Annals of Mathematics **178** (2013), 443–452
http://dx.doi.org/10.4007/annals.2013.178.2.2

Optimal asymptotic bounds for spherical designs

By Andriy Bondarenko, Danylo Radchenko, and Maryna Viazovska

Abstract

In this paper we prove the conjecture of Korevaar and Meyers: for each $N \geq c_d t^d$, there exists a spherical t-design in the sphere S^d consisting of N points, where c_d is a constant depending only on d.

1. Introduction

Let S^d be the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ with the Lebesgue measure μ_d normalized by $\mu_d(S^d) = 1$.

A set of points $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in S^d$ is called a *spherical t-design* if

$$\int_{S^d} P(x)\, d\mu_d(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i)$$

for all polynomials in $d+1$ variables, of total degree at most t. The concept of a spherical design was introduced by Delsarte, Goethals, and Seidel [12]. For each $t, d \in \mathbb{N}$, denote by $N(d,t)$ the minimal number of points in a spherical t-design in S^d. The following lower bound,

$$(1) \qquad N(d,t) \geq \begin{cases} \binom{d+k}{d} + \binom{d+k-1}{d} & \text{if } t = 2k, \\ 2\binom{d+k}{d} & \text{if } t = 2k+1, \end{cases}$$

is proved in [12].

Spherical t-designs attaining this bound are called *tight*. The vertices of a regular $t+1$-gon form a tight spherical t-design in the circle, so $N(1,t) = t+1$. Exactly eight tight spherical designs are known for $d \geq 2$ and $t \geq 4$. All such configurations of points are highly symmetrical, and optimal from many different points of view (see Cohn, Kumar [10] and Conway, Sloane [11]). Unfortunately, tight designs rarely exist. In particular, Bannai and Damerell [2], [3] have shown that tight spherical designs with $d \geq 2$ and $t \geq 4$ may exist only for $t = 4$, 5, 7, or 11. Moreover, the only tight 11-design is formed by minimal vectors of the Leech lattice in dimension 24. The bound (1) has been improved by Delsarte's linear programming method for most pairs (d, t); see [22].

On the other hand, Seymour and Zaslavsky [20] have proved that spherical t-designs exist for all d, $t \in \mathbb{N}$. However, this proof is nonconstructive and gives no idea of how big $N(d,t)$ is. So, a natural question is to ask how $N(d,t)$ differs from bound (1). Generally, to find the exact value of $N(d,t)$ even for small d and t is a surprisingly hard problem. For example, everybody believes that 24 minimal vectors of the D_4 root lattice form a 5-design with minimal number of points in S^3, although it is only proved that $22 \leq N(3,5) \leq 24$; see [6]. Further, Cohn, Conway, Elkies, and Kumar [9] conjectured that every spherical 5-design consisting of 24 points in S^3 is in a certain 3-parametric family. Recently, Musin [17] has solved a long standing problem related to this conjecture. Namely, he proved that the kissing number in dimension 4 is 24.

In this paper we focus on asymptotic upper bounds on $N(d,t)$ for fixed $d \geq 2$ and $t \to \infty$. Let us give a brief history of this question. First, Wagner [21] and Bajnok [1] proved that $N(d,t) \leq C_d t^{Cd^4}$ and $N(d,t) \leq C_d t^{Cd^3}$, respectively. Then, Korevaar and Meyers [14] have improved these inequalities by showing that $N(d,t) \leq C_d t^{(d^2+d)/2}$. They have also conjectured that

$$N(d,t) \leq C_d t^d.$$

Note that (1) implies $N(d,t) \geq c_d t^d$. Here and in what follows we denote by C_d and c_d sufficiently large and sufficiently small positive constants depending only on d, respectively.

The conjecture of Korevaar and Meyers attracted the interest of many mathematicians. For instance, Kuijlaars and Saff [19] emphasized the importance of this conjecture for $d = 2$ and revealed its relation to minimal energy problems. Mhaskar, Narcowich, and Ward [16] have constructed positive quadrature formulas in S^d with $C_d t^d$ points having *almost* equal weights. Very recently, Chen, Frommer, Lang, Sloan, and Womersley [7], [8] gave a computer-assisted proof that spherical t-designs with $(t+1)^2$ points exist in S^2 for $t \leq 100$.

