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Abstract

A Steiner star for a set $P$ of $n$ points in $\mathbb{R}^d$ connects an arbitrary center point to all points of $P$, while a star connects a point $p \in P$ to the remaining $n-1$ points of $P$. All connections are realized by straight line segments. Fekete and Meijer showed that the minimum star is at most $\sqrt{2}$ times longer than the minimum Steiner star for any finite point configuration in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The maximum ratio between them, over all finite point configurations in $\mathbb{R}^d$, is called the star Steiner ratio in $\mathbb{R}^d$. It is conjectured that this ratio is $\frac{4}{\pi} = 1.2732\ldots$ in the plane and $\frac{4}{3} = 1.3333\ldots$ in three dimensions. Here we give upper bounds of $1.3631$ in the plane, and $1.3833$ in 3-space, thereby substantially improving recent upper bounds of $1.3999$, and $\sqrt{2} - 10^{-4}$, respectively. Our results also imply improved bounds on the maximum ratios between the minimum star and the maximum matching in two and three dimensions.

Our method exploits the connection with the classical problem of estimating the maximum sum of pairwise distances among $n$ points on the unit sphere, first studied by László Fejes Tóth. It is quite general and yields the first non-trivial estimates below $\sqrt{2}$ on the star Steiner ratios in arbitrary dimensions. We show, however, that the star Steiner ratio in $\mathbb{R}^d$ tends to $\sqrt{2}$, the upper bound given by Fekete and Meijer, as $d$ goes to infinity. Our estimates on the star Steiner ratios are therefore much closer to the conjectured values in higher dimensions! As it turns out, our estimates as well as the conjectured values of the Steiner ratios (in the limit, for $n$ going to infinity) are related to the classical infinite Wallis product:

$$\frac{\pi}{2} = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{4n^2}{4n^2-1} \right) = \frac{2}{1} \cdot \frac{2}{3} \cdot \frac{4}{5} \cdot \frac{6}{7} \cdot \frac{8}{9} \cdot \frac{10}{11} \cdots.$$ 

1 Introduction

The study of minimum Steiner stars and minimum stars is motivated by applications in facility location and computational statistics [7,8,9,13]. The Weber point, also known as the Fermat-Toricelli point or Euclidean median, is the point of the space that minimizes the sum of distances to $n$ given points in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The problem of finding such a point can be asked in any metric space. It is known that even in the plane, the Weber point cannot be computed exactly, already for $n \geq 5$ [5,10]. (For $n = 3$ and 4, resp., Torricelli and Fagnano gave algebraic solutions.) The Weber center can however be approximated with arbitrary precision [8,9], mostly based on Weiszfeld’s algorithm [17]. The reader can find more information on this problem in [11], and in the recent paper of the the first two named authors [12].

The maximum ratio between the lengths of the minimum star and the minimum Steiner star, over all finite point configurations in $\mathbb{R}^d$, is called the star Steiner ratio in $\mathbb{R}^d$, denoted by $\rho_d$. The same ratio for a specific value of $n$ is denoted by $\rho_d(n)$. Obviously $\rho_d(n) \leq \rho_d$, for each $n$. Fekete and Meijer [15] were the first to study the star Steiner ratio. They proved that $\rho_d \leq \sqrt{2}$ holds for any dimension $d$. It is conjectured that $\rho_2 = 4/\pi = 1.2732\ldots$, and $\rho_3 = 4/3 = 1.3333\ldots$, which are the limit ratios for a uniform mass
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distribution on a circle, and surface of a sphere, respectively (in these cases the Weber center is the center of the circle, or sphere) [15]. By exploiting these bounds, Fekete and Meijer also established bounds on the maximum ratio \( \eta_d \), between the length of the minimum star and that of a maximum matching on a set of \( n \) points \( (n \text{ even}) \) in two and three dimensions \( (d = 2, 3) \).

