

'Fair' Partitions of Polygons – an Introduction

- R. Nandakumar¹, N. Ramana Rao

Abstract

In this article, we introduce a problem on Partitioning of Polygonal Regions and report on preliminary investigations.

The basic question is: Given any positive integer N , can any *convex* polygon be partitioned into N *convex* pieces so that all pieces have the same area and the same perimeter? We show a simple proof that the answer to this question is “Yes” for $N=2$ (2 pieces) and give some arguments which strongly indicate that the answer is again “Yes” for $N=3$.

We also show in detail how the arguments for $N=2$ do not generalize in a straightforward manner to higher values of N – specifically for powers of 2; and also that for a weaker version of the above question – when the convexity requirement on the pieces is relaxed – the answer is “Yes” for **any** N .

1. Introduction

Partitioning or Segmentation of polygonal regions (simply ‘polygons’ in what follows) into subunits of various types has been an intensively studied area of Computational and Combinatorial Geometry. There is extensive literature on partitioning a given polygon into triangles, often with certain additional desirable properties to be satisfied by the triangles. Partitioning complex polygons into *convex* pieces (where, for instance, the number of the pieces is sought to be minimized) is another well-studied area. ‘Polygon Dissection’ studies cutting a given polygon into a finite number of pieces and reassembling them to form another specified polygon.

A recently opened up area is the study of partitions of a convex polygon into convex pieces of equal area so that the pieces also share the outer boundary of the given convex polygon equally ([1] and [2]). As a ‘natural’ extension of this line, the present authors formulated the following question in 2006 ([3] and [4])

Given any positive integer N , can any convex polygon be partitioned into N convex pieces so that all pieces have the same area and the same perimeter?

The question requires the pieces only to be convex and to have the same area and the same perimeter. Within these constraints, they could well have different shapes, different number of sides etc. and can be arbitrarily positioned within the input convex polygon.

¹ nandacumar@gmail.com

All our inquiries on possible earlier studies in this area yielded the same – and very surprising – answer: nobody knew; we were, almost certainly, in uncharted territory. And this article is a summary of our explorations.

Our quest for patterns and examples - and counter examples – sometimes employs numerical programming. Some of the following sections contain numerical data on coordinates, areas, perimeters etc; they may be assumed to be accurate up to the 4th decimal place; indeed we have tried to ensure that their ‘precise precision’ has no real bearing on the qualitative correctness of our findings.

Definitions:

Following [4], we introduce these definitions:

A *Fair Partition* of a polygon is a partition of it into a finite number of pieces so that every piece has both the same area and same perimeter. Further, if the resulting pieces are all convex, we call it a *convex fair partition*.

Intuitively, the perimeter of a polygon, once its area is fixed, is a primary measure of how ‘compact’ it is - in an everyday sense. So, ‘fairness’ is in carrying out the partition into pieces with same area and comparable compactness.

With these definitions, we rephrase our basic question thus:

Given any positive integer N , does every convex polygon allow convex fair partitioning into N pieces?

Some simple examples of Convex Fair Partitions:

1. Any square, rectangle or parallelogram manifestly allows convex fair partition into N pieces – the ‘cuts’ are $N-1$ equally spaced parallel lines.
2. An equilateral triangle is easily seen to allow convex fair partitioning for $N = 4$ into 4 mutually identical equilateral triangles; the partitioning obviously generalizes to all powers of 4 recursively.

Note: We also see here that there *could be* more than one convex fair partitioning scheme for a given convex polygon and N . For instance, apart from what is given above, we can also have a convex fair partition of a square into 4 identical squares. This is, intuitively, a more *optimal* partition of the square than the one into 4 identical rectangles by parallel cuts; the pieces resulting from the former are more compact - equivalently, the ‘cut lines’ sum to a lower value.

In Appendix A below, we describe a couple of somewhat more complex convex fair partitions.

Conjecture:

The authors tend to believe that the answer to the basic ‘existential’ question posed above is “Yes”. The guess is: Every convex polygon allows a convex fair partition into N pieces for any N . ie every convex polygon can be broken into N convex pieces such that all pieces have the same area and same perimeter.

We do not distinguish convex polygons from finitely many sides with smooth convex regions; we *expect* the claim, to hold for say, a circular or elliptical disc.

Remarks

Proving this conjecture for general N appears quite difficult; finding a counter-example to the conjecture does not seem any easier.

Observation: If the pieces can have different perimeters, there exist infinitely many ways of partitioning a convex polygon into N convex pieces all of the same area. Indeed, choose *any* direction in the plane of the given convex polygon and a family of $N-1$ lines, all parallel to that direction and passing through the interior of the polygon. By adjusting the *gap* between each successive pair of these lines (and keeping them parallel), we can break the polygon into N pieces of equal area; by construction, all these pieces are also convex. And the same process can be repeated with sets of parallel lines of any orientation. Moreover, it is not hard to see that there are *infinitely many more* equal area convex partitions possible (we omit the proof of this bit).

However, ensuring that all pieces from the partition have the same perimeter - in addition to same area - is much trickier. Indeed, when a polygon and an N are given, although we readily know how much area each piece should have, we have no simple way of knowing *ab initio* how much perimeter each piece ought to have. In other words, the common value of the perimeters of pieces is an emergent property of the partitioning, not some quantity to be divided.

As we will see, what appears to make convex fair partitioning really non-trivial is not just the perimeter constraint but the *combination of the equal perimeter requirement and the need for all pieces to be convex*.

To our knowledge, this problem is *not* closely related to the classic Fair Division or Cake Cutting problem (for example, see [5]).

2. The Conjecture holds for $N = 2$

A simple Proof:

Obviously, the only way to divide a convex polygon into 2 convex pieces is by a straight line that passes right through it.

We observe that for any point P on the perimeter of any convex polygon, there is a unique point Q (call this the '*opposite point to P* ') such that the line P - Q (direction important in what follows) divides the polygon into two equal area convex pieces. The two pieces will, in general, have different perimeter. The position of Q on the boundary is obviously a function of the position of P (since the line PQ necessarily breaks the polygon into two equal area pieces).

Let us begin with any point P_1 on the boundary – let its opposite point be P_2 . Without loss of generality, we assume that the equal area piece to *left* of the cut line P_1 - P_2 has greater perimeter.