For $d = 2$, there is an even stronger conjecture by Hardin and Sloane [13] saying that $N(2,t) \leq \frac{1}{2}t^2 + o(t^2)$ as $t \to \infty$. Numerical evidence supporting the conjecture was also given.

In [4], we have suggested a nonconstructive approach for obtaining asymptotic bounds for $N(d,t)$ based on the application of the Brouwer fixed point theorem. This led to the following result:

For each $N \geq C_d t^{\frac{2d(d+1)}{d+2}}$, *there exists a spherical* t*-design in* S^d *consisting of* N *points.*

Instead of the Brouwer fixed point theorem, in this paper we use the following result from the Brouwer degree theory [18, Ths. 1.2.6 and 1.2.9].

THEOREM A. *Let* $f : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *be a continuous mapping and* Ω *an open bounded subset, with boundary* $\partial\Omega$, *such that* $0 \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. *If* $\langle x, f(x) \rangle > 0$ *for all* $x \in \partial\Omega$, *then there exists* $x \in \Omega$ *satisfying* $f(x) = 0$.

We employ this theorem to prove the conjecture of Korevaar and Meyers.

THEOREM 1. *For each* $N \geq C_d t^d$, *there exists a spherical* t*-design in* S^d *consisting of* N *points.*

Note that Theorem 1 is slightly stronger than the original conjecture because it guarantees the existence of spherical t-designs for *each* N greater than $C_d t^d$.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we explain the main idea of the proof. Then in Section 3 we present some auxiliary results. Finally, we prove Theorem 1 in Section 4.

2. Preliminaries and the main idea

Let $\mathcal{P}_t$ be the Hilbert space of polynomials P on S^d of degree at most t such that

$$\int_{S^d} P(x) d\mu_d(x) = 0,$$

equipped with the usual inner product

$$\langle P, Q \rangle = \int_{S^d} P(x) Q(x) d\mu_d(x).$$

By the Riesz representation theorem, for each point $x \in S^d$, there exists a unique polynomial $G_x \in \mathcal{P}_t$ such that

$$\langle G_x, Q \rangle = Q(x) \text{ for all } Q \in \mathcal{P}_t.$$

Then a set of points $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in S^d$ forms a spherical t-design if and only if

$$G_{x_1} + \cdots + G_{x_N} = 0. \tag{2}$$

The gradient of a differentiable function $f : \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x} := \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial \xi_{d+1}} \right), \qquad x = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{d+1}).$$

For a polynomial $Q \in \mathcal{P}_t$, we define the *spherical gradient*

$$\nabla Q(x) := \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \left(Q \left(\frac{x}{|x|} \right) \right), \tag{3}$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^{d+1}$.

We apply Theorem A to the open subset Ω of a vector space $\mathcal{P}_t$:

$$\Omega := \left\{ P \in \mathcal{P}_t \,\middle|\, \int_{S^d} |\nabla P(x)| d\mu_d(x) < 1 \right\}. \tag{4}$$

Now we observe that the existence of a continuous mapping $F : \mathcal{P}_t \to (S^d)^N$, such that for all $P \in \partial\Omega$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i(P)) > 0, \text{ where } F(P) = (x_1(P), \dots, x_N(P)), \tag{5}$$

readily implies the existence of a spherical t-design in S^d consisting of N points. Indeed, consider a mapping $L : (S^d)^N \to \mathcal{P}_t$ defined by

$$(x_1, \dots, x_N) \xrightarrow{L} G_{x_1} + \dots + G_{x_N},$$

and the following composition mapping $f = L \circ F : \mathcal{P}_t \to \mathcal{P}_t$. Clearly

$$\langle P, f(P) \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i(P))$$

for each $P \in \mathcal{P}_t$. Thus, applying Theorem A to the mapping f, the vector space $\mathcal{P}_t$, and the subset Ω defined by (4), we obtain that $f(Q) = 0$ for some $Q \in \mathcal{P}_t$. Hence, by (2), the components of $F(Q) = (x_1(Q), \dots, x_N(Q))$ form a spherical t-design in S^d consisting of N points.