In a recent paper, the upper bounds on the Steiner ratios for \( d = 2, 3 \) have been lowered to \( 1.3999 \) in the plane, and to \( \sqrt{2} - 10^{-4} \) in 3-space [12]. The method of proof used there was not entirely satisfying, as it involved heavy use of linear programming. Besides that, the proofs were quite involved and the improvements were rather small, particularly in three-space. It was also shown in [12] that the bound \( 4/\pi \) holds in two special cases, corresponding to the lower bound construction; details at the end of Section 2.

In this paper we get closer to the core of the problem, obtain substantially better upper bounds, and moreover replace the use of linear programming by precise and much shorter mathematical proofs. Here we prove that

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \approx 0.43459 \quad (d = 3, \; n \text{ even})$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \approx 0.3999 \quad (d = 3, \; n \text{ odd})$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \approx 0.3999 \quad (d = 2, \; n \text{ even})$$

Finally, our method yields the first non-trivial estimates below \( \sqrt{2} \) on the star Steiner ratio given Fekete and Meijer in fact a very good approximation of this ratio for higher dimensions \( d \); thus in this sense the problem in the plane is the most interesting one.

### Table 1: Lower and upper bounds on star Steiner ratios \( (\rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4, \rho_5, \rho_{100}) \), and matching ratios \( (\eta_2, \eta_3) \) for some small values of \( d \). Those marked with \( \uparrow \) are new.

| Ratio                                      | Lower bound | Old upper bound | New upper bound |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| \( \rho_2 \): \( \min S/SS^* \)           | \( \frac{\pi}{2} = 1.2732 \ldots \) | \( 1.3999 \)     | \( 1.3631 \uparrow \) |
| \( \rho_3 \): \( \min S/SS^* \)           | \( \frac{\pi}{3} = 1.3333 \ldots \) | \( \sqrt{2} - 10^{-4} = 1.4141 \ldots \) | \( 1.3833 \uparrow \) |
| \( \rho_4 \): \( \min S/SS^* \)           | \( \frac{14\pi}{35} = 1.3581 \ldots \uparrow \) | \( \sqrt{2} = 1.4142 \ldots \) | \( 1.3923 \uparrow \) |
| \( \rho_5 \): \( \min S/SS^* \)           | \( \frac{38\pi}{35} = 1.3714 \ldots \uparrow \) | \( \sqrt{2} = 1.4142 \ldots \) | \( 1.3973 \uparrow \) |
| \( \rho_{100} \): \( \min S/SS^* \)       | \( 1.4124 \ldots \uparrow \) | \( \sqrt{2} = 1.4142 \ldots \) | \( 1.4135 \uparrow \) |
| \( \eta_2 \): \( \min S/ \max M \)       | \( \frac{\pi}{2} = 1.6165 \) | \( 1.9999 \)     | \( 1.9562 \uparrow \) |
| \( \eta_3 \): \( \min S/ \max M \)       | \( \frac{\pi}{2} = 1.5 \) | \( 1.9999 \)     | \( 1.9562 \uparrow \) |

If \( q_0, q_1, \ldots, q_{n-1} \) are \( n \) variable points on the unit (radius) sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), let \( G(d, n) \) denote the maximum value of the function \( \sum_{i<j} |q_iq_j| \), i.e., the the maximum value of the sum of pairwise distances among the points. It was shown by Fejes Tóth [14], and rediscovered in [12], that \( G(2, n) \) has a nice expression in closed form:

$$G(2, n) = \frac{n}{\tan \frac{\pi}{2n}} = \frac{2}{\pi} n^2 - \frac{\pi}{6} + O \left( \frac{1}{n^2} \right). \quad (1)$$

However, only the simpler inequality \( G(2, n) \leq \frac{2}{\pi} n^2 \) will be needed here. The exact determination of \( G(d, n) \) for \( d \geq 3 \) is considered to be a difficult geometric discrepancy problem [8, pp. 298], however estimates of the form \( G(d, n) \leq c_d n^2/2 \) are known [6], where \( c_d \) is the “constant of uniform distribution” for the sphere [11, 8, 4]: \( c_d \) equals the average inter-point distance for a uniform mass distribution on the surface of the unit sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^d \). In particular for \( d = 3 \), Alexander [10, 2] has shown that

$$\frac{2}{3} n^2 - 10n^{1/2} < G(3, n) < \frac{2}{3} n^2 - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (2)$$

