

Regular packings on periodic lattices

Tadeus Ras, Rolf Schilling and Martin Weigel

Institut für Physik, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Staudinger Weg 7, D-55099 Mainz, Germany

(Dated: August 26, 2011)

We investigate the problem of packing identical hard objects on regular lattices in d dimensions. Restricting configuration space to parallel alignment of the objects, we study the densest packing at a given aspect ratio X . For rectangles and ellipses on the square lattice as well as for biaxial ellipsoids on a simple cubic lattice, we calculate the maximum packing fraction $\varphi_d(X)$. It is proved to be continuous with an infinite number of singular points $X_\nu^{\min}, X_\nu^{\max}$ $\nu = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. In two dimensions, all maxima have the same height, whereas there is a unique global maximum for the case of ellipsoids. The form of $\varphi_d(X)$ is discussed in the context of geometrical frustration effects, transitions in the contact numbers and number theoretical properties. Implications and generalizations for more general packing problems are outlined.

PACS numbers: 61.50.Ah, 82.70.Dd, 64.70.kt

The question of how densely objects can fill a volume has attracted both, mathematicians and physicists, for centuries. One famous problem is that of packing spheres. In 1611, Kepler conjectured that the face-centered cubic (fcc) and hexagonal close packed (hcp) lattice configurations of identical spheres yield the highest packing fraction $\varphi_{\max}^{d=3} = \pi/\sqrt{18} \cong 0.7404$. Gauß could show in 1831 that these are the optimal *periodic* packings of spheres, but only very recently it was proved that they are optimal within all possible arrangements [1]. Even for disks in the plane, the corresponding proof of optimality of the hexagonal packing with $\varphi_{\max}^{d=2} = \pi/\sqrt{12} \cong 0.9069$ was only found in 1943 [2]. Apart from its theoretical attraction, packing is a problem of practical relevance. Not only have practitioners long known that a densest packing of oranges or cannon balls can be achieved via hexagonal layering but, more recently, packing problems have received substantial attention in engineering and operations research as problems of optimizing yields in production or minimizing leakage currents in integrated circuits (see, e.g., Ref. [3]).

In physics, periodic packings [4–6] are relevant for describing and understanding crystalline materials. In contrast, random close packings [7], i.e., maxima of the packing fraction under some local dynamics starting from loosely packed configurations, have been used to model glasses [8] and granular materials [9]. For spheres in 3d, random close packing leads to a packing fraction $\varphi_{\text{RCP}}^{d=3} \approx 0.64$, significantly below $\varphi_{\max}^{d=3}$. The hard objects considered in such packings need not be spheres, but can be more general convex bodies. Although recently there has been extensive numerical work using techniques from dynamic programming and heuristic optimization, complemented by experiments, for studying periodic packings [10] or random close packing [11] for non-spherical objects, there is a lack of analytical understanding of these problems. For random close packing, it has been observed that the packing fraction increases over $\varphi_{\text{RCP}}^{d=3} \approx 0.64$ as spheres are replaced by ellipsoids, and might even approach $\varphi_{\max}^{d=3} = \pi/\sqrt{18} \cong 0.7404$ in some cases [11]. Concerning periodic packings, an affine

transformation maps the face-centered hard sphere packing to a periodic lattice packing of identically aligned ellipsoids with maximum packing fraction $\varphi_{\max}^{d=3} = \pi/\sqrt{18}$. That non-parallel arrangement of ellipsoids of revolution may exceed $\pi/\sqrt{18}$ has been predicted in Refs. [12, 13]. Such super-dense packings of ellipsoids were studied recently in more detail [14, 15]. Particularly, it has been shown that $\varphi \cong 0.7707$ for all aspect ratios $X \geq \sqrt{3}$ [14].

