

‘Fair’ Partitions of Polygons : An Introduction

R Nandakumar[†] and N Ramana Rao[★]

[†] *R.K.M.Vivekananda University, Belur Math, Howrah, India - nandacumar@gmail.com*

[★] *nallurirr@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

We address the question: Given a positive integer N , can any 2D convex polygonal region be partitioned into N convex pieces such that all pieces have the same area and same perimeter?

The answer to this question is easily ‘yes’ for $N=2$. We prove the answer to be ‘yes’ for $N=4$. This paper is a formal and concise reworking of earlier versions (especially v2) posted at arxiv.

1 Introduction - the Problem and a Conjecture

A recently studied problem in Combinatorial Geometry is to partition a given convex polygon into convex pieces of equal area with the pieces also sharing the boundary of the input polygon equally ([1] and [2]). As an extension thereof, we asked the following question in 2006 ([3] and [4]):

Given any positive integer N , can any convex polygonal region P be partitioned into N convex pieces such that all pieces have the same area and the same perimeter?

The convex pieces with same area and perimeter could well have different shapes, different numbers of sides etc. and could be arbitrarily positioned within P . To our knowledge, this problem had not been attempted before 2006. We compiled our explorations in [5] and this paper is a formal rewrite.

Following [4], we define a *Fair Partition* of a polygon as 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*. We may now rephrase our question: Given any positive integer N , does every convex polygon allow convex fair partitioning into N pieces?

Remarks: Any square, rectangle or parallelogram can be convex fair partitioned by $N - 1$ parallel lines into N pieces. Any triangle gives N identical triangles if N is a perfect square. Convex fair partitions need not be unique - eg: a square also has a convex fair partition into 4 identical squares.

The difficulty with convex fair partitions into N pieces comes from the perimeter constraint; unlike area, we don’t know ab initio how much perimeter each piece ought to have; the common value of the perimeter of pieces is an emergent property of the partition.

The Conjecture: We tend to believe that 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 all of the same area and perimeter. In this paper we discuss only polygonal regions with finite number of sides. But we expect

this property to hold for any 2D convex region, not only polygonal ones.

The conjecture is easily proved for $N = 2$ using simple continuity arguments (for example, see [5]). Indeed, on the boundary of any convex polygon, there exists *at least one* pair of points $\{P_1, P_2\}$ such that the line joining them divides the polygon into 2 pieces of equal area and perimeter. Here, we call such a line a *Fair Bisector* of the polygon.

Examples: (1) for an isosceles triangle with a narrow base, the only fair bisector is the angular bisector of its apex; (2) an equilateral triangle has 3 fair bisectors - its medians; a regular pentagon has 5 fair bisectors. (3) a rectangle has a continuum of infinitely many (any line passing through its center is a fair bisector). If a polygon has a fair bisector between interior points on 2 mutually parallel edges, then it automatically has infinitely many more fair bisectors connecting this pair of parallel edges.

2 Proof of the Conjecture: N=4

The $N=2$ proof does not readily generalize to $N=4$ and higher powers of 2. Indeed, if one partitions a polygon into 2 pieces of same area and perimeter and recursively does the same to both resulting pieces, one gets, in general, 4 pieces all of the same area, but with the common perimeter of a pair of them different from the common perimeter of the other pair ([5] shows a simple numerical example). However, as we show below, there is an 'enhanced' recursive procedure that does work for $N=4$.

Definition: An *Area Bisector* is a straight line that divides a convex polygon into two pieces of equal area (and, in general, different perimeters). From every point on the boundary of a convex polygon, there is an area bisector. A fair bisector is an area bisector giving 2 pieces of equal perimeter.

We say a curve C evolves continuously with a continuously varying parameter t if (1) every point P on C traces a continuous trajectory as a function of t and (2) the rate of displacement of each point P with change in t varies continuously along C . A closed curve stays closed during a continuous evolution but its area and perimeter could both be continuously changing functions of t .