Now, we move P_1 along the perimeter (clockwise, say; it does not matter which way). The opposite point P_2 also needs to move in the same direction around the perimeter so that the areas of the 2 pieces separated by line P_1P_2 are kept equal. The two points may not move at equal rates along the boundary – they only need to keep the areas of the two resulting pieces equal; and if P_1 moves continuously, P_2 does so as well.

Obviously, when P_1 reaches the initial position of P_2 , P_2 has to be at the initial position of P_1 . and now, the half area piece to the *right* of P_1 - P_2 has greater perimeter, the opposite to what we started with. In other words, the difference between the perimeters of the two equal area pieces has changed sign.

During this evolution, the two equal area pieces have changed their shapes continuously. So the perimeters of the two pieces have changed continuously and at the end, the sign of their difference has changed sign. So, by continuity, there ought to be some intermediate position or positions of the point pair when the two equal area pieces of the polygon will also have equal perimeter - when their difference is zero.

Thus we conclude: through any convex polygon, there exists at least one straight line which divides it into 2 pieces of same area and perimeter. In what follows we call such a line a *fair bisector* of the polygon (we do not need to call this line a 'convex fair bisector' since a line through a convex polygon can only break it into 2 convex pieces).

3. Convexity cannot be a 'Loop Invariant'

In this and a few subsequent sections, we describe some 'negative' properties of convex fair partitioning - properties which show how difficult it could be to develop a broad approach towards answering the existence question on convex fair partitions for general values of N .

First we consider the following simple sequential approach for general values of N :

Cut from the input polygon, a convex piece with area $1/N$ of the input, and *leaving behind a convex piece*. Note the perimeter of this first piece. Then break another convex piece of same perimeter and area as piece 1 off the remainder, again leaving behind a convex piece. Repeat this process $N-1$ times.

For a given convex polygon, we can calculate what range of values the perimeter of the breakaway convex piece can possibly have (its area is of course $1/N$ of the polygon itself); then we could choose a value within this range and break off the corresponding piece; then from the remaining convex polygon, we see if another piece of the same perimeter as the first piece can be broken and keep repeating the process. There could be a need to backtrack and this process could end up being, computationally, very expensive; but it is doable *in principle*, if it can be logically guaranteed to work.

Anyways, this protocol *will not* always work, as is illustrated by this example:

A circular disc is to be broken into 3 convex pieces, all of equal area and perimeter (recall that our problem pertains to all convex 2D shapes, including those with infinitely many sides; and even if we use a regular polygon with say 20 or 30 sides instead of the disc, what follows is qualitatively unaffected).

Since separating the first piece *has to* leave behind a convex piece, the first cut is necessarily a chord which breaks off $1/3$ area of the disc. Now, from the remainder, we can break off a second convex piece with same area and perimeter as the first and leaving a convex remainder in only one way – by another chord of the full circle. Obviously, the first and second piece will be mutually identical. Their removal will however leave a remainder which has clearly a larger perimeter than the first two pieces. The partitioning method has failed.

Of course, as can be readily seen, there is a simple convex fair partition of a circular disk into 3 pieces - into 3 identical sectors; and obviously, this partition cannot be achieved by the above simple sequential method – breaking off any of the three sectors as the first piece will leave a non-convex piece (to be further broken into 2). Somewhat less obviously, another *family* of convex fair partitions of the disc into three pieces exists - with 3 rays diverging from any point that lies on a circle inside the disc and concentric with it. Here too, initial removal of any one of the three resulting pieces as the initial piece will leave a non-convex remainder.

This example also shows that the ‘cut lines’ cannot always begin and end at the boundary of the input polygon; they may need to meet in the interior.

4. The $N = 2$ proof does not *readily* generalize to Powers of 2

We analyze here a simple recursive scheme that builds upon $N=2$: Convex fair partition the input convex polygon into 2 pieces, say, A and B, by a straight line cut; then separately convex fair partition the two pieces A and B into two pieces each; proceed recursively to achieve N pieces where N is any power of 2.

We prove that this scheme can fail for even $N=4$, by a specific counter example:

- Polygon P1 is an isosceles triangle with a narrow base with vertices: (0,0), (6, 20), (12, 0)


- Polygon P2 is a trapezium with same base length and one base angle equal to 90 degrees. P2 also has slightly less 'height' than the triangle P1; we can now adjust its other sides so that both P1 and P2 have the *same area and perimeter up to a small tolerance*. A possible set of vertices of P2 are: {(0,0), (12, 0), (12, -18.992), (11.3631,-18.992)}.

- Now, consider the large convex polygon P formed by joining P1 and P2 along their bases ie along the edge (0,0) - (12,0)

We find thru numerical computations that P has 3 fair bisectors - cut lines which leave 2 resulting pieces with both equal area and perimeter (the obvious partition into P1 and P2 themselves plus 2 other partitions). These bisectors are, to a close approximation:

- the obvious line joining (0,0) and (12,0)
- the line joining (0.50602,1.68673) and (12, -1.76073).
- the line joining (2.50594,-4.18836) and (10.5974,4.67521).

The above objects are illustrated in the figure below. The 3 fair bisectors are shown as dashed lines in the interior.



We considered each of these 3 convex fair bisections of P and looked at further convex fair bisections of the 2 resulting pieces. Numerically, in none of these 3 cases could we find 4 resultant pieces all of same area and perimeter. The final 4 pieces (obviously) all have same area but their perimeters always come in 2 *mutually different pairs*.

5. A more sophisticated Recursive Scheme to generalize N=2 - and its failure

Definitions:

We define a '*diameter*', as a line that divides a convex polygon into two pieces of equal


area - the perimeters of the 2 pieces could be different (in the terminology of Section 2, a diameter connects any given point on the boundary to its *opposite* point).

Let us recall that a line which divides a convex polygon into 2 pieces of equal area and equal perimeter is a *fair bisector*. As we also see in more detail below, a polygon can have just one fair bisector (eg: for an isosceles triangle with very narrow base), a few fair bisectors (as in the polygon discussed in section 4) or even infinitely many (for a square, any line passing through its center is a fair bisector).

We say that a finite line segment changes continuously as a whole if (i) if one of its end point remains fixed and the other moves continuously or (ii) both end points move simultaneously and continuously.