The most naive approach to construct such F is to start with a certain well-distributed collection of points x_i ($i = 1, \dots, N$), put $F(0) := (x_1, \dots, x_N)$, and then move each point along the spherical gradient vector field of P. Note that this is the most greedy way to increase each $P(x_i(P))$ and make $\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i(P))$ positive for each $P \in \partial\Omega$. Following this approach we will give an explicit construction of F in Section 4, which will immediately imply the proof of Theorem 1.

3. Auxiliary results

To construct the corresponding mapping F for each $N \geq C_d t^d$, we extensively use the following notion of an area-regular partition.

Let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_N\}$ be a finite collection of closed sets $R_i \subset S^d$ such that $\cup_{i=1}^{N} R_i = S^d$ and $\mu_d(R_i \cap R_j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq N$. The partition $\mathcal{R}$ is called area-regular if $\mu_d(R_i) = 1/N$, $i = 1, \dots, N$. The partition norm for $\mathcal{R}$ is defined by

$$\|\mathcal{R}\| := \max_{R \in \mathcal{R}} \operatorname{diam} R,$$

where $\operatorname{diam} R$ stands for the maximum geodesic distance between two points in R. We need the following fact on area-regular partitions (see Bourgain, Lindenstrauss [5] and Kuijlaars, Saff [15]).

THEOREM B. *For each $N \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists an area-regular partition $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_N\}$ with $\|\mathcal{R}\| \le B_d N^{-1/d}$ for some constant B_d large enough.*

We will also use a result that is an easy corollary of Theorem 3.1 in [16].

THEOREM C. *There exists a constant r_d such that for each area-regular partition $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_N\}$ with $\|\mathcal{R}\| < \frac{r_d}{m}$, each collection of points $x_i \in R_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$, and each polynomial P of total degree m, the inequality*

$$\frac{1}{2}\int_{S^d} |P(x)| d\mu_d(x) \le \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} |P(x_i)| \le \frac{3}{2}\int_{S^d} |P(x)| d\mu_d(x) \tag{6}$$

holds.

Theorem 3.1 in [16] was stated for slightly different definition of an area-regular partition. Namely, it was additionally assumed that each R_i is a spherical region. However the proof clearly works for our more general definition as well; see [16, §3.3].

COROLLARY 1. *For each area-regular partition $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \ldots, R_N\}$ with $\|\mathcal{R}\| < \frac{r_d}{m+1}$, each collection of points $x_i \in R_i$ $(i = 1, \ldots, N)$, and each polynomial P of total degree m,*

$$\frac{1}{3\sqrt{d}}\int_{S^d} |\nabla P(x)| d\mu_d(x) \le \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} |\nabla P(x_i)| \le 3\sqrt{d}\int_{S^d} |\nabla P(x)| d\mu_d(x). \tag{7}$$

Proof. For a point $x = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{d+1}) \in S^d$, we get by (3) that

$$|\nabla P(x)| = \sqrt{P_1^2(x) + \cdots + P_{d+1}^2(x)},$$

where

$$P_j(x) := \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_j}(x) - \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} \xi_j \xi_k \frac{\partial P}{\partial \xi_k}(x)$$

are polynomials of total degree at most $m+1$. Thus, using a simple inequality

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{d+1}}\sum_{k=1}^{d+1} |P_k(x_i)| \le \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{d+1} P_k^2(x_i)} \le \sum_{k=1}^{d+1} |P_k(x_i)|$$

and then applying (6) to polynomials P_k, we obtain the statement of the corollary. □

4. **Proof of Theorem 1**

In this section we construct the map F introduced in Section 2 and thereby finish the proof of Theorem 1.