We make progress in the analytical understanding of the problem of packings of non-spherical bodies by taking a complementary approach. Instead of finding the lattice structure that maximizes the packing fraction for a given type $\mathcal{K}$ of objects, we start out from a fixed Bravais lattice Λ and attach a body $\mathcal{K}$ of the same shape and orientation ω to each lattice site (at its center of mass, say). We then determine the maximum packing fraction as a function of $\mathcal{K}$, i.e., as a function of the parameters characterizing its shape and orientation. To the best of our knowledge, this problem has not been studied before. As for periodic packings in continuous space our approach may contribute to describing, for instance, plastic crystals, i.e., lattices with a molecule fixed at each site. In particular, aromatic molecules can be approximately described by hard ellipsoids. Similarly, applications are envisaged in operations research and manufacturing. Insight into the frustration effects generated by the competing length scales of $\mathcal{K}$ and Λ should also contribute to the understanding of packings without a pre-determined lattice structure.

Consider a class of identical d -dimensional convex bodies $\mathcal{K}$ whose shape depends merely on their “length” l and “width” w and which, consequently, are characterized by a single parameter $X = l/w$, the aspect ratio. As a general example one might think of a d -dimensional ellipsoid of revolution. Fixing the aspect ratio X and orientation ω , proportional rescaling of the bodies allows to reach the maximum packing fraction without overlaps, $\varphi_d(X, \omega)$. This fraction varies with ω , and we are interested in the maximum packing fraction irrespective of orientation, $\varphi_d(X) = \max_{\omega} \varphi_d(X, \omega)$. This maximum $\varphi_d(X)$ is continuous as a function of




FIG. 1. (Color online). Maximum packing configurations of rectangles with aspect ratios $X = 4$ (green, bottom), $X = X_{21}^{\max} = 5$ (blue, middle), and $X = 7$ (red, top), respectively. Lattice lines $L_{jk}^{(\sigma)}$, $\sigma = 0, \pm 1, \dots$ for $(j, k) = (2, 1)$ are indicated with dashed lines.

X . To see this, note that the object's volume $v_d(l, w)$ is continuous in l and w and increases monotonically with l and w . Now, assume that $\varphi_d(X)$ is discontinuous at some $X_0 = l_0/w_0$. With $\varphi_0 = \varphi_d(X_0)$ and $\varphi_{\pm} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \varphi_d(X_0 \pm \varepsilon)$, define $\varphi_{\min} = \min\{\varphi_-, \varphi_0, \varphi_+\}$ and $\varphi_{\max} = \max\{\varphi_-, \varphi_0, \varphi_+\} = \varphi_{\min} + \Delta\varphi$. As $\varphi_d(X)$ is assumed to be discontinuous at X_0 , we have $\Delta\varphi \geq \text{const} > 0$. $\varphi_{\max}$ can be written as $v_d(l_{\max}, w_{\max})/v_0$, where v_0 is the volume of the primitive unit cell of the lattice Λ . Here, $l_{\max}$, $w_{\max}$ are not necessarily identical to l_0 , w_0 , but it must hold that $l_{\max}/w_{\max} = X_0$. Starting from the configuration with $(l_{\max}, w_{\max})$, we can generate a *continuous* family of packings with decreasing volume fraction by either decreasing l or decreasing w . The corresponding packing fraction $\tilde{\varphi}_d(X)$ is *continuous* in X , and it is $\tilde{\varphi}_d(X) \leq \varphi_{\max}$ for all X . Since $\tilde{\varphi}_d(X)$ is continuous, there exists a finite interval (X_-, X_+) with $X_- < X_0 < X_+$ depending on $\Delta\varphi$ such that $\tilde{\varphi}_d(X) > \tilde{\varphi}_d(X_0) - \frac{1}{2}\Delta\varphi = \varphi_{\max} - \frac{1}{2}\Delta\varphi = \varphi_{\min} + \frac{1}{2}\Delta\varphi$ for all X in that interval. On the other hand, it must be $\varphi_d(X) \geq \tilde{\varphi}_d(X)$ since, by definition, $\varphi_d(X)$ is the maximum packing fraction for fixed X . From the last two inequalities we deduce that $\varphi_d(X) > \varphi_{\min}$ for all X with $X_- < X < X_+$ which, however, is in contradiction with the assumption that $\varphi_d(X)$ takes its minimal value $\varphi_{\min}$ in that interval. Hence, $\varphi_d(X)$ must be continuous in X .