The modified recursive scheme

Divide the input polygon into two equal area pieces by any one of its diameters; call these pieces A and B. Consider a *fair bisector* of piece A, dividing A into pieces {A1, A2} - where A1 and A2 have equal area and equal perimeter. Likewise consider a fair bisector of B which gives pieces {B1,B2}. See figure below. At the initial position of the diameter, let the pair of pieces A1-A2 have higher perimeter than the pair B1-B2.



Begin to rotate the diameter of the input polygon continuously from its initial position (by moving one of its end points along the perimeter of the polygon and hence the other end); then, the pieces A and B change continuously, maintaining equality of areas; the fair bisectors of these pieces also keep changing. Finally the diameter reaches a position that is perfectly the reverse of its initial position. Now, the pair of pieces A1-A2 and the pair B1-B2 have merely exchanged their initial positions – likewise, the fair bisectors of A and B. By a continuity argument similar to the proof of $N=2$, we could say: somewhere along the rotation of the diameter, a state exists where the two pairs A1-A2 and B1-B2 had the same perimeter (of course, throughout the evolution, all of A1, A2, B1, B2 had

same area).

The above argument could prove the conjecture for $N=4$. Repeating the recursion, we could extend the proof to $N=2^n$ for any n . And if the conjecture could be proved for any number m , this recursion could give even a ready extension to $N=2m$.

A Counter Example

However, we find that continuity in the evolution of fair bisectors is not guaranteed for all convex polygons. More to the point, the *perimeter of the halves* cut out of a polygon by its fair bisectors of a polygon does not always change continuously as the polygon itself is deformed continuously.

We carried out the following experiment: given a convex polygon, take an initial diameter, continuously rotate this diameter and track the evolution of the fair bisector(s) of one of the equal area pieces cut out by this diameter say, A (note that the piece A itself is deformed continuously as the diameter rotates). Then, for some polygons, the common perimeter of the pair of pieces (A_1 and A_2) resulting from A 's fair bisector(s) *will not change continuously all the way* until the diameter is opposite to its initial position.

Before we examine a specific polygon where this recursive scheme fails, we need to observe some properties of fair bisectors:

Observation 1: As noted above, any given convex polygon could have exactly one fair bisector, a few fair bisectors or infinitely many. If a fair bisector is found connecting two edges of the polygon that are mutually parallel, we can easily see that there are automatically infinitely many more fair bisectors connecting this same edge pair.

Observation 2: When a convex polygon is continuously deformed, keeping its area constant, (1) its fair bisector(s) can also evolve continuously or (2) new fair bisectors can suddenly emerge, typically in pairs or (3) two fair bisectors could approach each other, merge and disappear.

Observation 2 can be visualized thus: Let a convex polygon have area A . Start at any specific point on the boundary of the polygon, say P . There is a unique point P' on the polygon such that the *perimeters* of the two pieces made by line PP' are equal. If P were to move continuously along the boundary, P' too moves at the same 'speed' and the area of either of the pieces resulting from line PP' (we choose to look at the piece to the left of PP') changes continuously.

Start with any fixed reference position for P , say P_0 . Form a plot with the distance moved by P from P_0 along the boundary on the X axis and the area of the left piece broken off from the polygon by PP' on Y axis. A curve results. Every intersection of this graph with the horizontal line $y = A/2$ corresponds to a fair bisector of the polygon. And since every polygon has at least one fair bisector, the graph is guaranteed to intersect this horizontal line at least once.


Now, if the polygon is gradually deformed keeping its area at A , the curve plotted above will change as a whole but in a continuous manner, always keeping at least one intersection with the $y = A/2$ line. It is now easily seen that when the curve as a whole changes continuously, the *number* of intersections with $y = A/2$ can change; typically, this change will be: a portion of the curve will gradually approach the line $y = A/2$ and have a tangency at a stage; then the tangency will turn into a *pair* of intersections \Rightarrow number of fair bisectors increases by 2. Likewise, two intersections of the graph with $y = A/2$ can approach each other and turn into a tangency which lifts off $y=A/2$ (or dips down from it) thus causing a net reduction in number of fair bisectors by 2. The curve also can have a finite portion lying entirely along $y = A/2$ – a continuous range of infinitely many fair bisectors. Such continuous ranges are ‘unstable’; even a slight further deformation of the polygon causes a ‘collapse’ of the range into a pair of bisectors or none at all.

Note: The above suggests the following exercise: Given a number M , construct a convex polygon which has exactly M fair bisectors.

We now consider a convex decagon with the vertices:

(0.000000, 0.000000) – (6.000000, 2.000000) – (30.000000, 8.916667) –
 (30.000000, 4.000000) – (25.000000, 2.000000) – (20.000000, 0.000000) --
 (18.000000, -0.750000) – (14.500000, -1.800000) – (2.590000, -2.098025) –
 (-5.014520, -2.005808).

This decagon is shown in the following figure:



Consider the evolution of the diameter of this decagon (dashed line in above figure) as its left end moves on the boundary in a *clockwise sense* past the vertex (6, 2). We look at the lower of the two pieces separated from the decagon by this diameter (of the full input polygon) and the fair bisectors of *this lower piece*.

Obviously, as the diameter evolves, the lower piece too (call this piece A) continuously changes its shape and perimeter (its area is of course constant) - eventually, when the diameter has moved to exactly the reverse to its original position, piece A would have evolved into what was *initially* the upper piece.

Our numerical calculations reveal the following evolution for various objects as the left end of the diameter is in the neighborhood of vertex (6, 2) of the input polygon:

- As the left end of the diameter approaches (6, 2) from above, the lower piece A has exactly one fair bisector of length nearly 9 units; this fair bisector also continuously changes with the diameter - its length slowly increases.
- As the left end of the diameter touches (6, 2), in addition to the above single bisector of length nearly 9 which has been evolving slowly, an infinite range of fair bisectors suddenly emerge – with their lengths varying from around 20 to 30 units. This range of fair bisectors connect two parallel edges of the decagon: $\{(0, 0) - (-5.01452, -2.005808)\}$ and $\{(25, 2) - (20, 0)\}$.
- Just after the left end of the diameter of the decagon passes the vertex (6,2), piece A has exactly *three* fair bisectors (the infinite range of bisectors which momentarily came up was unstable and has collapsed into just a pair) and these three fair bisectors have widely different lengths – one just length just over 10 and slowly increasing, the others have length nearly 20 and 30.
- As we continue evolving the diameter (and A), the shorter two the fair bisectors of A approach each other (hence the perimeters of $\{A1, A2\}$ they both yield approach each other). Eventually, these bisectors meet and disappear (When they merge and disappear, they both have length around 16 units); that leaving a single fair bisector with length around 25 units.
- During this entire process the perimeter of piece A has changed – continuously - by only around 0.5 unit.