The 'Augmented' Recursive Scheme for N=4

Divide the 'full convex polygon' to be convex fair partitioned into 4 pieces into two equal area pieces by any *area bisector*; call the resulting pieces A and B . Consider a fair bisector of piece A , that divides A into pieces $\{A_1, A_2\}$ - where both pieces have equal area and equal perimeter. Likewise consider a fair bisector of B which gives pieces $\{B_1, B_2\}$ - see figure 1 below; the fair bisectors are shown as dashed lines. In general, at any given initial position of the area bisector, the pair of pieces $\{A_1, A_2\}$ and the pair $\{B_1, B_2\}$ have different common perimeters.

Consider rotating the area bisector of the full polygon from its initial position - by moving both end points of the initial area bisector of the full polygon continuously from their initial positions around the boundary of the polygon so that the 2 pieces A and B continue to have the same area. A and B both change shapes continuously; the fair bisectors of A and B also change (as detailed below). When the area bisector of the full polygon reaches an orientation that is perfectly the reverse of the initial, the piece A




Figure 1:

would have become the initial B and vice versa. On further rotation of the area bisector, both pieces eventually return to their initial shapes.

PROPOSITION: During the full rotation of the area bisector, a state necessarily exists where the 2 pairs of pieces $\{A_1, A_2\}$ and $\{B_1, B_2\}$ have the same common perimeter.

All A_1, A_2, B_1, B_2 - have same area throughout the rotation of the area bisector; so the proposition implies: the augmented recursion achieves a convex fair partition of any convex polygon into 4 pieces.

Let the boundary of a convex polygon be linearly parametrized by the length s measured from any boundary point. For every value of s , there is a point P on the boundary and also a unique *antipodal point* - a point P' halfway around the boundary from P .

We define a singlevalued function of s : $\alpha(s)$ = difference between areas of the piece of a convex polygon lying to the left of the directed line PP' corresponding to s and that of the piece to the right of PP' .

Lemma 1: $\alpha(s)$ is continuous and piece-wise polynomial of degree at most 2 in s .

Proof: The continuity of $\alpha(s)$ follows from that of the polygon. Let point $P(s)$ vary along an edge, say E_i (which joins vertices E_{i1} and E_{i2} of the polygon) and the corresponding P' move along another edge E_j (joining E_{j1} to E_{j2}). Then, $A_l(s)$, the area of the left piece separated by PP' consists of a constant part (the part of the polygon to the left of the line from E_{i1} to E_{j2}) and a variable part - the quadrilateral (E_{i1}, P, P', E_{j2}) . This quadrilateral is, in turn, the union of 2 triangles, (E_{i1}, P, E_{j2}) and (P, P', E_{j2}) . It is easy to see that the area of the former triangle is a linear function of s and area of the latter is at most quadratic in s . So $\alpha_l(s)$ is at most quadratic in s . Likewise, $\alpha_r(s)$, the area of the piece of the polygon to the right of PP' is also quadratic in s . So also $\alpha(s) = \alpha_l(s) - \alpha_r(s)$. \diamond

Note: Each pair of antipodally located zeros of $\alpha(s)$ corresponds to a fair bisector of the polygon.

Lemma 2: For a polygon with finitely many sides, the set of zeros of $\alpha(s)$ is a finite union of points and closed intervals.

Proof: By lemma 1, each piece of $\alpha(s)$ is at most of degree 2 in s ; so in any finite interval of s , there will be only finitely many discrete zeros of $\alpha(s)$. There could be continuous intervals of zeros - this happens when instead of the maximum quadratic degree in s , the areas of the left and right pieces remain constant and equal for a finite interval of s values (when edges E_i and E_j defined above are parallel). Obviously, the number of such intervals is also finite for a polygon with finitely many sides. \diamond

We define a *Fair Range* of a polygon as a connected component of the set of zeros of its $\alpha(s)$. Fair ranges come in antipodal pairs. By lemma 2, the number of fair ranges is finite. Further, a fair range is *Proper* if $\alpha(s)$ changes sign past it. Joining a pair of antipodal proper fair ranges, we have *proper fair bisectors*. Special case: If $\alpha(s) = 0$ for *all* values of s (as happens with centrally symmetric polygons - rectangle, regular hexagon, etc.), we consider the full range of s as a single proper fair range.

