

# ‘Fair’ Partitions of Polygons – an Introduction

- R. Nandakumar<sup>1</sup>, N. Ramana Rao

**Abstract:** In this article, we introduce a problem on Partitioning 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 such 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 describe some attempts to generalize the  $N=2$  proof to higher values of  $N$  – specifically to powers of 2.

We proceed to give some arguments which strongly indicate that the answer is again “Yes” for  $N=3$  and also show 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 such 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 numbers of sides etc. and can be arbitrarily positioned within the input convex polygon.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> nandacumar@gmail.com

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 4<sup>th</sup> 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 such 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, once the area of a polygon is fixed, its perimeter is a primary measure of how ‘compact’ it is - in an everyday sense. Thus, ‘fairness’ is in carrying out the partition of the given polygon 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 into 4 mutually identical equilateral triangles; the partition 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 partitioning of the square into squares is, intuitively, more *optimal* than the partition 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, where the pieces are not all mutually identical. Section 4 has an example as well.

### *Conjecture:*

The authors tend to believe that the answer to the basic ‘existential’ question posed above is “Yes”. I.e. the guess is: Every convex polygon allows a convex fair partition into  $N$  pieces for any  $N$ . i.e. 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 with finitely many sides from 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 of these lines and the next (and keeping them parallel), we can cut the polygon along them 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, thus giving infinitely many convex equal area partitions. Moreover, it is not hard to see that there are *infinitely many more* convex equal area partitions possible (we omit the proof of this bit).

However, ensuring that all pieces from the convex 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 equally 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  $Q$  on the boundary (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 the *left* of the 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  $P_1$ - $P_2$  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, if a cut is made along  $P_1$ - $P_2$ , equal; but, 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 the above 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, 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 section, 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 polygon*. 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 so that the remainder is also convex (the area of the breakaway piece is of course  $1/N^{\text{th}}$  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 could see if another convex piece of the same area and 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 100 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. But their removal will 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 3 pieces exists - by 3 rays (semi-infinite lines) 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  $N=2$ : First, 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. The dimensions of P2 can be chosen so that both P1 and P2 have the *same area and perimeter*. 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  $(0, 0) - (12, 0)$ . See figure.



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).

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

We considered each of these 3 convex fair bisections of P and numerically calculated further convex fair bisections of the 2 resulting pieces. In none of these 3 cases did we find 4 final 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

*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 also recall that a line which divides a convex polygon into 2 pieces of equal area and equal perimeter is a *fair bisector*.

We say that a finite line segment changes continuously as a whole if (i) one of its end points remains fixed and the other moves continuously or (ii) both end points move simultaneously and continuously. We could also conceive of a convex polygon being continuously deformed into another convex polygon of the same area, staying convex and keeping the same area throughout this deformation. During this continuous evolution of a polygon, the number of vertices etc. can change – for example, a triangle can be continuously deformed into a square of the same area, remaining convex at every intermediate stage.

*An 'Augmented' Recursive Scheme for N=4*

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 *both* 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 a higher common 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 the other end accordingly); then, the pieces A and B both change shapes 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 – piece A would have then become the initial B and vice versa. Now, the fair bisectors of A and B have merely exchanged initial positions; likewise, the pair of pieces  $\{A1, A2\}$  and the pair  $\{B1, B2\}$ . On continuing the rotation of the diameter further, all pieces return to their initial state. By a continuity argument, 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 common perimeter (of course, throughout the evolution, all of A1, A2, B1 and B2 had same area).

**Claim: This augmented recursive approach works for  $N=4$ .**

**Proposed Proof:** Consider this thought experiment: given any input convex polygon, find an initial diameter, continuously rotate this diameter and track the evolution of the fair bisector(s) of one of the equal area pieces, say A, cut out by this diameter (note that the piece A itself is deformed continuously as the diameter rotates; its area remains constant but its perimeter would, in general, change but continuously). Obviously, by the time the diameter rotates by 180 degrees, piece A will have evolved into the initial B - and a 360 degree rotation will take it back to its initial state.