(Note: In appendix B, we compile the numerical data in greater detail)

Analysis: The common perimeter of the pieces into which A is divided by a fair bisector (call the pieces A1 and A2) is the sum of the length of the fair bisector itself and half the perimeter of A. The latter quantity has changed only very little (albeit continuously) during the evolution described above. But the length of the fair bisector has had a much larger *and discontinuous* change:

1. The original single bisector changes length continuously from around 9 to around 16, and then it disappears in a merger.
2. The surviving fair bisector has emerged with its length around 30, then varying to 25 and persists, varying slowly and continuously thereafter.
3. The surviving fair bisector was initially continuously reachable from a short-lived 'temporary' middle bisector - indeed, the two emerged together; but post-emergence, they separated and evolved separately until the middle bisector merged with the original shorter bisector and disappeared with it. There is no continuity of evolution from the original single fair bisector to the one that survives at the end.

So, we conclude: the common perimeter of the pieces into which a polygon is broken by its fair bisector(s) need not vary continuously when the polygon itself is continuously deformed => a necessary prerequisite for the modified recursive scheme is not satisfied in general => the modified recursive scheme can fail.

The failure of this recursive scheme *does not* in any way imply that convex fair partitioning for $N=4$ cannot occur for some polygons. Indeed, the scheme puts some constraints on the partitioning which weren't there to begin with: eg: this scheme should give two pairs of pieces $\{A1, A2\}$ and $\{B1, B2\}$ so that if *either pair* is removed from the input polygon, we are left with a convex polygon. A failure to do a convex fair partitioning under such constraints cannot in itself mean that a 'freer' convex fair partitioning is impossible.

Aside

Consider the above recursive scheme modified as: (1) divide the polygon into 2 pieces A and B of **equal perimeter** rather than equal area by a straight line and calculate the fair bisectors of the two pieces and then (2) keep rotating the main dividing line and keep updating the fair bisectors of the equal perimeter pieces A and B.

We easily see that this scheme would not work either. Indeed, if we divide the full polygon into equal perimeter pieces by a line and continuously move the end points of dividing line along the boundary, **none** of the positions of this line where the 2 resulting pieces A and B *do not* have same area can give a convex fair partition into 4 pieces. So, for our purpose, the only candidate positions of the dividing line are when pieces A and B have same area - in addition to same perimeter. Call this set of candidate positions of the dividing line and hence of pieces A and B as 'S'.

We proved by counter example above that even if we consider the *entire continuous range of pieces A and B when the full polygon is divided by a single straight line into equal area pieces*, there is no guarantee that this range yields a convex fair partition into 4 pieces. And the set S defined here is only a proper subset of this entire range. Since the full range can be insufficient for our purpose, its subset S can be insufficient as well.

6. N=3

We describe here a plausibility argument for the conjecture for $N=3$ (3 pieces). This is *not* a conclusive proof; but we include it here for its possible intuitive appeal. A rigorous and more sophisticated proof has recently been worked out specifically for $N=3$ by Imre Barany and Pavle Bogdanovic ([6]) and is being prepared for publication.

Basic Observations

First we note: partitioning *any* convex polygon into three convex pieces can be achieved *only* by either (1) 2 rays (semi-infinite straight lines) emerging from a point on/outside the polygon (this origin point could be infinitely far away in which case the 2 rays become parallel lines) and cutting thru the interior or (2) 3 rays emerging from a point in the interior of the polygon.

Indeed, every convex polygon has this property: For *any* point P on or outside the polygon, we have exactly 2 rays starting from P which together cut the polygon into 3 convex pieces of equal area (perimeters immaterial, just for now). If P is inside the polygon, we can find infinitely many *sets of 3 rays* diverging from P which cut the polygon into 3 convex pieces of equal area. And if we know for sure that a given point P is the origin of 2 or 3 rays which do a convex fair partitioning of a convex polygon into 3 pieces, we could find the actual rays which do the job easily by a quick search 'anchored' to P .

Consider *all* straight lines passing thru a convex polygon and dividing it into two pieces with areas in the ratio 1:2; further, look at the intersection of the *larger* of all such pieces (with area $2/3$ of the polygon). This intersection gives a convex region well inside the polygon; we call this region, the 'core' of the polygon.


It can be shown that for every point P in this core region of a convex polygon, we have at least 2 distinct ray triplets diverging from P which divide the entire convex polygon into 3 equal area pieces *with 2 of the pieces also having equal perimeter*. The proof, which involves simple continuity arguments, is omitted here. And substantial portions of the 'annular' region between the core and the outer boundary (although not the whole of this annulus) are also made of points which are sources of 2 such ray triplets and points which support 1 such triplet.

'Reflective' polygons

We now look at 'reflective polygons' ie. convex polygons with at least one reflection symmetry (isosceles triangles are the simplest reflective polygons).

Property 1: It is obvious that *every* point on the infinite line containing a reflection axis of a reflective polygon (call this the 'axial line' of the polygon) has the property: it is the origin of 2 or 3 rays (2 rays if the point is on/outside the polygon, 3 rays if the point is inside) which divide the polygon into 3 pieces of equal area so that 2 of the 3 pieces also have equal perimeter – these two pieces are in fact identical, due to the reflection

symmetry. This figure shows a point P on the axial line (dashed) and outside a reflexive polygon and the equal partition of the polygon by 2 rays (dashed) diverging from this point.



Our experiments with random reflexive convex polygons show a further, stronger property for this axial line. The rest of this section hinges on its validity but we have no full proof.

Property 2: Some point(s) on the axial line is(are) guaranteed to be the starting point(s) of 2 or 3 infinite rays (2 rays if the point is on/outside the polygon, 3 rays if the point is inside) which divide the reflexive polygon into 3 pieces of equal area with all three pieces also having equal perimeter. In other words, this property says: we need only to search the axial line to find at least one point which can be the origin of rays which achieve a convex fair partition of the reflexive polygon into 3 pieces.