Here \( c_2 = 4/\pi \), and \( c_3 = 4/3 \). The connection with this problem is explained in the next section.
2 Stars in the plane

Fix an arbitrary coordinate system. Let \( P = \{p_0, \ldots, p_{n-1}\} \) be a set of \( n \) points in the Euclidean plane, and let \( p_i = (x_i, y_i) \), for \( i = 0, \ldots, n - 1 \). Let \( SS^* \) be a minimal Steiner star for \( P \), and assume that its center \( c = (x, y) \) is not an element of \( P \). As noted in [15], the minimality of the Steiner star implies that the sum of the unit vectors rooted at \( c \) and oriented to the points vanishes, i.e., \( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} |\overrightarrow{cp_i}| = 0 \). For completeness, we include here the brief argument (omitted in [15]). The length of the star centered at an arbitrary point \((x, y)\) is

\[
L(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sqrt{(x - x_i)^2 + (y - y_i)^2}.
\]

If \((x, y)\) is the Weber center, we have

\[
\frac{\partial}{\partial x} L(x, y) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y} L(x, y) = 0.
\]

The two equations give

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{x - x_i}{\sqrt{(x - x_i)^2 + (y - y_i)^2}} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \frac{y - y_i}{\sqrt{(x - x_i)^2 + (y - y_i)^2}} = 0.
\] (3)

Our setup is as follows. Refer to Figure 1. We may assume w.l.o.g. that the Weber center is the origin \( o = (0, 0) \). We may also assume that the Weber center is not in \( P \), since otherwise the ratio is 1. We can assume w.l.o.g. that the closest point in \( P \) to \( o \) is \( p_0 = (1, 0) \), hence \( SS^* = (1 + \delta)n \), for some \( \delta \geq 0 \). Let \( C \) be the unit radius circle centered at \( o \). We denote by \( \overrightarrow{v} \) a vector \( v \), and by \( |\overrightarrow{v}| \) its length. Write \( \overrightarrow{r_i} = \overrightarrow{op_i} \), for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1 \), and let \( \overrightarrow{q_i} = \overrightarrow{op_i} / |\overrightarrow{op_i}| \) be the corresponding unit vector; i.e., \( q_i \) is the intersection between \( \overrightarrow{r_i} \) and the the unit circle \( C \). Let \( a_i = |\overrightarrow{r_i}| \), \( b_i = |\overrightarrow{op_i}| \), and \( a'_i = |\overrightarrow{op_i}| \), for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1 \). We have \( SS^* = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i \). Finally, let \( \alpha_i \in [0, 2\pi) \) be the angle between the positive x-axis and \( \overrightarrow{r_i} \).

Figure 1: Left: estimating the length of a star centered at \( p_0 = (1, 0) \in P \). Right: estimating pairwise distances.

Henceforth (3) can be rewritten in the more convenient form

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \cos \alpha_i = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sin \alpha_i = 0.
\] (4)
Since the orientation of the coordinate system was chosen arbitrarily, such formulas hold for any other orientation. Note that this is also equivalent with sum of unit vectors vanishing: \( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} oq_i = 0 \). Moreover, such formulas hold for any dimension \( d \geq 2 \).

