

# CSE 544T Notes

Andy Shulman

October 15, 2012

## Thus far

$n = 2$	proportional $\rightarrow$ envy free
$n = 3$	Conway-Guy-Selfridge (5 [sometimes 4] cuts) Stromquist (4 knives, 2 cuts) Levmore-Cook (2 knives, 2 cuts) Webb (2 rounds, 1+2 cuts) Pie-cutting (3 knives, 1 person)

## Algorithm

$n = 3$  or  $4$ , envy free, attributed to Brams

Rules ( $n = 3$ ):

$P_1$  and  $P_2$  create  $X, Y, Z$

$P_3$  chooses first

$P_1$  and  $P_2$  must be satisfied and not envy with any piece despite  $P_3$  choosing first.

Procedure ( $n = 3$ ):

$P_1$  and  $P_2$  create  $X, Y, Z$  using Austin's algorithm such that

$$V_1(X) = V_2(X)$$

$$V_1(Y) = V_2(Y)$$

$$V_1(Z) = V_2(Z)$$

$$\frac{1}{3}$$

$P_3$  choose first since  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  think all pieces are  $\frac{1}{3}$ .

Rules/Procedure ( $n = 4$ ):

\* Try to separate rules from procedure

$P_1$  and  $P_2$  jointly create  $W, X, Y, Z$ , all equal to  $\frac{1}{4}$ .

$P_1$  and  $P_2$  consider all pieces equal, so they won't envy.

$P_3$  creates a 2-way tie for largest by trimming. Without loss of generality,

$$W = W' + E \text{ via Conway-Guy-Selfridge}$$

$P_4$  chooses first.  $P_3$  must choose  $W'$  if available.

What about  $E$ ?:

$P_3$  and  $P_4$   $P_T$ :  
 $P_N$ :

$P_1$  or  $P_2$  as normal. Irrevocable advantage over  $P_T$ .

$P_N$  and  $P_2$  create  $E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4$

$P_T$  chooses  $E_i$ , and is thus envy free.

$P_1$  chooses next. Doesn't envy due to irrevocable advantage over  $P_T$

$P_2$  and  $P_N$  pick next, in either order. Neither envies because they view all pieces equal to  $\frac{1}{4}$

### Asymptotic number of cuts to cut cake

Lemma: One Cut Suffices

Given  $M$  pieces of cake,  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m$ , it is possible to divide the cake into two equal platters, cutting only one piece to do so.

$P$  partitions the pieces  $x_i$  such that  $L = V(Y_1)$  and  $R = V(Y_2)$  where  $L$  and  $R$  are the desired value of the two platters.

1. sort  $x_i$  into ascending value
2. determine  $D$  such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) \leq L < \sum_{i=1}^{D+1} V(x_i)$$

If  $\sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) = L$ , then the one cut is not necessary. Otherwise:

$$\sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) < L < \sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) + V(x_{D+1}) \tag{1}$$

Let  $V(x_{D+1}) = a + b$ , where  $a$  goes to  $L$  and  $b$  goes to  $R$ . Thus,

$$a = L - \sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i)$$

$$L < \sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) + V(x_{D+1})$$

$$L < \sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) + a + b$$

$$L < \sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) + L - \sum_{i=1}^D V(x_i) + b$$

$$L < L + B$$

$$b > 0$$

Thus, we have shown that only one cut is required to balance  $L$  and  $R$  as desired.

Last diminisher (trimming):

1 cut suffices:  $\frac{1}{n}$

The rest is just trimming

$(n-1) + (n-2) + \dots + 1 = O(n^2)$  cuts

Fink's lone chooser:

Assuming gluing to make previous cuts whole:

$n = 1 \rightarrow 0$  cuts

$n = 2 \rightarrow 4$  cuts

$n = 3 \rightarrow 9$  cuts

Without gluing:

$n$  people:  $(n - 1)(n - 1)!$  cuts

But if we use 1 cut suffices:

P creates  $K$  pieces of equal value and creates two platters, one with  $\frac{1}{K}$  value the other with  $\frac{K-1}{K}$  value. P repeats the platter division until  $K$  platters which requires  $K - 1$  cuts, which yields  $\sum_{i=1}^{K-1} i^2$  cuts which is the same as if we used glue.