Depending on the shape of the reflexive convex polygon, there could be just one or a few of these special intersection point(s) on the infinite axial line; they may lie within the polygon or outside – for example, for an isosceles triangles with very narrow base (say of the order of $1/50^{\text{th}}$ of altitude) the only such special intersection point is on the axis, just outside the triangle and close to its sharp corner (apex).

On to General convex polygons

We observed (empirically) above that all reflexive polygons allow convex fair partitioning into 3 pieces; next we try to establish that even general convex polygons share a specific structural property with reflexive ones - this property could lead to the required 3-partitioning being possible for general polygons as well.

For a general convex polygon, we try to show that an *infinite continuous polyline* exists, passing thru the polygon, and having Property 1 of the axis of reflexive polygons: every point on this polyline is the origin of 2 or 3 rays which divide the convex polygon into 3

pieces of equal area so that 2 of the pieces also have equal perimeter. We call this hypothetical polyline the '*axial polyline*' of the polygon.

By definition, an axial polyline (if it exists), shares property 1 with the axial line of reflective polygons (except that the axial polyline might have bends, there appear to be no qualitative differences); and we are led to *believe* that this polyline would also have the Property 2, ie some point(s) on this infinite polyline also has 2 or 3 rays diverging which give 3 equal area pieces from the polygon with *all pieces* also having same perimeter. And that would prove the existence of convex fair partitions for $N=3$. We summarize below our arguments for the existence of the axial polyline.


Constructing the 'axial polyline'

We begin by proving the following: there exist at least 2 special points (say P_1 and P_2) on the *boundary* of any convex polygon, from where 2 rays diverge dividing the polygon into 3 pieces of equal area with 2 of the pieces also having equal perimeter.

Proof: It is obvious that for any point P on the boundary of the polygon, there are exactly 2 rays starting at P and dividing the polygon into 3 pieces, all of equal area (perimeters of the pieces could be different). Looking into the interior of the polygon from P , these three equal area pieces could be called the left piece, middle piece and right piece of P . Let the perimeters of the left and right pieces be P_l and P_r respectively.

Now, for any point P , there is another point P' on the boundary so that the right piece of P is also the left piece of P' ; there is also another point P'' on the boundary so that the left piece of P is also the right piece of P'' as can be seen from figure below.

Note: Even if point P is *outside* the polygon rather than inside, we still have two rays diverging from P and exiting the polygon at P' and P'' respectively so that they cut the polygon into 3 equal area pieces and perimeters of two of these pieces can still be called P_l and P_r .



Consider plotting the values of P_l and P_r (on Y axis) against the position of P as it moves around the boundary of the polygon (on X axis) - resulting in two curves.

The maximum and minimum values of both curves are the same – because every P_l is the P_r of some other point and vice-versa – although they occur at different positions of P. In other words, we see that the *ranges* of values of P_l and P_r are exactly the same. It is also obvious that both P_l and P_r are periodic functions of the position of point P – when P completes a full round trip of the boundary, the values of P_l and P_r will also complete one full cycle.

These properties - same range of values + periodicity - together imply that *the P_l and P_r curves necessarily intersect each other at least twice* (a very similar scenario is given by plots of $\sin(x)$ and $\cos(x)$ as x runs over the full period of 360 degrees; there are two values of x , 45 and 225 degrees where the two curves intersect). The existence of a minimum of two intersections means on the boundary of the polygon there are at least two points on the boundary of the polygon (these are the special points P1 and P2 we were looking for) where the left piece and right piece have the same perimeters. QED.

Now, we consider a new convex polygon, obtained from the input polygon by a very slight expansion, and let a variable point P run around this new polygon; it can be shown via essentially the same argument as above that at least 2 points exist on this expanded polygon such that among the 3 equal area pieces cut from the input polygon (*not* the expanded one) by rays diverging from these points, 2 pieces also have the same

perimeter. And by continuity, 2 of these points on the expanded polygon (call them P1' and P2') lie in the immediate neighborhood of P1 and P2 on the input polygon.

By continuously expanding the polygon along which P varies, we find P1' and P2' trace two *semi-infinite curves* growing outward from the input convex polygon; we use the word 'curve' here because in the absence of symmetries in the input polygon, the trajectory of P'1 and P2' may not be straight. It can also be easily shown that these two curves tend to diametrically opposite directions at infinity. We believe that for convex polygons without any additional symmetry, these curves are semi-infinite *polylines*..

Obviously, by construction, all points on these two semi-infinite polylines are start points of 2 rays which divide the input polygon into three equal area pieces with two of the pieces also having same perimeter.

Now for continuity (indeed, existence) of the *full* axial polyline, we need to prove that *between points P1 and P2* a continuous 'bridge' exists thru the interior of the input polygon such that every point in this bridge has 3 rays diverging from it and dividing the polygon into 3 pieces of equal area and with 2 of the pieces also having same perimeter. Such a bridge will guarantee the continuity and existence of the infinite axial polyline.

Part of this bridge between P1 and P2 is readily provided by the *core region* of the polygon (described above). We now need two segments of the bridge – two pathways leading from points P1 and P2 to the core formed by points which are origins of ray triplets with the same property.

We do not yet have a rigorous proof of this bit but our experiments strongly indicate that these pathways of points do exist, always – connecting P1 and P2 to the core. This leaves us convinced of the existence of an infinite and continuous axial polyline.

Note: As noted above, every point in the 2-dimensional core region gives at least 2 ray triplets which divide the polygon into 3 equal area pieces with 2 pieces also having same perimeter. So, within the part of the axial line through the core is not unique.

7. 'Fair' vs 'Convex Fair'

We mentioned in the 'Introduction' that part of the difficulty of convex fair partitioning is from the requirement that the pieces be convex. We elaborate on this point a bit here.

Let us say, we need only to *fair partition* a given convex polygon into N pieces - the pieces only need to have same area and perimeter and are *not* required to be convex. We give a simple proof below that a fair partition is always possible for any polygon and any N.

Proof

We describe a ‘thought construction’ which can achieve a fair partition for any convex polygon for any $N > 2$.

First, divide the input convex polygon into N equal area pieces with exactly 1 ‘central’ piece that *does not* touch the boundary and each of the remaining $N - 1$ pieces sitting around it, each sharing some *finite* boundary with this central piece (these outer pieces obviously divide up the outer boundary of the input polygon among them). We show how such a configuration can always be made a little later.