We first prove: the common perimeter of the pair of pieces  $\{A1, A2\}$  resulting from A’s fair bisector(s) *will change continuously* for any finite rotation of the diameter.

Our proof is organized into 2 parts.




**Part1:** Here we study, in general terms, the continuous evolution of a convex polygon (with area and convexity as invariants) and the impact of this evolution on its fair bisectors.

*Observation 1:* A convex polygon could have exactly one fair bisector, a few fair bisectors or infinitely many. Examples: (1) an isosceles triangle with very narrow base has only one fair bisector; (2) the pentagon discussed in section 4 has 3 fair bisectors; (3) a square has infinitely many (any line passing through its center is a fair bisector). Indeed, if a fair bisector is found in a polygon, connecting two edges of the polygon that are mutually parallel, we easily see that there are automatically infinitely many more fair bisectors connecting this parallel edge pair.

*Observation 2:* When a convex polygon is continuously deformed, retaining convexity and area, (1) its fair bisector(s) can also evolve continuously or (2) new fair bisectors can suddenly emerge or (3) existing fair bisectors could approach each other, merge and disappear.

We now explain these observations - and their consequences - in detail:

Let a convex polygon have area  $A$ . Let this polygon lie on the  $XY$  plane. Consider any general point on the boundary of the polygon, say,  $X$ . For every  $X$ , there is a unique point  $X'$  on the boundary such that the *perimeters* of the two pieces cut from the polygon by line  $XX'$  are equal. Now, if  $X$  were to move continuously along the boundary,  $X'$  too moves at the same 'speed' and the area of either of the pieces resulting from line  $XX'$  changes continuously (these areas could be different). In what follows, we choose to look at the piece to the *left* of  $XX'$ . Indeed, we can think of a function associating each point  $X$  on the boundary of the given polygon with the area of the *left* piece cut from the polygon by the line  $XX'$ .



See the above figure. It captures *a particular instant in the evolution of a convex polygon*.

- At every point  $X$  on the boundary of the polygon being considered (which lies on the  $XY$  plane), we have plotted in the  $Z$  direction, the area of the left piece broken off from the polygon by the line  $XX'$  corresponding to  $X$ ; this plot is a solid closed 3D polygonal curve, named  $G$ .
- We have also shown a *dashed* replica of the underlying polygon, displaced from the  $XY$  plane in  $Z$  direction to a height  $A/2$  (where  $A$  is the area of the underlying polygon). This shifted replica is called  $G_0$ . Note that the curves  $G$  and  $G_0$  strike the same 'shadow' on the  $XY$  plane on parallel projection (although it is not too obvious in our figure!). Of course,  $G_0$  entirely lies in a horizontal plane (a plane parallel to  $XY$  plane) but  $G$  does not, in general.
- Now, every convex polygon is guaranteed at least one fair bisector (from section 3); the end points of each fair bisector correspond to *a pair of intersections* of  $G$  with the  $G_0$  – such a pair of intersections is  $\{P, P'\}$ , shown in the figure. The region where  $G$  lies at a lower  $Z$  level than  $G_0$  is shown by the shaded region in the figure.

*Note:* Without loss of generality, we consider the boundary of the underlying polygon and also the curves  $G$  and  $G_0$  to run in a counter-clockwise sense, as in above figure.

*Observation 3:* For every intersection pair  $\{P, P'\}$  between  $G$  and  $G_0$  – corresponding to the end points of the same fair bisector – if  $G$  cuts  $G_0$  upwards (increasing  $Z$  direction) at  $P$ , it necessarily cuts  $G_0$  downwards at  $P'$  and vice-versa (this property follows from the definition of curve  $G$ ).