We now turn to the calculation of $\varphi_d(X)$ for specific hard objects. As an example in two dimensions (2d), we study a square lattice with lattice constant $a = 1$. Consider first the case of rectangles of length l and width w . Imagine two identical rectangles with common orientation $\mathbf{e} = (\cos \omega, \sin \omega)$, of their long side, attached with their centers to lattice sites $(0, 0)$ and $\mathbf{R}_{jk} = (j, k)$, respectively. In the following, we assume that $j \geq 0$ and $k \geq 0$ are coprime integers, i.e., they do not have a common divisor other than 1. For fixed aspect ratio X , it is obvious that the rectangles will attain maximum volume $v_2(l, w)$ if they touch each other along their short or long sides, cf. Fig. 1. Hence, $\mathbf{e}$ must be par-




FIG. 2. (Color online). Maximum packing fraction $\varphi_2(X)$ for rectangles (dashed line, right scale) and for ellipses (solid line, left scale). All global maxima lie on the dotted and dashed lines, respectively. Inset: orientation angle ω as a function of X for rectangles (dashed line) and ellipses (solid line). The dots correspond to the position of the maxima of $\varphi_2(X)$ for ellipses.

allel to $\mathbf{R}_{jk}$. It is straightforward to prove that, due to the periodicity of Λ , this stays true also if taking *all* the rectangles of the lattice into account [16]. In other words, for given X maximum packing fractions will always occur for “rational” orientations $\omega = \arctan(k/j)$ of the rectangles. Maximal packings for specific X can be constructed using the concept of *lattice lines*. The line $L_{jk}^{(0)}$ through the origin is defined by the lattice vector $\mathbf{R}_{jk} = (j, k)$. The distance of adjacent lattice sites on $L_{jk}^{(0)}$ equals $l_{jk} = \sqrt{j^2 + k^2}$. The square lattice can be decomposed into a set of parallel lattice lines $L_{jk}^{(\sigma)}$, $\sigma = 0, \pm 1, \dots$, of distance w_{jk} , where $w_{jk} l_{jk} = v_0 = 1$ (cf. the dashed lines in Fig. 1). Choosing $l = l_{jk}$ and $w = w_{jk}$, i.e., $X = X_{jk}^{\max} = l_{jk}/w_{jk} = j^2 + k^2$ leads to a perfect tiling with $\varphi_{\max} = \varphi_2(X_{jk}^{\max}) = l_{jk} w_{jk} = 1$, for all coprime pairs (j, k) , cf. the maxima at $\varphi_2 = 1$ in the lower part of the main panel of Fig. 2. The pairs (j, k) can be ordered such that $X_{\nu-1}^{\max} < X_{\nu}^{\max}$ where $X_{\nu}^{\max} = X_{j_{\nu}k_{\nu}}^{\max}$, $\nu = 0, 1, 2, \dots$. Since $\mathbf{e}$ must be parallel to $\mathbf{R}_{jk}$, the maximum packing for $X < X_{jk}^{\max}$ and $X > X_{jk}^{\max}$ is obtained by decreasing l below l_{jk} keeping $w = w_{jk}$, and decreasing w below w_{jk} keeping $l = l_{jk}$, respectively (see Fig. 1). Consequently,

$$\varphi_2(X) = \begin{cases} w_{j_{\nu}k_{\nu}}^2 X, & X_{\nu-1}^{\max} \leq X \leq X_{\nu}^{\max} \\ l_{j_{\nu}k_{\nu}}^2/X, & X_{\nu}^{\max} \leq X \leq X_{\nu+1}^{\max} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The positions $X_{\nu}^{\min} = l_{j_{\nu}k_{\nu}} l_{j_{\nu+1}k_{\nu+1}}$ follow from the matching condition $(l_{j_{\nu}k_{\nu}})^2/X_{\nu}^{\min} = (w_{j_{\nu+1}k_{\nu+1}})^2 X_{\nu}^{\min}$ and $l_{j_{\nu+1}k_{\nu+1}} w_{j_{\nu+1}k_{\nu+1}} = 1$. $\varphi_2(X)$ is shown in Fig. 2, together with the optimal orientation $\omega(X)$ in the inset.