2. Now, we *deform* the boundaries between the central piece with each of its $N - 1$ neighbors so as to make all the $N - 1$ neighbors have the same perimeter.

Indeed, if two pieces share an edge, we could introduce some zigzags (and hence concavities) on that edge, causing the perimeter of both pieces sharing the edge to increase by the same amount - without causing any change in their respective areas. Now, note among the $N - 1$ outer pieces, which has the highest perimeter and increase the perimeters of each of the other $N - 2$ outer pieces to this value - by tweaking the common boundary of each of them with the *central piece*.

3. Now, all outer pieces have same area and same perimeter. The central piece also has the same area but a possibly very large perimeter since its boundaries with all outer pieces (except one) have been deformed. We now try to increase the perimeter of all outer pieces equally to this large value.

We note the difference between the perimeter of the central piece and that of an outer piece - call this quantity d . Then we deform all the boundaries *between the outer pieces* - ie. the boundary between outer piece 1 and outer piece 2, then the boundary between 2 and 3 and so on - so that the increase in perimeter to both the pieces separated by any such boundary is $d/2$. So, when all boundaries have been deformed, every outer piece increases its perimeter by d - which is as desired. The central piece is untouched in this stage. The result: all pieces now have the same perimeter.

Possible (very unlikely) Exception: If after step 2, the central piece still has *less perimeter* than the common value of the perimeters of the outer pieces, we could tweak the boundary of the central piece with each of the outer ones equally so that every outer piece gains a little perimeter and the inner piece gains $N - 1$ times that much - this way we could again equalize all the perimeters.

A bit remains: how to divide the input convex polygon into N equal area pieces so that one piece is in the middle and the remaining $N - 1$ surround it? For this, we could, say, scale the input polygon by a factor of $1/N$ and the resulting small polygon can be put somewhere inside the input polygon (this scaling will work if the input polygon is

convex; else we could simply ‘thin’ uniformly the polygon until its area reduces to $1/N$ th). This is the central piece. Then we can walk around the central piece and sweep out $N-1$ equal area pieces from the remaining ‘annular’ portion of the input polygon. These $N-1$ outer pieces are free to be concave so we could force each of these to share a finite boundary with the inner piece.

Remarks

Obviously, the above approach can cause all the pieces to have very large perimeters and they will also have jagged boundaries – in some sense, it is an ‘equally unfair’ partition with every piece getting ‘flabby’ rather than compact.

The argument will go through and yield a fair partition even if the input polygon is not convex.

8. ‘Optimal Fair’ vs ‘Convex Fair’


We consider the following issue: A given convex polygon is to be *optimally* fair partitioned, ie the pieces should all have same area and perimeter and the total length of cuts used is the minimum but we *do not* insist that all pieces are convex. We prove by a simple example that even the best convex fair partition may not be a very good way to minimize the length of cuts in a fair partition:

Consider an isosceles triangle ‘T’ with base 1 and altitude 2 (the equal sides are then $\sqrt{5}$ each). Join a square ‘S’ of side 1, to its base to form pentagon. The area of this pentagon is 2 units. Take $N = 2$. ie we need to break the pentagon into 2 pieces of equal area and perimeter. See the following figure.

If we were to cut the pentagon into T and S, their areas would be equal and perimeters would be 5.4721 units and 4 units respectively - a difference of very nearly 1.4721 units.

As is almost obvious, the best - and indeed *only* - convex fair partition of the pentagon is by the bisector of the apex of the isosceles triangle (dashed line in the figure). And the length of the cut is 3 units.

Now, it is possible to have another fair partitioning of the pentagon into (1) practically the same isosceles triangle T and (2) a non-convex polygon formed by attaching to square S two *infinitesimally thin* ‘horns’ (as shown in figure below). The horns can be adjusted so that together they add 1.4721 units to the perimeter of the square S. This implies, the length of the cut separating out the horned square from the pentagon is around 1.736 units, which is considerably less than 3. Clearly this fair partitioning is ‘better’ than the only convex fair one. (Note: Obviously, instead of two horns, we could just as well have a single horn on one side).



Indeed, saying “the fair partition that minimizes sum of piece perimeters has all pieces convex” would imply that a convex fair partition always exists – our main conjecture. There has to be *some* fair partitioning into n pieces that has the least total of cut lengths. And so, given any fair partition with non convex pieces, if this partition is guaranteed to be suboptimal (in that the total length of cuts is not the least possible), we have a guarantee in turn that a fair partition with all pieces convex necessarily exists. But as we just saw, no such assertion on sub-optimality of partitions with non-convex pieces can be made in general.

We surmise: finding *optimal* fair partitions for any given polygon is a fundamentally different problem from finding its convex fair partitions.

Note: Strictly speaking, we can't just appeal to common sense and assert that for any convex polygon and N , an *optimal fair partition necessarily exists* – in some cases, there may well be *no optimal solution* at all (for a different but very instructive example see [7]). So, the above argument is, partially, tentative. But it does establish that convex fair is not necessarily optimal fair.

9. Conclusion

We have only made an elementary beginning, based on a conjecture, towards answering the simple question of the existence of convex fair partitions of convex polygons. A full proof of the conjecture – one that works for any N - is likely to involve much more sophisticated Mathematics. Or there may well be an elementary proof – which could be very elegant.

On the other hand, a smart counter example could debunk our conjecture; and that in turn will raise the following (perhaps a little less exciting) question:

How does one *decide* if a convex fair partition exists for a given convex polygon and given N ?

One could also ask: If a convex fair partition is allowed by a specific convex polygon for a give N , how does one find the *optimal* convex fair partition that minimizes the total length of the cut segments?

As we saw in Section 7, a fair partition (without the pieces required to be convex) always *exists* for any polygon and any N . And we saw in Section 8, if we need to *optimally* fair partition a polygon (fair partition with least total of cut lengths) – this optimal solution *could* necessarily contain non-convex pieces. We do not know an algorithm which could find an optimal fair partition for a given polygon (convex or otherwise) and given N .

And we could finally ask: what about higher dimensional analogs of these problems?