Now, if the underlying polygon is continuously deformed, keeping it convex and its area at  $A$ , the curves  $G_0$  and  $G$  will both change as a whole but in a continuous manner, and always keeping at least one *pair* of intersections between themselves (and  $G_0$  stays on the same plane). In this continuous evolution of the two curves, the *number* of their intersections can change, as discussed below:

*Observation 4:* Let  $G$  and  $G_0$  have a known intersection pair  $\{P, P'\}$ . If another intersection pair is to exist at, say  $\{Q, Q'\}$  (see figure), then, points  $Q$  and  $Q'$  cannot be both on the same side of line  $PP'$ . (Proof simple; omitted here)

Observations 3 and 4 can be used to prove following *key property* - an elaboration of Observation 2, which stated that fair bisectors can emerge or disappear as a polygon is deformed: New intersections between  $G$  and  $G_0$  only emerge as *pairs of pairs* (Proof simple, omitted)  $\Rightarrow$  fair bisectors always emerge in pairs. In other words, a single new fair bisector cannot emerge – equivalently, just one pair of intersections between  $G$  and  $G_0$  cannot emerge. Bisectors also can vanish, again, only in pairs. As we will see below, at the instant that they appear or vanish, the two bisectors in a pair are physically coincident lines.

*Observation 5:* Apart from intersections, the curves  $G$  and  $G_0$  may touch each other tangentially – these tangencies too occur at pairs of points, with each point in a pair lying halfway around the boundary of the underlying polygon from the other. Moreover, for a tangency pair  $\{R, R'\}$ , if the tangency at a point  $R$  is such that  $G$  touches  $G_0$  from below (lower  $Z$ ), at the other point in the pair,  $R'$ ,  $G$  necessarily touches  $G_0$  from above (proof simple, omitted).

*Observation 6:* When a polygon is continuously deformed, any given fair bisector, so long as it is not disappearing in a merger with another bisector, also evolves continuously – i.e as a polygon continuously evolves, a fair bisector cannot discontinuously jump to another position. This follows from the continuity in the evolution of the curves  $G$  and  $G_0$ .

We now summarize the ways in which the number of intersections between  $G$  and  $G_0$  can change, as the underlying convex polygon is deformed continuously:

- A portion of  $G$  can gradually approach  $G_0$  and have a tangency at a stage – indeed for each tangency that emerges, there is another simultaneous tangency that is halfway around the perimeter on both  $G$  and  $G_0$ . Immediately thereafter, each of the tangencies in the pair will turn into two intersections - i.e a total of 4 new intersections between  $G$  and  $G_0$  have appeared, in 2 pairs  $\Rightarrow$  the number of fair bisectors has increased by 2. At the instant they emerge at the tangency, the bisectors in the pair may be thought to be two coincident lines.
- Likewise, two pairs of intersections of  $G$  with  $G_0$  can approach each other and turn into a pair of tangencies which together lift off  $G_0$  (or dip down from it).

- Equivalently, this means two fair bisector lines approaching and coinciding with each other and then ceasing to exist => number of fair bisectors has fallen by 2.
- G can also have a pair of finite portions lying entirely along  $G_0$  – these correspond to a continuous range of infinitely many fair bisectors. Such continuous ranges are usually ‘unstable’; even a slight further deformation of the polygon causes a ‘collapse’ of the range into a pair of bisectors or none at all.

Our numerical experiments with the continuous evolution of convex polygons have confirmed the above ‘pair production’ and ‘pair annihilation’ processes of fair bisectors. Note that if  $\{b_1, b_2\}$  are a pair bisectors which emerged together, it is possible for either to merge with a third bisector and disappear.

*Note 1:* We noted above that pairs of tangencies between G and  $G_0$  may emerge during the continuous evolution of the underlying polygon - and each tangency pair corresponds to a single fair bisector. These tangency pairs are observed to be unstable and, on further evolution of the polygon, immediately turn into *pairs of pairs* of intersections (i.e pairs of bisectors) or disappear altogether. However, it is conceivable that some tangency pairs may persist, along with the corresponding single bisectors, maybe even throughout the full evolution of the polygon. But, such exceptional tangency pairs and associated single bisectors (if at all they exist) are no problem for our arguments. Indeed, it can be shown (using above observations) that however many such tangency pairs there may be in a convex polygon, there is always, necessarily, at least one ‘*proper intersection pair*’ between G and  $G_0$  - where the curves actually cut through each other. It can also be seen easily that a proper intersection pair (and the associated ‘proper bisector’) can disappear only when it merges with another proper intersection pair. Indeed, in this entire proof, we ignore persistent tangency pairs and look only at proper intersection pairs and the corresponding bisectors - and only those tangency pairs which merely mark the emergence/disappearance of pairs of *proper bisectors*.