For $d, t \in \mathbb{N}$, take $C_d > (54 d B_d / r_d)^d$, where B_d is as in Theorem B and r_d is as in Theorem C, and fix $N \ge C_d t^d$. Now we are in a position to give an exact construction of the mapping $F : \mathcal{P}_t \to (S^d)^N$, which satisfies condition (5). Take an area-regular partition $\mathcal{R} = \{R_1, \dots, R_N\}$ with

$$\|\mathcal{R}\| \le B_d N^{-1/d} < \frac{r_d}{54dt} \tag{8}$$

as provided by Theorem B, and choose an arbitrary $x_i \in R_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, N$. Put $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{d}}$, and consider the function

$$h_\varepsilon(u) := \begin{cases} u & \text{if } u > \varepsilon, \\ \varepsilon & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Take a mapping $U : \mathcal{P}_t \times S^d \to \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ such that

$$U(P, y) = \frac{\nabla P(y)}{h_\varepsilon(|\nabla P(y)|)}.$$

For each $i = 1, \dots, N$, let $y_i : \mathcal{P}_t \times [0, \infty) \to S^d$ be the map satisfying the differential equation

$$\frac{d}{ds} y_i(P, s) = U(P, y_i(P, s)) \tag{9}$$

with the initial condition

$$y_i(P, 0) = x_i$$

for each $P \in \mathcal{P}_t$. Note that each mapping y_i has its values in S^d by definition of spherical gradient (3). Since the mapping $U(P, y)$ is Lipschitz continuous in both P and y, each y_i is well defined and continuous in both P and s, where the metric on $\mathcal{P}_t$ is given by the inner product. Finally, put

$$F(P) = (x_1(P), \dots, x_N(P)) := \left(y_1(P, \frac{r_d}{3t}), \dots, y_N\left(P, \frac{r_d}{3t}\right)\right). \tag{10}$$

By definition, the mapping F is continuous on $\mathcal{P}_t$. So, as explained in Section 2, to finish the proof of Theorem 1 it suffices to prove

LEMMA 1. *Let $F : \mathcal{P}_t \to (S^d)^N$ be the mapping defined by (10). Then for each $P \in \partial\Omega$,*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i(P)) > 0,$$

where Ω is given by (4).

Proof. Fix $P \in \partial\Omega$; that is,

$$\int_{S^d} |\nabla P(x)| d\mu_d(x) = 1.$$

For the sake of simplicity, we write $y_i(s)$ in place of $y_i(P, s)$. By the Newton-Leibniz formula, we have

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i(P)) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(y_i(r_d/3t)) = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i) + \int_0^{r_d/3t} \frac{d}{ds}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(y_i(s))\right] ds. \tag{11}$$

Now to prove Lemma 1, we first estimate the value

$$\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i)\right|$$

from above and then estimate the value

$$\frac{d}{ds}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(y_i(s))\right]$$

from below for each $s \in [0, r_d/3t]$. We have

$$\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i)\right| = \left|\sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_{R_i} P(x_i) - P(x)\, d\mu_d(x)\right| \le \sum_{i=1}^{N}\int_{R_i} |P(x_i) - P(x)| d\mu_d(x) \le \frac{\|\mathcal{R}\|}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \max_{z\in S^d\colon \operatorname{dist}(z,x_i)\le\|\mathcal{R}\|} |\nabla P(z)|,$$

where $\operatorname{dist}(z, x_i)$ denotes the geodesic distance between z and x_i. Hence, for $z_i \in S^d$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(z_i, x_i) \le \|\mathcal{R}\|$ and

$$|\nabla P(z_i)| = \max_{z\in S^d\colon \operatorname{dist}(z,x_i)\le\|\mathcal{R}\|} |\nabla P(z)|,$$

we obtain

$$\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i)\right| \le \frac{\|\mathcal{R}\|}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} |\nabla P(z_i)|.$$