10. References

- [1] Jin Akiyama, A. Kaneko, M. Kano, Gisaku Nakamura, Eduardo Rivera-Campo, S. Tokunaga, and Jorge Urrutia.
Radial perfect partitions of convex sets in the plane.
In *Japan Conf. Discrete Comput. Geom.*, pages 1-13, 1998.
- [2] Jin Akiyama, Gisaku Nakamura, Eduardo Rivera-Campo, and Jorge Urrutia.
Perfect divisions of a cake.
In *Proc. Canad. Conf. Comput. Geom.*, pages 114-115, 1998.
- [3] We first wrote about ‘fair partitioning’ at
<http://nandacumar.blogspot.com/2006/09/cutting-shapes.html> (September 2006)
- [4] The first mainstream publication of this problem was at the ‘Computational Geometry Open Problems Project’: <http://maven.smith.edu/~orourke/TOPP/P67.html#Problem.67> (July 2007)

[5] – Jack Robertson and William Webb – ‘Cake Cutting Algorithms’ – AK Peters Ltd. (1998).

[6] Imre Barany – personal communication (September 2008)


[7] Abram Besicovitch – ‘The Kakeya Problem’ – American Mathematical Monthly, September 1963.

Appendix A: Some Examples of Convex Fair Partitions

We briefly describe here a couple of specific convex fair partitioning examples:

1. A regular hexagon to be convex fair partitioned into 7 pieces.

We consider two 'extreme configurations' as shown in the figure below:



a. Configuration 1: Hexagon of side 1, kept as shown. A square (the area of this square has to be $\frac{3}{7}$ of the hexagon) is kept as shown inside the hexagon so that the centers of both coincide and a diagonal of the square coincides with a longest diagonal of the hexagon. The square can be further divided into 3 identical rectangles and the rest of the hexagon into 4 pentagons identical among themselves.

In this configuration, the areas of all seven pieces are equal by construction. We calculate that the perimeter of each of the 3 rectangles constituting the central square is very nearly

equal to 2.81388. The perimeter of the 4 pentagons is found to be around 2.929 units.

b. configuration 2: Big regular hexagon unchanged. The square in the middle (appearing as a diamond) is gradually stretched along its vertically aligned diagonal into a rhombus (of course, keeping its area constant at $\frac{3}{7}$ of the hexagon) with the longer diagonal of the rhombus eventually coinciding with the diagonal of the regular hexagon.

At the end, the rhombus can obviously be cut into 3 mutually identical parallelograms. the rest of the hexagon outside the rhombus can be readily cut into 4 mutually identical quadrilaterals. All seven pieces have the same area.

We numerically calculate that in this state, the perimeter of each of the 3 parallelograms cut from the inner rhombus is 3.05208. the perimeter of each of the 4 outer pieces is now 2.95382.

Conclusion: config 2 can be reached by continuously deforming config 1 (and preserving the left-right symmetry). Throughout the deformation, the inner rhombus gives 3 identical parallelograms and the rest of the hexagon is formed of 4 identical pieces. In config 1, the 3 inner pieces have a clearly *lower* perimeter than the 4 outer pieces. In config 2, the 3 inner pieces have a clearly *greater* perimeter than the outer pieces. So, by continuity, there is a intermediate state where the perimeters of the two sets of pieces are equal. That settles the regular hexagon into 7 pieces case.

In this case, we have *not* found a convex fair partition itself but produced a guarantee that one definitely exists somewhere between the two extreme configurations.

Note: If $N = 5$, the above continuity argument will still work; we begin with a square in the middle (with area $\frac{1}{5}$ of the regular hexagon) and stretch it into a rhombus.

2. An equilateral triangle to be partitioned into 5 convex pieces all of equal area and perimeter:


Consider an equilateral triangle of side 5 units. We begin by dividing any side AB of the triangle (call this side the base) into 5 equal parts and connecting the dividing points to the opposite vertex, the apex C. Now, if we number the 5 pieces left to right as 1,2,3,4,5, extreme pieces 1 and 5 have maximum perimeter and the central piece 3 has least. All pieces have the same area.

Consider pieces 1 and 2 together as a single large triangular piece. We find thru a numerical calculation that we can divide this piece into two pieces 1' and 2' of equal area and also equal perimeter by a line from a point on its side (segment AC) at a distance 0.4098 from the apex C to a point on the base at a distance 1.0892 from vertex A (piece 1' is a triangle and 2' is a quadrilateral, both convex; basically, original piece 1 has had its base increased from 1 unit and height reduced keeping area constant but so that its perimeter reduces; piece 2 also suffers a perimeter reduction but to a much lesser extent).

Now, surprisingly, the perimeters of 1' and 2' are found to be exactly equal to that of central piece 3 which has not been touched. The areas of all pieces 1', 2' and 3 are anyway equal. The same strategy employed to pieces 4 and 5 together finishes the partitioning.

Appendix B – Details of the Experiment in Section 5

Here, we compile some of the numerical data generated from the 10-vertex polygon, the counter-example to the modified recursive scheme analyzed in Section 5. The data reveals the *discontinuity in evolution of the perimeter of fair bisected halves of one of the pieces cut by a diameter(as the diameter itself evolves continuously)*.



The full input polygon:

Vertices:

0.000000, 0.000000 -- 6.000000, 2.000000 -- 30.000000, 8.916667 -- 30.000000, 4.000000 -- 25.000000, 2.000000 -- 20.000000, 0.000000 -- 18.000000, -0.750000 -- 14.500000, -1.800000 -- 2.590000, -2.098025 -- -5.014520, -2.005808 --

Its Perimeter: 77.698066; Area: 156.000001

We list below a few stages (snapshots) in the evolution of the diameter as its left end moves clockwise past the vertex (6, 2). These stages have been chosen to illustrate the transitions taking place; they are not equally spaced stages. We look at only the lower half area piece broken off by the diameter and its evolution.

Stage 1:

Diameter end points: (6.009609, 2.002769) and (24.993076, 1.997230).

The vertices of the lower half area piece:

(6.009609, 2.002769), (24.993076, 1.997230), (20.000000, 0.000000),
(18.000000, -0.750000), (14.500000, -1.800000), (2.590000, -2.098025),
(-5.014520, -2.005808), (0.000000, 0.000000), (6.000000, 2.000000).

Its perimeter: 61.405450; area: 77.999999 (within a small tolerance, this is half the area of the full polygon).

Fair bisectors of lower half area piece:

Lower piece has only one fair bisector at this stage. Its end points:
(5.540310, 1.846770), (14.443131, -1.801423). Let us call this bisector 'b1'.