*Note 2:* That the area of the underlying convex polygon is a constant as the polygon evolves is not crucial to our arguments; the polygon staying convex throughout is.


**Part 2:** The common perimeter of sub-pieces  $\{A_1, A_2\}$  is obviously a function of the shape of piece A itself. We now look at the specific issue of the continuity in the evolution of this common perimeter, as piece A is deformed by the rotation of a diameter of the input polygon. Note that, in what follows, piece A (not the full input polygon) takes the place of the ‘underlying convex polygon’ in the discussion of Part 1.

The continuity in the evolution of the common perimeter of  $\{A_1, A_2\}$  is *not* readily apparent. The number of fair bisectors which can separate  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  may change (obviously discontinuously) during the continuous evolution of piece A; the fair bisector(s) of piece A which are present at the initial position of the diameter may not last until the diameter reaches the opposite orientation - they may disappear (always in pairs) midway in the evolution and some other newly emerged bisector(s) may be the one(s) we see in piece B. But we argue now that the *common perimeter of sub-pieces  $\{A_1, A_2\}$*  nevertheless evolves continuously for any finite rotation of the diameter.

*Observation 7:* The number of proper intersection pairs and hence, proper fair bisectors in any convex polygon is necessarily odd. Indeed, from Part 1, when a polygon is continuously deformed, retaining convexity and area, the number of proper intersection pairs can increase and decrease only in steps of 2. And any convex polygon can be continuously deformed into a narrow-based isosceles triangle of the same area - which has, as noted above, only 1 fair bisector. That confirms Observation 7.

If the continuity of evolution of common perimeters of  $\{A1, A2\}$  is guaranteed for any finite evolution of piece A, we have an automatic guarantee that the common perimeter evolves continuously through a full, 360 degree rotation of the diameter, during which piece A would have evolved into B and further, all the way back to A. Obviously the same guarantee applies to the common perimeter of  $\{B1, B2\}$  - it evolves continuously for the entire 360 degree rotation of the diameter. Now, the set of shapes through which the pair  $\{A1, A2\}$  evolves is the same as the set of shapes of  $\{B1, B2\}$ ; hence the *range* of values of the common perimeter is same for both  $\{A1, A2\}$  and  $\{B1, B2\}$ . Moreover, the evolutions of  $\{A1, A2\}$  and  $\{B1, B2\}$  have the same period – 360 degrees. These properties – continuity + same range of values + same period – guarantee that the graph of the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  necessarily intersects, at least twice, the graph of the common perimeter of  $\{B1, B2\}$  over a full period. Such an intersection means all 4 pieces A1, A2, B1, B2 have same area and perimeter somewhere, as we had claimed.

Now, we try to prove the continuity in evolution of common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  for any finite rotation of the diameter:



The above is a schematic plot of a finite *part* of the evolution of fair bisectors of a continuously evolving convex polygon, informed by the discussion above (it is also consistent with our experiments, details of one of which are provided in Appendix B).

We show the typical evolution of the common perimeter of the sub-pieces  $\{A1, A2\}$  cut from piece A by A's fair bisector(s) (on Y axis) – against the evolution of piece A itself, represented by the angle rotated by the diameter separating A and B, measured from a reference position (on X axis).

There corresponds a value of the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  to each fair bisector of piece A any given state of A. Piece A itself changes as the diameter of the input polygon rotates. At any given stage of this evolution of A, it could have multiple fair bisectors and hence, there could be multiple values of the common value of perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$ .