Let \( S_i \) be the star (and its length) centered at \( p_i \), for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1 \), and let \( \min S = \min_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} S_i \) denote the minimum star. Using the local optimality condition (4), Fekete and Meijer [15] show that if one moves the center of \( SS^* \) from the Weber center to a closest point of \( P \), the sum of distances increases by a factor of at most \( \sqrt{2} \); this bound which is best possible for this method implies that for any \( d \geq 2 \) (see [15] for details):

\[
\rho_d(n) \leq \sqrt{2}, \quad \text{thus} \quad \rho_d \leq \sqrt{2}.
\]  

From the opposite direction, by considering a uniform mass distribution on the surface of a unit sphere in \( \mathbb{R}^d \), one has for any \( d \geq 2 \):

\[
\rho_d \geq c_d.
\]  

Our new argument is a nutshell is as follows. If \( \delta \) is large, we consider the star centered at a point in \( P \) closest to the Weber center, as a good candidate for approximating the minimum star. If \( \delta \) is small, we use an averaging argument to upper bound the length of the minimum star. In the end we balance the two estimates obtained. Applying the averaging argument (for small \( \delta \)) leads naturally to the problem of maximizing the sum of pairwise distances among \( n \) points on the surface of the unit sphere (or unit circle).

**Theorem 1** The star Steiner ratio in the plane is less than 1.3631. More precisely:

\[
\frac{4}{\pi} \leq \rho_2 \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}} < 1.3631.
\]

**Proof.** Consider an \( n \)-element point set \( P \), and the previous setup. It is enough to show that

\[
\frac{\min S}{SS^*} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}}.
\]

By the triangle inequality (see also Fig. 1(left)), we have \( a_i' \leq b_i + a_i - 1 \), for \( i = 0, \ldots, n - 1 \). Hence

\[
S_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} a_i' \leq \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (b_i + a_i - 1) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i + \delta n.
\]

By Lemma 4 in [15], the local optimality condition (4) implies \( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i \leq n\sqrt{2} \). It follows then that

\[
S_0 \leq (\sqrt{2} + \delta)n.
\]

Hence the star Steiner ratio is at most

\[
\frac{S_0}{SS^*} \leq \frac{\sqrt{2} + \delta}{1 + \delta}.
\]

Since the local optimality condition \( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \cos \alpha_i = 0 \) holds for any \( d \), (7) also holds for any \( d \). Observe that

\[
\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\sqrt{2} + \delta}{1 + \delta} = \sqrt{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta \to \infty} \frac{\sqrt{2} + \delta}{1 + \delta} = 1,
\]

with the above expression being a decreasing function of \( \delta \) for \( \delta \geq 0 \).

Clearly, the sum of the lengths of the \( n \) stars (centered at each of the \( n \) points) equals twice the sum of pairwise distances among the points.

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} S_i = 2 \sum_{i<j} |p_ip_j|.
\]
By the triangle inequality (see also Fig. 1 right)

$$|p_ip_j| \leq |p_iq_i| + |q_iq_j| + |q_jp_j| = (a_i - 1) + |q_iq_j| + (a_j - 1).$$

By summing up over all pairs $i < j$, we get

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} S_i \leq 2 \sum_{i<j} |q_iq_j| + 2(n-1) \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a_i - 1) = 2 \sum_{i<j} |q_iq_j| + 2\delta(n-1)n.$$

Using the upper bound estimate on $G(2, n)$ in (1) we obtain

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} S_i \leq \frac{2n}{\tan \frac{\pi}{2n}} + 2\delta(n-1)n \leq \frac{4}{\pi} n^2 + 2\delta n^2.$$

The minimum of the $n$ stars, $\min S$, clearly satisfies:

$$\min S \leq \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} S_i}{n} \leq \left(\frac{4}{\pi} + 2\delta\right)n.$$

It follows that the star Steiner ratio is at most

$$\frac{\min S}{SS^*} \leq \frac{\frac{4}{\pi} + 2\delta}{1 + \delta}.$$ (8)