We now turn to the case of packing ellipses on the square lattice. A naive approach would be to inscribe them into the rectangles considered above. The resulting packing fraction of ellipses is then just $\pi/4$ that of the rectangles. In reality, however, maximally packed ellipses do not, in general, touch each other “head” to “tail”, nor are they oriented parallel to the lattice lines, cf. Fig. 3. In contrast to the highly degenerate case of packing rectangles which touch along whole line segments, packings of general, smooth convex bodies are characterized by K contact points per body of which, due to inversion symmetry, only $K/2$ are independent. The three parameters describing an ellipse (two half axes and the orientation angle) are under-determined in the generic case of $K = 4$ contact points (resulting in $K/2 = 2$ equations), yielding a *continuum* of solutions as a function of X . Non-generic is the case of $K = 6$ contacts, leading to a *discrete* set of maxima in $\varphi_2(X)$. For this situation, put one ellipse at the origin, such that the sites of the other ellipses are at $\pm(l_i, m_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ and $\pm(j, k) = \pm(l_1 + l_2, m_1 + m_2)$, cf. Fig. 3. Note that $0 \leq l_i \leq j$, $0 \leq m_i \leq k$. Then, the three independent contact vectors $\mathbf{c}_i = \frac{1}{2}(l_i, m_i)$, $i = 1, 2$ and $\mathbf{c}_3 = \frac{1}{2}(j, k) = \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2$ uniquely determine the three coefficients a , b , and c in the ellipse equation $ax^2 + 2bxy + cy^2 = 1$. This allows to determine the lengths of the half axes and thus the aspect ratio to be

$$X_{jk}^{\max} = (\alpha_+ + \sqrt{\alpha_-^2 + \alpha_0^2})/\sqrt{3}, \quad (2)$$

$$\alpha_i = \mathbf{c}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \mathbf{c}_1 + \mathbf{c}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \mathbf{c}_2 + \mathbf{c}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i \mathbf{c}_2,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{\pm} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \pm 1 \end{pmatrix}$. The corresponding packing fraction is $\varphi_{\max} = \varphi_2(X_{jk}^{\max}) = \pi/\sqrt{12}$ for all (j, k) , identical to the packing fraction of hcp disks. In fact, each such maximal ellipse packing can be continuously deformed via an affine transformation into a packing of disks. On increasing (decreasing) X from $X_{jk}^{\max}$, the shortest (longest) contact vector disappears, and the remaining four contacts allow to determine the coefficients a , b and c , and therefore $\varphi_2(X)$ and $\omega(X)$ in between the maxima $X_{jk}^{\max}$ as a function of X in a closed-form expression.

The result for $\varphi_2(X)$ and $\omega(X)$ is displayed in Fig. 2. Since $\varphi_2(1/X) = \varphi_2(X)$, only the regime $X \geq 1$ is shown. The maximum packing fraction is singular at $X_{\nu}^{\max}$ for all ν . The orientation $\omega(X)$ is discontinuous at those $X_{\nu}^{\min}$ at which $\varphi_2'(X)$ is discontinuous and at those $X_{jk}^{\max}$ which are degenerate, such as $X_{51}^{\max} = X_{52}^{\max}$ (cf. Fig. 2). At these points, there are two degenerate maximal packings with the same packing fraction and aspect ratio, but different orientations. The global maximum value of $\varphi_{\max} = 1$ and $\varphi_{\max} = \pi/\sqrt{12}$ for rectangles and ellipses, respectively, is attained for an *infinite* number of packings, uniquely labeled by (j, k) . From Fig. 2 it appears plausible that $\lim_{X \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_2(X) = \varphi_{\max}$, which indeed can be proved [16].

The mathematical relation of the contact points can be understood from a number-theoretic point of view.




FIG. 3. (Color online). Maximum packing configurations of ellipses with aspect ratios $X = 3$ (green, bottom), $X_{21}^{\max} = \sqrt{29 + 8\sqrt{13}}/\sqrt{3} \approx 4.39$ (blue, middle), and $X = 6$ (red, top). Lattice lines for $(j, k) = (2, 1)$ (dashed lines) and contact points (crosses).