From *Observation 6* above, each bisector of A, except at the point when it disappears in a merger, changes continuously with the continuous evolution of A and the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  corresponding to this bisector changes continuously as well. Also recall from above discussion that bisectors can emerge (and disappear) only in pairs.

In the scenario illustrated above (we have shown only a portion of the full evolution), initially, piece A has only one bisector b1; the evolution of b1 (more precisely, the evolution of the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  corresponding to b1) due to evolution of A is shown by the solid curve b1. At a particular position of the diameter, represented by point O above, a pair of new bisectors b2 and b3 emerges.

To begin with, b2 and b3 are coincident (this happens when G and  $G_0$ , in their evolutions, just begin to touch at a pair of points) but they move apart and evolve separately and the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  evolves separately for the two bisectors (as shown by a dashed and a solid curve respectively). Thus, for a while, piece A has 3 separate bisectors, all evolving continuously with A.

Bisectors b2 and b1 coincide and disappear at a later stage, shown by point X. That leaves bisector b3 to evolve alone thereafter.

The graph shows: there can be a discontinuity between the initial bisector b1 and final bisector b3 and the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  cut by these bisectors need not have a common value. But, as we now argue, there is indeed an *overall continuity* in the evolution of the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  – this continuity is mediated by the short-lived intermediate bisector b2.

To see this continuity better, we could (1) evolve the diameter, considering only bisector b1 and the associated value of common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  to evolve from the beginning to X, where b1 vanishes in a merger with b2, then (2) 'rewind' the diameter evolution but trace only bisector b2 and the associated common perimeter backwards from X (opposite to the arrow on the b2 curve) until the emergence of b2 at point O and then (3) switch the evolution of the diameter back to the initial sense but now following bisector b3 (and the associated common perimeter) from *its* emergence at O. Despite these switches in its direction of rotation, we have kept continuity in the evolution of the diameter - and the common perimeter of  $\{A1, A2\}$  also has had a continuous evolution.

This argument appears to guarantee that we do have a continuous evolution of the common perimeter of  $\{A_1, A_2\}$  during the finite range of evolution shown above, thus guaranteeing the success of this recursive scheme for  $N=4$ . Indeed, the failure of the initial fair bisector(s) to persist over any finite evolution of piece A is the *only* apparent possible source of discontinuity in the evolution of common perimeter of  $\{A_1, A_2\}$  - and the above analysis takes care of just this possibility. As is readily seen, the common perimeter is *not* a single valued function of the state of evolution of piece A, but this has had no effect on the continuity of its evolution.

Note 1: That the number of proper fair bisectors is odd has also been implicitly used in arguing that the evolution scenario shown in the above schematic chart exhausts all possibilities of ‘non-conservation of fair bisectors’ – and specifically, its impact on the continuity of the change in the common perimeter.

Note 2: A *range* of infinitely many bisectors may suddenly emerge and this range could suddenly collapse into two discrete bisectors; or a bisector pair may evolve into such a range, which disappears altogether. In such cases, points like X and O in the chart above will be replaced by vertical line segments. This ‘stretching’ of points X/O into vertical line segments has no effect on the above continuity argument.

Note 3: Numerical data showing a fairly complex example of bisector(s) evolution (and illustrating most issues touched upon above) has been given in Appendix B. It is also conceivable that the above recursive scheme (if it stands up to rigorous scrutiny) could be generalized further to values of  $N$  equal to higher powers of 2.

## 6. $N=3$

We now give 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 Barany, Blagojevic and Szucs ([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 necessarily 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, into 3 pieces, of the polygon by 2 rays (dashed) diverging from this point.



Our experiments with random reflective 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 reflective 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 reflective polygon into 3 pieces.

Depending on the shape of the reflective 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 triangle with very narrow base (say of the order of  $1/50^{\text{th}}$  of altitude) the only such special intersection point on the axis is just outside the triangle and close to its sharp corner (apex).