This estimate holds for any dimension $d$: the points $q_i$ lie on the surface of the unit radius sphere $B$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centered at $o$ (rather than on the unit circle $C$). Observe that

$$\lim_{\delta \to 0} \frac{\frac{4}{\pi} + 2\delta}{1 + \delta} = \frac{4}{\pi}, \text{ and } \lim_{\delta \to \infty} \frac{\frac{4}{\pi} + 2\delta}{1 + \delta} = 2,$$

with the above expression being an increasing function of $\delta$ for $\delta \geq 0$. Therefore, by combining this observation with the previous observation following (7), we get

$$\frac{\min S}{SS^*} \leq \max_{\delta \geq 0} \min \left(\frac{\sqrt{2} + \delta}{1 + \delta}, \frac{\frac{4}{\pi} + 2\delta}{1 + \delta}\right).$$

The maximum value is given by substituting for $\delta$ the solution of the equation $\sqrt{2} + \delta = \frac{4}{\pi} + 2\delta$ (that is, by balancing the two upper estimates on the Steiner ratio given by inequalities (7) and (8)). The solution $\delta_0 = \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi} = 0.1409 \ldots$ yields

$$\rho_2(n) \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \frac{2}{\pi}} = 1.3630 \ldots,$$

thus also $\rho_2 \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}} = 1.3630 \ldots.$ (9)

By the result in [15], $SS^* \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \max M$. By our Theorem II $\min S \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}} \cdot SS^*$. Combining the two upper bounds yields the following upper bound on $\eta_2$:

**Corollary 1** The minimum star to maximum matching ratio in the plane ($\eta_2$) is less than $1.5739$. That is, for any point set

$$\frac{\min S}{\max M} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{\pi}} \cdot \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \leq 1.5739.$$
The best known lower bound for this ratio, is $4/3$, see [15].

According to [12] Theorem 2, the star Steiner ratio for a set of $n$ points in the plane that lie on a circle centered at the Weber center is at most

$$\frac{\pi}{\tan \frac{\pi}{2n}} \cdot \frac{4}{\pi} < \frac{4}{\pi}.$$  

The same bound holds for any finite point set in the plane where the angles from the Weber center to the $n$ points are uniformly distributed (that is, $\alpha_i = 2i\pi/n$, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1$) [12, Theorem 3]. We think that this is always the case, and thereby venture a slightly stronger version of the conjecture proposed by Fekete and Meijer [15] (however, this is for specific values of $n$):

**Conjecture 1** The star Steiner ratio for $n$ points in the plane is

$$\rho_2(n) = \frac{\pi}{\tan \frac{\pi}{2n}} \cdot \frac{4}{\pi}.$$ 

### 3 Stars in the space

In this section we give estimates on the star Steiner ratio in 3-space (Theorem 2), and in higher dimensions (Theorem 3).

**Theorem 2** The star Steiner ratio in $\mathbb{R}^3$ is less than 1.3833. More precisely:

$$\frac{4}{3} \leq \rho_3 \leq \frac{2}{17}(16 - 3\sqrt{2}) < 1.3833.$$  

**Proof.** The method of proof and the setup is the same as in the planar case, so we omit the details. Let $B$ be the unit radius sphere centered at $o$, analogous to the unit circle $C$. Now all the points $q_i$ lie on the surface of $B$. Using the upper bound estimate on $G(3, n)$ in (2) we get the analogue of Equation (8):

$$\min S \leq \frac{\frac{4 + 2\delta}{1 + \delta}}{SS^*}.$$  

Taking also (7) into account, we have

$$\rho_3 \leq \max_{\delta \geq 0} \left( \frac{\sqrt{2} + \delta}{1 + \delta}, \frac{4 + 2\delta}{1 + \delta} \right).$$  

By balancing the two upper estimates in (7) and (10) as in the planar case yields $\delta_0 = \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{3} = 0.0808\ldots$, and

$$\rho_3 \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{3}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \frac{4}{3}} = \frac{6\sqrt{2} - 4}{3\sqrt{2} - 1} = \frac{2}{17}(16 - 3\sqrt{2}) = 1.3832\ldots.$$  

By the result in [15], $SS^* \leq \sqrt{2} \cdot \max M$. By our Theorem 2 $\min S \leq \frac{2}{17}(16 - 3\sqrt{2}) \cdot SS^*$. Combining the two yields the following upper bound on $\eta_3$:

**Corollary 2** The minimum star to maximum matching ratio in 3-space ($\eta_3$) is less than 1.9562. That is, for any point set

$$\frac{\min S}{\max M} \leq \frac{2}{17}(16 - 3\sqrt{2})\sqrt{2} = \frac{4}{17}(8\sqrt{2} - 3) < 1.9562.$$  

6
The best known lower bound for this ratio, is $3/2$, see [15].

The same method we used in proving Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 together with various approximations yield the following estimates on the star Steiner ratio in $\mathbb{R}^d$:

**Theorem 3** Let $1 < c_d < 2$ be the “constant of uniform distribution” for the sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $d \geq 2$. The star Steiner ratio in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is bounded as follows:

$$c_d \leq \rho_d \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - c_d}{1 + \sqrt{2} - c_d},$$

where $\lim_{d \to \infty} c_d = \lim_{d \to \infty} \rho_d = \sqrt{2}$.

The following closed formula approximations hold:

$$\sqrt{2} - \frac{1}{4(2d-3)} \leq \rho_d \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \sqrt{2}e^{-\frac{\pi d}{2(2d-3)}}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \sqrt{2}e^{-\frac{\pi d}{2(2d-3)}}}.$$  

**Proof.** Note that by the same argument used in the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 (equations (9) and (11)), we have

$$c_d \leq \rho_d \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - c_d}{1 + \sqrt{2} - c_d}. \quad (12)$$

In order to establish the limits, we start by computing the “constant of uniform distribution” $c_d$. Recall that $c_d$ equals the average distance from a point on the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^d$ to all the other points on the same sphere, for a uniform mass distribution. It is easy to verify that $c_d$ is given by the following integral formula:

$$c_d = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^d \alpha \cdot \sin \alpha \, d\alpha.$$  

Some initial values are

$$c_1 = 1, \quad c_2 = \frac{\pi}{4} = 1.2732 \ldots, \quad c_3 = \frac{4}{3} = 1.3333 \ldots, \quad c_4 = \frac{64}{15\pi} = 1.3581 \ldots, \quad c_5 = \frac{48}{35} = 1.3714 \ldots.$$  

In order to establish a recurrence on $c_d$, define

$$a_{ij} = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^i \alpha \cdot \cos^j \alpha \, d\alpha, \quad i, j \geq 0.$$  

Some initial values are

$$a_{00} = \frac{\pi}{2}, \quad a_{01} = a_{10} = 1, \quad a_{11} = \frac{1}{2}, \quad a_{02} = a_{20} = \frac{\pi}{4}.$$  

Expanding $\sin 2\alpha$ yields then

$$c_d = \frac{2a_{d-1,d-2}}{a_{d-2,d-2}}.$$  

Recall that integration by parts leads to the well-known recurrence relations for $a_{ij}$, for $i, j \geq 1$:

$$a_{ij} = \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^i \alpha \cdot \cos^j \alpha \, d\alpha = \left. \frac{\sin^{i-1} \alpha \cdot \cos^{j+1} \alpha}{i+j} \right|_0^{\pi/2} + \frac{i-1}{i+j} \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^{i-2} \alpha \cdot \cos^j \alpha \, d\alpha$$

$$= \frac{\sin^{i+1} \alpha \cdot \cos^{j-1} \alpha}{i+j} \left|_0^{\pi/2} + \frac{j-1}{i+j} \int_0^{\pi/2} \sin^i \alpha \cdot \cos^{j-2} \alpha \, d\alpha. \right.$$
Since denote the partial finite and respectively partial infinite Wallis products, so that Standard inequalities and consequently (15) gives

\[ c_{d+2} = \frac{2 \cdot d}{2d+1} \cdot \frac{d-1}{2d-1} \cdot a_{d-1,d-2} = \frac{4d^2}{4d^2 - 1} c_d = \left( 1 + \frac{1}{4d^2 - 1} \right) c_d. \]