Consider another area-regular partition $\mathcal{R}' = \{R_1', \dots, R_N'\}$ defined by $R_i' = R_i \cup \{z_i\}$. Clearly $\|\mathcal{R}'\| \le 2\|\mathcal{R}\|$ and so, by (8), we get $\|\mathcal{R}'\| < r_d/(27\, d\, t)$. Applying inequality (7) to the partition $\mathcal{R}'$ and the collection of points z_i, we obtain that

$$\left|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i)\right| \le 3\sqrt{d}\,\|\mathcal{R}\| \int_{S^d} |\nabla P(x)| d\mu_d(x) < \frac{r_d}{18\sqrt{d}\,t} \tag{12}$$

for any $P \in \partial\Omega$. On the other hand, the differential equation (9) implies

$$\begin{aligned}(13)\qquad \frac{d}{ds}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(y_i(s))\right] &= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{|\nabla P(y_i(s))|^2}{h_\varepsilon(|\nabla P(y_i(s))|)} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i:\,|\nabla P(y_i(s))|\geq\varepsilon} |\nabla P(y_i(s))| \\ &\geq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} |\nabla P(y_i(s))| - \varepsilon.\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left|\frac{\nabla P(y)}{h_\varepsilon(|\nabla P(y)|)}\right| \leq 1$$

for each $y \in S^d$, it follows again from (9) that $\left|\frac{dy_i(s)}{ds}\right| \leq 1$. Hence we arrive at

$$\operatorname{dist}(x_i, y_i(s)) \leq s.$$

Now for each $s \in [0, r_d/3t]$, we consider the area-regular partition $\mathcal{R}'' = \{R''_1, \ldots, R''_N\}$ given by $R''_i = R_i \cup \{y_i(s)\}$. By (8), we have

$$\|\mathcal{R}''\| < \frac{r_d}{54dt} + \frac{r_d}{3t},$$

so we can apply (7) to the partition $\mathcal{R}''$ and the collection of points $y_i(s)$. This and inequality (13) yield

$$\begin{aligned}(14)\qquad \frac{d}{ds}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(y_i(s))\right] &\geq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} |\nabla P(y_i(s))| - \frac{1}{6\sqrt{d}} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3\sqrt{d}}\int_{S^d} |\nabla P(x)|d\mu_d(x) - \frac{1}{6\sqrt{d}} = \frac{1}{6\sqrt{d}}\end{aligned}$$

for each $P \in \partial\Omega$ and $s \in [0, r_d/3t]$. Finally, equation (11) and inequalities (12) and (14) imply

$$(15)\qquad \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} P(x_i(P)) > \frac{1}{6\sqrt{d}}\,\frac{r_d}{3t} - \frac{r_d}{18\sqrt{d}\,t} = 0.$$

Lemma 1 is proved. □

Acknowledgements. We thank Joaquim Bruna, Jacob Korevaar, Pieter Moree, Michael Ontiveros, Joaquim Ortega-Cerdà, Andriy Prymak, Edward Saff, Igor Shevchuk, and Sergey Tikhonov for several fruitful discussions. We also thank the referee for valuable suggestions.

References

[1] B. Bajnok, Construction of spherical t-designs, *Geom. Dedicata* **43** (1992), 167–179. MR 1180648. Zbl 0765.05032. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF00147866.

[2] E. Bannai and R. M. Damerell, Tight spherical designs. I, *J. Math. Soc. Japan* **31** (1979), 199–207. MR 0519045. Zbl 0403.05022. http://dx.doi.org/10.2969/jmsj/03110199.

[3] E. Bannai and R. M. Damerell, Tight spherical designs. II, *J. London Math. Soc.* **21** (1980), 13–30. MR 0576179. Zbl 0436.05018. http://dx.doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s2-21.1.13.

[4] A. V. Bondarenko and M. S. Viazovska, Spherical designs via Brouwer fixed point theorem, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **24** (2010), 207–217. MR 2600661. Zbl 1229.05057. http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/080738313.

[5] J. Bourgain and J. Lindenstrauss, Distribution of points on spheres and approximation by zonotopes, *Israel J. Math.* **64** (1988), 25–31. MR 0981745. Zbl 0667.52001. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02767366.

[6] P. Boyvalenkov, D. Danev, and S. Nikova, Nonexistence of certain spherical designs of odd strengths and cardinalities, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **21** (1999), 143–156. MR 1661307. Zbl 0921.05016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/PL00009406.

[7] X. Chen, A. Frommer, and B. Lang, Computational existence proofs for spherical t-designs, *Numer. Math.* **117** (2011), 289–305. MR 2754852. Zbl 1208.65032. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00211-010-0332-5.