Note that the centers (l_i, m_i) , $i = 1, 2$ of two ellipses touching the central one at $(0, 0)$ also define lattice lines $L_{li, mi}^{(0)}$ with direction (l_i, m_i) . These are the directions closest to that of $L_{jk}^{(0)}$ provided that l_i and m_i are coprime and $0 \leq l_i \leq j$, $0 \leq m_i \leq k$. In more mathematical terms this means that m_i/l_i , $i = 1, 2$, are the two *best* rational approximants of the rational number k/j that are obtained as follows [17]. First, determine the finite continued fraction expansion

$$k/j = a_0 + 1/[a_1 + 1/[a_2 + \dots + 1/[a_{n-1} + 1/a_n] \dots]] \quad (3)$$

with positive integers a_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, which are uniquely determined by k/j . Then, it is $l_1 = s_{n-1}$, $m_1 = r_{n-1}$, where the best *principal* approximant r_{n-1}/s_{n-1} follows from Eq. (3) for $a_n = \infty$. If $a_n = 1$, it is $l_2 = s_{n-2}$, $m_2 = r_{n-2}$ and r_{n-2}/s_{n-2} is the next best principal approximant for which $a_{n-1} = \infty$ in (3). For $a_n > 1$, one has $l_2 = s_{n, a_n-1}$, $m_2 = r_{n, a_n-1}$ with the best *intermediate* approximant $r_{n, a_n-1}/s_{n, a_n-1}$ obtained from Eq. (3) replacing a_n by $a_n - 1$.

Finally, we have investigated ellipsoids of revolution on a simple cubic lattice. Analytically, it is possible to proceed in a similar fashion as for the ellipses. The resulting eighth-order polynomial in w^2 can only be solved numerically, however, and the intermediate expressions are rather unwieldy. Therefore, we instead determined $\varphi_3(X)$ numerically by a downhill-simplex minimization algorithm, the result of which is shown in Fig. 4; it agrees with that determined earlier in Ref. [18] and, as expected, shows continuity, too. Similar to the results in 2d, $\varphi_3'(X)$ seems to be discontinuous at a series of maxima at $X_{\nu}^{\max}$. It appears to be discontinuous at some, but not all, minima $X_{\nu}^{\min}$. The symmetry between $1/X$ and X valid in 2d, however, is lost. Most strikingly, the global maximum $\varphi_{\max} = \pi/\sqrt{18}$ for ellipsoids appears to be attained only for the single packing fraction $X_{-1}^{\max} = 1/2$, whereas in 2d there was a countable infinity of degenerate maxima. This maximum corresponds to the highly non-generic case of each ellipsoid




FIG. 4. (Color online). Maximum packing fraction for biaxial ellipsoids on an sc lattice on a logarithmic X scale. The dashed and dotted lines represent global minimal and maximal packing fractions, respectively.

touching 12 neighbors. Consequently, an affine transformation can be applied to map this pattern to closest packing of hard spheres resulting in an fcc or hcp lattice. A second prominent maximum occurs at $X_1^{\max} = 2$, where 8 contact points occur. The corresponding transformed hard sphere packing yields a bcc-lattice. It can be shown that $\varphi_3(X) \geq \varphi_{\min} = \pi/6 = \varphi_3(X = 1)$, i.e., the packing fraction of hard spheres on an sc lattice is a lower bound for $\varphi_3(X)$ [16]. From the numerical results in Fig. 4 we conjecture that, analogous to the 2d case, $\varphi_3(X) \rightarrow \varphi_{\max} = \pi/\sqrt{18}$ for $X \rightarrow \infty$ and $X \rightarrow 0$, respectively.

To conclude, the maximum packing fraction $\varphi_d(X)$ of parallel aligned convex objects $\mathcal{K}$ characterized by a single aspect ratio exhibits universal features that appear to be independent of $\mathcal{K}$, the underlying Bravais lattice Λ , and even its dimension d . In particular, $\varphi_d(X)$ has been very generally proved to be continuous. In fact, this proof can even be extended to the case of convex bodies characterized by an arbitrary number of aspect ratios. Furthermore, as shown for the case of rectangles and ellipses on the square lattice as well as for biaxial ellipsoids on the sc lattice, there is an infinite number of local maxima and minima at which $\varphi_d(X)$ is singular. The singularities at the minima and at certain, degenerate maxima (see Fig. 2 for the case of ellipses) are correlated to the

discontinuities in the orientation of $\mathcal{K}$. For the studied cases, we find that $\varphi_d(X)$ converges to its global maximum for $X \rightarrow \infty$ as well as for $X \rightarrow 0$. While we were only able to prove this rigorously for the case of rectangles and ellipses, we believe that this property holds far more generally, implying that convex hard objects, on average, pack much better if they become more oblate or prolate.