Recall at this point the infinite Wallis product from number theory [16]:

\[ \frac{\pi}{2} = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{4k^2}{4k^2 - 1} \right) = \frac{2 \cdot 2}{1 \cdot 3} \cdot \frac{4 \cdot 4}{3 \cdot 5} \cdot \frac{6 \cdot 6}{5 \cdot 7} \cdot \frac{8 \cdot 8}{7 \cdot 9} \cdots. \]

Let

\[ W_n = \prod_{k=1}^{n} \left( \frac{4k^2}{4k^2 - 1} \right), \quad \text{and} \quad Z_n = \prod_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{4k^2}{4k^2 - 1} \right), \]

denote the partial finite and respectively partial infinite Wallis products, so that \( W_nZ_n = \pi/2 \), for every \( n \geq 1 \). Our recurrence for \( c_d \) yields that \( c_d \) is an increasing sequence satisfying also

\[ c_{d+1}c_{d+2} = c_1c_2W_d, \quad d \geq 1. \tag{14} \]

Since \( c_d \) is bounded, it converges to some limit \( c \). The value of \( c \) can be obtained by solving the equation

\[ c^2 = c_1c_2 \frac{\pi}{2} = 2. \]

We thus have \( \lim_{d \to \infty} c_d = \sqrt{2} \). Since \( c_d \leq \rho_d \leq \sqrt{2} \), we also have \( \lim_{d \to \infty} \rho_d = \sqrt{2} \). From Equation (14), we also get that for \( d \geq 3 \)

\[ c_1c_2W_{d-2} \leq c_d^2 \leq c_1c_2W_{d-1}, \quad \text{or} \quad \sqrt{c_1c_2W_{d-2}} \leq c_d \leq \sqrt{c_1c_2W_{d-1}}. \tag{15} \]

Observe that

\[ \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4k^2 - 1} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{2k-1} - \frac{1}{2k+1} \right) = \frac{1}{2(2n+1)}. \]

Standard inequalities\(^1\) \( e^{4x/5} \leq 1 + x \leq e^x \) for \( x \in [0, 1/3] \) now imply that for each \( n \geq 1 \)

\[ Z_n = \prod_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{4k^2 - 1} \right) \leq e^{\sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4k^2 - 1}} = e^{\frac{1}{2(2n+1)}}, \]

and

\[ Z_n = \prod_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{4k^2 - 1} \right) \geq e^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{4k^2 - 1}} = e^{\frac{2}{(2n+1)}}. \]

Since \( W_n = (\pi/2)/Z_n \), we have

\[ \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{2(2n+1)}} \leq W_n \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \cdot e^{-\frac{2}{(2n+1)}}, \]

and consequently (15) gives

\[ \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{4(2d-3)}} \leq c_d \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{2}} \cdot e^{-\frac{1}{4(2d-1)}}, \]

\(^1\)Here we have chosen \( 4x/5 \) for simplicity of resulting expressions.
or equivalently
\[
\sqrt{2}e^{-\frac{1}{4(2d-3)}} \leq c_d \leq \sqrt{2}e^{-\frac{1}{5(2d-1)}}.
\]

Taking into account \((12)\) and substituting the above upper bound on \(c_d\), we finally get the estimate (for any \(d \geq 4\)):
\[
\sqrt{2}e^{-\frac{1}{4(2d-3)}} \leq \rho_d \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2} - \sqrt{2}e^{-\frac{1}{5(2d-1)}}}{1 + \sqrt{2} - \sqrt{2}e^{-\frac{1}{5(2d-1)}}}.
\]

For the values of \(c_d\) given by \((13)\), we can extend the conjecture of Fekete and Meijer to all dimensions \(d \geq 2\):

**Conjecture 2** The star Steiner ratio in \(\mathbb{R}^d\) equals the “constant of uniform distribution” for the sphere in \(\mathbb{R}^d\): that is, \(\rho_d = c_d\) for any \(d \geq 2\).
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