### *On to General convex polygons*

We observed (empirically) above that all reflective polygons allow convex fair partitioning into 3 pieces; next we try to establish that even general convex polygons share a specific structural property with reflective 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 reflective 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 (indeed, we guess that for any general convex polygon, there could be an equivalent reflective polygon – for which convex fair 3-partition exists by Property 2; and the axis of a reflective polygon may only be a special case of the axial polyline of a general convex polygon). 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 P1 and P2)

on the *boundary* of any convex polygon, from where 2 rays diverge dividing the polygon into 3 convex 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, as is shown in the figure below, 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  $P''$ .

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  $P$ . Indeed, 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  $P$  with the same period – 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 + continuity - 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 that P1' and P2' trace two *semi-infinite curves* (curves which start from a known point and grow away to infinity) growing outward from the input convex polygon; we used the word 'curve' because in the absence of symmetries in the input polygon, the trajectory of P1' 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 actually 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 – they divide the input polygon into 3 equal area pieces, 2 of which have same perimeter as well.

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:* We have not fully specified the precise path taken by the axial polyline through the interior and specifically, the core of the polygon – we have only provided evidence for a 2 dimensional continuous region between points P1 and P2 – all points of this region being origins of ray triplets which give 3 equal area pieces with 2 of the pieces also

having same perimeter. For reflective polygons as well, such 2-dimensional regions do exist but symmetry allows us to focus only on the axial line as it cuts through the interior.

## 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.

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* polygon (not necessarily convex) for any  $N > 2$ .

1. 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, as follows:

Indeed, if two pieces share an edge, we could always 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 gains in perimeter by  $d$ . The central piece is untouched in this stage. The result: all pieces

now have the same perimeter, as desired.

*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 equally the boundaries of the central piece with each of the outer ones 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; if the input polygon is not convex, we could simply ‘thin’ uniformly the polygon until its area reduces to  $1/N^{\text{th}}$ ). 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.

## **8. ‘Optimal Fair’ vs ‘Convex Fair’**

We consider here the following issue: A given convex polygon is to be *optimally* fair partitioned; i.e 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  $N = 2$ . i.e 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 1.4721 units.

As is almost obvious, the best - indeed the *only* - convex fair partition of the pentagon into 2 pieces 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 much ‘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 simply 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 given  $N$ , 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. Acknowledgements

We are very grateful to John Rekesh, Pinaki Majumdar, Arun Sivaramakrishnan, Varun Vikas and Bhalchandra Thatte for discussions and comments.

## 11. 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 – Some data supporting the Proof given in Section 5

Here, we compile some numerical data generated during an experiment done to track the evolution of the fair bisectors from a 10-vertex polygon, shown below.



### 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 of the input polygon (shown as a dashed line above) 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 – this piece is piece A in notation of section 5.

As we track evolution of each fair bisector of piece A below, instead of the common perimeter of sub-pieces {A1, A2} cut from A by this bisector, we record the length of bisector itself. This is sufficient. Indeed, the common perimeter of {A1, A2} is the *sum* of the length of bisector and half the perimeter of A. The perimeter of piece A changes continuously throughout as the diameter of input polygon rotates. So, for continuity in evolution of common perimeter of {A1, A2}, we need only continuity in the evolution of the length of the bisector.

### 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 *continuous range* of fair bisectors has 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).

Recall Note 2 at end of section 5 on the emergence/disappearance of ranges of bisectors.

**Stage 3:**

The continuous range of bisectors in stage 2 is unstable and ‘collapses’ into two discrete fair bisectors, far apart from each other; 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

**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 continuously 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:**

The above evolution of various quantities is consistent with the schematic 'evolution chart' given in Section 5. Difference: the emergence of the bisector pair {b2, b3} is not as single coincident bisector (corresponding to the point O in that chart) but as a range of bisectors which collapse immediately into a pair. But, this only corresponds to point O being stretched into a finite vertical segment – no qualitative change in the evolution of the common perimeter of {A1, A2}. In data above, the varying lengths of b1 and b3 have no common value (length of b1 changes from around 9 to 15.8 units and that of b3 from 30 to 24.9) – as in the chart in section 5 - but the rewind evolution' of b2 – and the point O stretched into a vertical segment - gives continuity.