Lemma 3: The number of proper fair range pairs of any convex polygon is necessarily odd.

Proof: From lemma 2, the number of fair ranges is finite. Consider any pair of antipodal points P and P' on the polygon boundary. By definition, $\alpha(s)$ has opposite signs at P and P' . This means, if we move continuously from P to P' along the boundary, $\alpha(s)$ will change sign an odd number of times. And since each sign change gives a proper fair range, there is an odd number of them between P and P' . If $\alpha(s) = 0$ for all s , there is exactly one proper fair range; so there is no exception. \diamond

We now return to our recursion scheme and focus on the piece A , which evolves continuously with the orientation of the rotating area bisector of the full polygon that separates it and B . At any orientation of this area bisector (measured by an angle θ), piece A could have one or more fair bisectors so there could be many values for the common perimeter of the subpieces $\{A_1, A_2\}$ cut from A by A 's fair bisectors. At every shape of A , we could think of the function $\alpha(s)$ defined above. Here on, we refer to it as $\alpha_A(s)$ to denote its dependency on the length parameter s at a given shape of the changing A .

Consider the relation $R = \{(\theta, p) : 0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi\}$, where θ is as defined above and p , the common perimeter(s) of $\{A_1, A_2\}$ given by *some* fair bisector of A . Consider the set of all fair bisectors of A for the whole 2π period of θ . Given b , a proper fair bisector of A at some $\theta = \theta_0$, there is a maximal open interval I of θ values containing θ_0 , such that b can be followed continuously as θ varies in this interval (possible since a proper intersection of curves is robust for small continuous evolutions of the curves). This gives a curve in R of (θ, p) values for b ; we call such curves γ curves. As θ tends to an end point, say θ_1 , of I , b tends to a fair bisector in a fair range that is *improper*. On the $\theta - p$ plane, this fair range gives a vertical segment (in special cases, this could be just a point) lying above θ_1 ; we call these the β segments. Define G to be the union of all γ s and β s (there are finitely many of each) of the evolving A in the $\theta - p$ plane.

Lemma 4: For each connected component C of G , for all θ values not under a β segment, the *parity* of the number of γ curve segments above θ remains constant.

Proof: If at any θ , there are no improper fair ranges of A in C , all γ curves in C continue thru that θ , so parity of the number of γ curves in C does not change at those θ s.

At a θ value θ_1 , let there be an improper fair range of A with the function $\alpha_A(s)$ having zeros at all s values in $[s_1, s_2]$. By definition, $\alpha_A(s)$ has the same sign (say, positive) for s values on either side of $[s_1, s_2]$. By continuity of evolution of the curve $\alpha_A(s)$ with θ , for θ values on both sides of θ_1 , $\alpha_A(s)$ should still be positive on both sides of $[s_1 - \epsilon, s_2 + \epsilon]$. So, the sign of $\alpha_A(s)$ changes an even number (could be 0) of times within $[s_1 - \epsilon, s_2 + \epsilon]$ at θ values just before and just after θ_1 . This implies that on both sides of θ_1 , there are an even number of proper fair ranges within $[s_1 - \epsilon, s_2 + \epsilon]$. An even number of proper fair ranges means an even number of *proper* fair bisectors. So, on the $\theta - p$ plane, the improper fair range $[s_1, s_2]$ at $\theta = \theta_1$ corresponds to a β segment which is met by even numbers of γ curves from each side. So, the parity of the number of γ curve segments is conserved across $\theta = \theta_1$. \diamond

Note: Typical ‘events’ at improper fair ranges are the emergence of a pair of proper fair bisectors or two proper fair bisectors becoming coincident lines and disappearing.

Lemma 5: G contains at least one connected component that spans the entire 2π period of θ .