Length of the fair bisector b1: approximately 9.621306 units.

Stage 2:

Diameter end points: (6.000000, 2.000000) and (25.000000, 2.000000). These are also two of the vertices of the input polygon.

The vertices of the lower half area piece:

(6.000000, 2.000000), (25.000000, 2.000000), (25.000000, 2.000000)
(20.000000, 0.000000), (18.000000, -0.750000), (14.500000, -1.800000),
(2.590000, -2.098025), (-5.014520, -2.005808) (0.000000, 0.000000)

Its perimeter: 61.419440 area: 78.000001

Fair bisectors of lower piece:

b1 of stage one has continuously evolved to the segment:
(5.530824, 1.843608) – (14.460121, -1.800998).

Length of b1 = 9.644455

Additionally, a whole new *range* of fair bisectors have sprung up connecting points on the edge { (-5.014520, -2.005808) – (0,0) } with the edge: { (25, 2) – (20,0). Note that these edges of the input polygon are parallel. The lengths of these bisectors range continuously from 20 units to approximately 30.5 units. The shortest of these fair bisectors is the line joining vertices (0,0) and (20,0).

Stage 3:

The continuous range of bisectors in stage 2 is unstable and quickly evolves into two discrete fair bisectors; we call them b2 and b3:

Diameter end points: (5.976705, 1.992235), (25.019409, 2.007764)

The vertices of the lower half area piece:

(5.976705, 1.992235), (25.019409, 2.007764), (25.000000, 2.000000),
(20.000000, 0.000000), (18.000000, -0.750000), (14.500000, -1.800000),
(2.590000, -2.098025), (-5.014520, -2.005808), (0.000000, 0.000000)

Its perimeter: 61.458499; area: 78.000000

Fair bisectors of lower piece:

There are now 3 fair bisectors for the lower piece:

Fair bisector b1 (evolved from stage 1):

End points: (5.379034, 1.793011) and (14.633749,-1.759875).

The length of b1: 9.928904.

Fair bisector b2:

Vertices: (0.199223, 0.066408) and (19.821657,-0.066879)

Length of b2: 19.641692

Fair bisector b3:

Vertices: (-4.769459,-2.008780) - (24.760065, 2.007552)

Length of b3: 29.781602

Observe that the lengths of the three fair bisectors are widely different.

Stage 4:

The three fair bisectors show some continuous evolution from stage 3 as follows:

Diameter End points: (5.881836, 1.960612) and (25.098368, 2.039347)

Vertices of lower piece:

(5.881836, 1.960612), (25.098368, 2.039347), (25.000000, 2.000000)
(20.000000, 0.000000), (18.000000, -0.750000), (14.500000, -1.800000),
(2.590000, -2.098025), (-5.014520, -2.005808), (0.000000, 0.000000)

Perimeter of the lower piece: 61.617523; area: 78.000001

Fair bisectors of lower piece:

Bisector b1:

End points: (3.785246, 1.261749) - (16.319056,-1.254283).

Length of bisector: 12.783849

Bisector b2:

End points: (0.996117, 0.332039) – (19.109590,-0.333904)

Length of bisector: 18.125710

Bisector b3:

End points: (-3.496674,-2.024214), (23.571688, 2.033092)

Length of bisector: 27.370750

Stage 5:

After some continuous (and qualitatively unchanged) evolution of the various objects, we observe that bisectors b1 and b2 are approaching each other.

Diameter end points: (5.824915, 1.941638), (25.145680, 2.058272).

Vertices of the lower piece:

(5.824915, 1.941638), (25.145680, 2.058272), (25.000000, 2.000000),
(20.000000, 0.000000), (18.000000, -0.750000), (14.500000, -1.800000),
(2.590000, -2.098025), (-5.014520, -2.005808), (0.000000, 0.000000)

Perimeter of the lower piece: 61.712904; area: 78.000001

Fair bisectors of lower piece:

Fair Bisector b1:

End points: (3.035787, 1.011929) and (17.121418,-1.013575)

Length: 14.230519

Fair Bisector b2:

End points: (1.517893, 0.505964) and (18.639263,-0.510276)

Length: 17.151503

Fair bisector b3:

End points: (-2.909596,-2.031334) and (23.035170,2.045532).

Length: 26.263125

Stage 6:

The fair bisectors b1 and b2 approach each other and are about to merge and disappear.

The ends of the diameter: (5.767994, 1.922665) and (25.192945, 2.077178).

Vertices of the lower piece:

(5.767994, 1.922665), (25.192945, 2.077178), (25.000000, 2.000000),
(20.000000, 0.000000), (18.000000, -0.750000), (14.500000, -1.800000),
(2.590000, -2.098025), (-5.014520, -2.005808), (0.000000, 0.000000)

Perimeter of lower piece: 61.808258 area: 78.000000

Fair bisectors of lower piece:

Bisector b1:

End points: (2.371708, 0.790569), (17.837563, -0.798731)

Length: 15.547300

Bisector b2:

End points: (2.077616, 0.692539), (18.131470, -0.700699)

Length: 16.114197

Bisector b3:

End points: (-2.421386, -2.037254), (22.597462, 2.056533)

Length: 25.351565

Stage 7:

Bisectors b1 and b2 have just merged at a common length of around 15.8 units and disappeared. The only surviving fair bisector is b3:

The ends of the diameter: (5.739534, 1.913178) and (25.216560, 2.086624).

Vertices of lower piece:

(5.739534, 1.913178), (25.216560, 2.086624), (25.000000, 2.000000),
(20.000000, 0.000000), (18.000000, -0.750000), (14.500000, -1.800000),
(2.590000, -2.098025), (-5.014520, -2.005808), (0.000000, 0.000000)

Perimeter of lower piece: 61.855926. Area: 78.000001

The only Fair bisector of lower piece:

Fair bisector b3:

End points: (-2.207568, -2.039847), (22.408873, 2.061621)

Length: 24.955785

Summary:

During the above evolution, the diameter of the input polygon and the shape of the lower piece have changed continuously; the Perimeter of the lower piece as a whole changes continuously by less than 0.5 units. The fair bisectors of the lower piece have shown a discontinuous evolution. The perimeters of the two halves into which the lower piece is cut by its made by the fair bisectors have also shown a jump discontinuity.