On the other hand, there are also significant differences between the systems studied in two and three dimensions. For rectangles and ellipses, the global maximum packing fraction $\varphi_{\max} = 1$ (rectangles) and $\varphi_{\max} = \pi/\sqrt{12}$ (ellipses) is attained for an *infinite* number of discrete aspect ratios $X_{jk}^{\max}$, uniquely labeled by pairs (j, k) of coprime integers. On the contrary, for symmetric ellipsoids with $1/100 \leq X \leq 100$, $\varphi_3(X)$ takes its maximal height $\varphi_{\max} = \pi/\sqrt{18}$ at the *single* value $X_{-1}^{\max} = 1/2$ only. This qualitative difference can be understood as follows. Consider, for instance, a d -dimensional symmetric ellipsoid which depends on $d + 1$ parameters. In a packing, K contacts lead to $K/2$ equations. In the generic case of $K/2 = d$, the system is under-determined and φ_d can be found as a function of the aspect ratio X . For the non-generic case $K/2 = d + 1$, there is always a solution corresponding to the local maxima of $\varphi_d(X)$ at $X_{\nu}^{\max}$. It appears likely that the competing point symmetries of $\mathcal{K}$ and Λ are responsible for the non-equal heights of these maxima for $d = 3$ and $K = 8$. It is conceivable that this extra frustration might be relieved by considering convex hard objects characterized by *three* length scales, possibly leading again to an infinity of equal-height maxima. The even more non-generic situation $K/2 > d + 1$ as realized, e.g., in the global maximum $\varphi_{\max} = \pi/\sqrt{18}$ for our 3d ellipsoids with $K = 12$, corresponds to an *over-determined* set of equations such that, at most, only very few solutions can be expected. Of course, it might be a challenge to study packings of the considered type on different lattices. Even richer behavior is expected on weakening the condition of parallel alignment, paving the way for the occurrence of superdense packings in analogy to those recently found for ellipsoids in the 3d continuum [14, 15].

M.W. acknowledges funding by the DFG under contract No. WE4425/1-1 (Emmy Noether Program).

-
- [1] T. C. Hales, Ann. Math. **162**, 1065 (2005)
 - [2] L. F. Tóth, Math. Z. **48** (1943), 676-684.
 - [3] K. A. Dowsland and W. B. Dowsland, Eur. J. Oper. Res. **56**, 2 (1993).
 - [4] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, "Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups" (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999)
 - [5] C. A. Rogers, "Packing and Coverings" (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1964)
 - [6] G. Grünbaum and G. C. Shepard, "Tilings and Patterns" (W. H. Freeman, New York, 1987)
 - [7] S. Torquato, "Random Heterogeneous Materials: Microstructure and Macroscopic Properties" (Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002)
 - [8] R. Zallen, "The Physics of Amorphous Solids" (Wiley, New York, 1983)
 - [9] A. J. Liu and S. R. Nagel, "Jamming and Rheology" (Taylor & Francis, New York, 2001)
 - [10] A. Torquato and Y. Jiao, Nature, **460**, 876 (2009).
 - [11] A. Donev, *et al.*, Science, **303**, 990-993 (2004).
 - [12] A. Bezdek and W. Kuperberg, Applied Geometry and Discrete Mathematics **4**, 71 (1991)
 - [13] J. M. Wills, Mathematika, **38**, 318 (1991)
 - [14] A. Donev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 255506 (2004)
 - [15] P. Pfleiderer and T. Schilling, Phys. Rev. **E75**, 020402

- (R) (2007)
- [16] T. Ras, Diploma Thesis, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (2011).
- [17] S. Lang “Introduction to Diophantine Approximations” (Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1966)
- [18] M. Ricker, PhD Thesis, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz (2005).