Proof: If any single fair bisector of A lasts the full 2π period, there is nothing to prove. So we assume that every fair bisector of A begins at a θ value at an improper fair range and ends at another θ in another improper fair range. Consider the set of connected components of G . At every θ , A has an odd number of proper fair bisectors (lemma 3); so an odd number of γ curves pass over every θ (we don’t count γ ’s that end or begin directly above that θ). This implies that G has at least one connected component C containing an odd number of segments at that θ . Now, for each connected component of G , the parity of the number of the number of curve segments remains the same for all values of θ not under the finitely many β segments (lemma 4). Since, for component C , the number of curve segments is odd for all θ , for no θ can the number of curve segments in C become zero (even parity); so C spans the entire 2π range of θ . Indeed, C contains a continuous curve on $\theta - p$ plane, that spans the full range of θ because β segments in C connect pairs of γ curves of C terminating at same θ . \diamond

Lemma 6: Given a connected graph G_1 whose edges are curve segments defined on the $\theta - p$ plane over $\theta = [0, 2\pi]$ such that G_1 spans the full interval of θ and has period 2π . If another graph G_2 differs from G_1 only by a finite phase δ , then the two have at least one common point.

Proof: Consider all the curves on graphs G_1 and G_2 plotted on the $\theta - p$ plane. Let G_1 and G_2 reach their (equal) maximum p value, p_{max} and minimum value p_{min} at different values of θ (else, we already have an intersection). Consider the infinite strip: $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$ on the $\theta - p$ plane. Removal of (θ, p) points on G_1 from this strip gives 2 separate semi-infinite strips. Let G_2 have the minimum value p_{min} at point P_1 and the value p_{max} at P_2 on the (θ, p) plane. Now, P_1 and P_2 lie in opposite semi-infinite strips separated by G_1 . Due to connectedness, there is a path P on the edges of G_2 from P_1 to P_2 . The graph G_1 lies between p -values p_{min} and p_{max} and divides the strip $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$ and so, path P has to cut thru G_1 to reach P_2 from P_1 . \diamond

The Final Step: Consider again, the relation $R = \{(\theta, p)\}$ as defined before lemma 4, for both pieces A and B . Both relations obviously have period 2π in θ , the orientation of the area bisector and an identical sequence of (θ, p) pairs - since pieces A and B go thru the same sequence of shapes - indeed, the 2 relations differ by only a phase π . By lemma 5, each relation contains a curve spanning the $[0, 2\pi]$ period. These 2 curves differ only by a phase of π and by lemma 6, they necessarily intersect within a period. So, there is a value of θ when perimeters of $\{A_1, A_2\}$ and those of $\{B_1, B_2\}$ have a common value. That proves our original proposition and the conjecture for $N = 4$. \diamond

3 Conclusion

A sophisticated proof of our conjecture for $N = 3$ has been published ([6]). Some arguments for $N = 3$ are also in [5]. For other N , no work is known. Our $N = 4$ proof may generalize to all powers of 2 ('final step' above uses intersections of periodic curves and intersection points of continuously evolving curves trace continuous curves). Indeed, if the conjecture is proved for any N (say, for 3, as in [6]), a generalization of our proof may work for $2N$. We also believe our $N = 4$ proof (for polygonal regions) can be extended to any 2D convex region.

This is known: if we need only to *fair partition* a convex polygon into N pieces (ie the pieces have same area and perimeter but don't have to be convex), it is possible for any polygon and any N ([5]). By simple examples, we see that the fair partition which *minimizes* the total perimeter of pieces is *not necessarily* a convex fair partition ([5]). Such 'optimal' fair partitioning seems an unexplored area.

If a smart counter example disproves our conjecture for some N , we could ask: how to *decide* if a convex fair partition exists for a given convex polygon and given N ? And what about higher dimensional analogs of this problem?

Acknowledgements: The present version of the document has benefited from advice and guidance from Kingshook Biswas.

References

- [1] Akiyama, Kaneko, Kano, Nakamura, Rivera-Campo, Tokunaga, and 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] <http://nandacumar.blogspot.com/2006/09/cutting-shapes.html> (September 2006)
- [4] <http://maven.smith.edu/orourke/TOPP/P67.html> (July 2007)
- [5] R. Nandakumar and N. Ramana Rao. <http://arxiv.org/abs/0812.2241v2> (December 2008).
- [6] I. Barany, P. Blagojevic and A. Szucs. 'Equipartitioning by a Convex 3-fan'. Advances in Mathematics, Volume 223, Issue 2, January 2010, pages 579-593.