[8] X. Chen and R. S. Womersley, Existence of solutions to systems of underdetermined equations and spherical designs, *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* **44** (2006), 2326–2341. MR 2272596. Zbl 1129.65035. http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/050626636.

[9] H. Cohn, J. H. Conway, N. D. Elkies, and A. Kumar, The D_4 root system is not universally optimal, *Experiment. Math.* **16** (2007), 313–320. MR 2367321. Zbl 1137.05020. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10586458.2007.10129008.

[10] H. Cohn and A. Kumar, Universally optimal distribution of points on spheres, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **20** (2007), 99–148. MR 2257398. Zbl 1198.52009. http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-06-00546-7.

[11] J. H. Conway and N. J. A. Sloane, *Sphere Packings, Lattices and Groups*, third ed., *Grundl. Math. Wissen.* **290**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999. MR 1662447. Zbl 0915.52003.

[12] P. Delsarte, J. M. Goethals, and J. J. Seidel, Spherical codes and designs, *Geometriae Dedicata* **6** (1977), 363–388. MR 0485471. Zbl 0376.05015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03187604.

[13] R. H. Hardin and N. J. A. Sloane, McLaren's improved snub cube and other new spherical designs in three dimensions, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **15** (1996), 429–441. MR 1384885. Zbl 0858.05024. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF02711518.

[14] J. Korevaar and J. L. H. Meyers, Spherical Faraday cage for the case of equal point charges and Chebyshev-type quadrature on the sphere, *Integral Transform. Spec. Funct.* **1** (1993), 105–117. MR 1421438. Zbl 0823.41026. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10652469308819013.

[15] A. B. J. Kuijlaars and E. B. Saff, Asymptotics for minimal discrete energy on the sphere, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **350** (1998), 523–538. MR 1458327. Zbl 0896.52019. http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-98-02119-9.

[16] H. N. Mhaskar, F. J. Narcowich, and J. D. Ward, Spherical Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund inequalities and positive quadrature, *Math. Comp.* **70** (2001), 1113–1130. MR 1710640. Zbl 0980.76070. http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-00-01240-0.

[17] O. R. Musin, The kissing number in four dimensions, *Ann. of Math.* **168** (2008), 1–32. MR 2415397. Zbl 1169.52008. http://dx.doi.org/10.4007/annals.2008.168.1.

[18] D. O'Regan, Y. J. Cho, and Y.-Q. Chen, *Topological Degree Theory and Applications*, *Ser. Math. Anal. Appl.* **10**, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2006. MR 2223854. Zbl 1095.47001. http://dx.doi.org/10.1201/9781420011487.

[19] E. B. Saff and A. B. J. Kuijlaars, Distributing many points on a sphere, *Math. Intelligencer* **19** (1997), 5–11. MR 1439152. Zbl 0901.11028. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF03024331.

[20] P. D. Seymour and T. Zaslavsky, Averaging sets: a generalization of mean values and spherical designs, *Adv. in Math.* **52** (1984), 213–240. MR 0744857. Zbl 0596.05012. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0001-8708(84)90022-7.

[21] G. Wagner, On averaging sets, *Monatsh. Math.* **111** (1991), 69–78. MR 1089385. Zbl 0721.65011. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01299278.

[22] V. A. Yudin, Lower bounds for spherical designs, *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.* **61** (1997), 213–223. MR 1478566. Zbl 0890.05015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1070/im1997v061n03ABEH000132.

(Received: March 10, 2011)

Centre de Recerca Matemàtica, Bellaterra (Barcelona), Spain and
National Taras Shevchenko University, Kyiv, Ukraine and
Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway
E-mail: bonda@univ.kiev.ua

Max Planck Institute for Mathematics, Bonn, Germany and
National Taras Shevchenko University, Kyiv, Ukraine
E-mail: danrad@mpim-bonn.mpg.de

University of Cologne, Cologne, Germany and
Max Planck Institute for Mathematics, Bonn, Germany
E-mail: mviazovs@math.uni-koeln.de