+1}]$, the radius takes the form

$$r_{i,j}(\theta) = -\frac{2A_{i,j}}{(\vec{t}_{i,j})^\perp \cdot (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)^T}, \quad (6.2)$$
where the triangle area $A_{i,j}$ is given by

$$A_{i,j} := \frac{1}{2} |\vec{d}_{i,j} \times \vec{l}_{i,j}| = \frac{1}{2} \vec{d}_{i,j}^2 \cdot \vec{l}_{i,j} = \frac{1}{2}(\vec{x}_i - \vec{v}_{i,j}) \cdot \vec{l}_{i,j}^2. \quad (6.3)$$

Here and below $\vec{x}^\perp := R\vec{x}$, where $R$ is rotation by $\pi/2$. Notably the sub-parts $r_{i,j}$ of $r_i$ dependent linearly upon $\vec{x}_i$ through $A_{i,j}$. We re-write the denominator of $r_{i,j}(\theta)$ as

$$(\vec{l}_{i,j})^\perp \cdot (\cos \theta, \sin \theta)^T = |\vec{l}_{i,j}| \sin(\theta + \psi_{i,j}),$$

where the phase is given by

$$\psi_{i,j} = -\arctan \left( \frac{l_{i,j}^{(1)}}{l_{i,j}^{(2)}} \right). \quad (6.4)$$

The integral can be evaluated through the substitution $u = \tan((\theta + \psi_{i,j})/2)$ yielding the expression

$$\bar{r}_{i,j} = \frac{A_{i,j}}{\pi|\vec{l}_{i,j}|} \left( \arctanh \left( \frac{\vec{d}_{i,j+1} \cdot \vec{l}_{i,j}}{|\vec{d}_{i,j+1}||\vec{l}_{i,j}|} \right) - \arctanh \left( \frac{\vec{d}_{i,j} \cdot \vec{l}_{i,j}}{|\vec{d}_{i,j}||\vec{l}_{i,j}|} \right) \right). \quad (6.5)$$

Denoting the angle between the edge $\vec{l}_{i,j}$ and the site-vertex distances $\vec{d}_{i,j}$ and $\vec{d}_{i,j+1}$ as $\alpha_{i,j}$ and $\beta_{i,j}$ respectively, measured counter-clockwise, then the average radius has the expression

$$\bar{r}_i := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=1}^{m_i} |\vec{d}_{i,j}| \sin(\alpha_{i,j}) (\arctanh(\cos \beta_{i,j}) - \arctanh(\cos \alpha_{i,j})). \quad (6.6)$$
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