In this chapter we show that if \( m \geq s \), then \( f(m, s) \geq \frac{1}{3} \).

1.1 Example: \( f(19, 17) \geq \frac{1}{3} \)

We express \( \frac{19}{17} \) as \( \frac{57}{51} \) since other fractions will have a denominator of 51.

We initially divide all 19 muffins \( \left( \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3} \right) \). There are now 57 pieces \( \frac{1}{3} \)-pieces. Since

\[
\frac{1}{3} \times 3 < \frac{19}{17} < \frac{1}{3} \times 4
\]

- The max number of pieces someone can get and have \(< \frac{19}{17} \) is 3.
- The min number of pieces someone can get and have \( > \frac{19}{17} \) is 4.

Hence we will give everyone either 3 or 4 \( \frac{1}{3} \)-pieces (which we will denote by \( W = 3 \) in the general technique). The only way to distribute 57 pieces so that everyone gets 3 or 4 pieces is to give 11 students 3 pieces and 6 students 4 pieces \( (s_W = s_3 = 11 \text{ and } s_{W+1} = s_4 = 6 \text{ in the general technique}) \). As usual a student who gets 3 (4) shares is called a 3-student (4-student).

We describe a process whereby students give pieces of muffins, called gifts, to other students so that, in the end, all students
have \( \frac{57}{51} \). Each gift leads to a change in how the muffins are cut in the first place; however, there will never be a muffin of size \( < \frac{1}{3} \).

Each 4-student has \( \frac{4}{3} = \frac{68}{51} \) and hence has to give (perhaps in several increments) \( \frac{68}{51} - \frac{57}{51} = \frac{11}{51} \) to get down to \( \frac{57}{51} \). Realize that if a 4-student gives \( \frac{11}{51} \) to a 3-student, then the 3-student now has \( \frac{51}{51} + \frac{11}{51} = \frac{62}{51} > \frac{57}{51} \).

Each 3-student has \( \frac{51}{51} \) and hence has to receive \( \frac{57}{51} - \frac{51}{51} = \frac{6}{51} \) to get up to \( \frac{57}{51} \).

Call the 11 3-students \( g_1, \ldots, g_{11} \).

Call the 6 4-students \( f_1, \ldots, f_6 \).

Notation 1.1. \( x(f_1 \rightarrow g_1) \) means the following: \( f_1 \) gives \( x \) to \( g_1 \) by taking two \( \frac{1}{3} \)-pieces, combining them, cutting off a piece of size \( x \), giving it to \( g_1 \) while keeping the rest. \( g_1 \) takes the piece given to him and combines it with a \( \frac{1}{3} \) piece. Notice that in terms of pieces we are taking three pieces of size \( \frac{1}{3} \) (2 from \( f_1 \) and 1 from \( g_1 \)) and turning them into 1 piece of size \( \frac{2}{3} - x \) and one of size \( \frac{1}{3} + x \). Hence we can easily rearrange how the muffins are cut.

We need to make sure this procedure never results in a piece that is \( < \frac{1}{3} \). In the above example (1) \( f_1 \) now has a piece of size \( \frac{2}{3} - x \), hence we need \( x \leq \frac{1}{3} \), (2) \( g_1 \) now has a piece of size \( \frac{1}{3} + x \), which is clearly \( \geq \frac{1}{3} \). Hence the only restriction is \( x \leq \frac{1}{3} \).

(1) \( \frac{1}{3}(f_1 \rightarrow g_1) \). Now \( f_1 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_1 \) has \( \frac{52}{51} \).

(2) \( \frac{5}{51}(g_1 \rightarrow g_2) \). Now \( g_1 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} - \frac{5}{51} = \frac{52}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_2 \) has \( \frac{51}{51} + \frac{5}{51} = \frac{56}{51} \).

(3) \( \frac{1}{51}(f_2 \rightarrow g_2) \). Now \( g_2 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( f_2 \) has \( \frac{58}{51} \).

(4) \( \frac{10}{51}(f_2 \rightarrow g_3) \). Now \( f_2 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_3 \) has \( \frac{61}{51} \).

(5) \( \frac{2}{51}(g_3 \rightarrow g_4) \). Now \( g_3 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_4 \) has \( \frac{55}{51} \).

(6) \( \frac{2}{51}(f_3 \rightarrow g_4) \). Now \( g_4 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( f_3 \) has \( \frac{66}{51} \).
\[ m \geq s \text{ then } f(m, s) \geq \frac{1}{3} \]

(7) \( \frac{9}{51} (f_3 \to g_5) \). Now \( f_3 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_5 \) has \( \frac{60}{51} \).

(8) \( \frac{3}{51} (g_5 \to g_6) \). Now \( g_5 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_6 \) has \( \frac{54}{51} \).

(9) \( \frac{3}{51} (f_4 \to g_6) \). Now \( g_6 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( f_4 \) has \( \frac{55}{51} \).

(10) \( \frac{4}{51} (f_4 \to g_7) \). Now \( f_4 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_7 \) has \( \frac{50}{51} \).

(11) \( \frac{2}{51} (g_7 \to g_8) \). Now \( g_7 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_8 \) has \( \frac{53}{51} \).

(12) \( \frac{7}{51} (f_5 \to g_9) \). Now \( f_5 \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_9 \) has \( \frac{58}{51} \).

(13) \( \frac{4}{51} (g_9 \to g_{10}) \). Now \( g_9 \) has \( \frac{58}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_{10} \) has \( \frac{52}{51} \).

(14) \( \frac{7}{51} (f_6 \to g_{10}) \). Now \( g_{10} \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( f_6 \) has \( \frac{63}{51} \).

(15) \( \frac{9}{51} (f_6 \to g_{11}) \). Now \( g_{11} \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \). YEAH. However, \( g_{11} \) has \( \frac{57}{51} \).

OH. thats a good thing!

YEAH- we are done.

Note that the first \( x \) was \( \frac{11}{51} \leq \frac{1}{3} \) and the remaining \( x \) were all \( \leq \frac{11}{51} \leq \frac{1}{3} \). Hence all pieces in the final procedure are \( \geq \frac{1}{3} \).

End of Example

**Theorem 1.2.** For all \( m \geq s \), \( f(m, s) \geq \frac{1}{3} \).

**Proof.** Divide all the muffins into \( \left( \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3} \right) \). Let \( W \) be such that

\[
\frac{1}{3} \times W \leq \frac{m}{s} \leq \frac{1}{3} (W + 1).
\]

Give some students \( W \frac{1}{3} \)-pieces and some \((W + 1) \frac{1}{3}\)-pieces. How many students? Let \( s_W \) \( (s_{W+1}) \) be the number of students who get \( W \) \((W + 1) \frac{1}{3}\)-pieces. Then:

\[
W s_W + (W + 1) s_{W+1} = 3m \]

\[ s_W + s_{W+1} = s \]

These equations have a unique solution and unique value of \( W \) if \( s \) does not divide \( 3m \). If \( s \) does divide \( 3m \) there will be more than one possible value of \( W \); however, we can pick one arbitrarily. So we give \( s_W \) students \( W \frac{1}{3} \)-pieces and \( s_{W+1} \) students \( W + 1 \frac{1}{3} \)-pieces.
By the definition of $W$:

$$0 \leq \frac{m}{s} - \frac{W}{3} \leq \frac{1}{3} \quad (1.1)$$

$$0 \leq \frac{W + 1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} \leq \frac{1}{3} \quad (1.2)$$

Now we will need to smooth out the distribution so that everyone receives $\frac{m}{s}$. We will do this by a sequence of moves of the form $x(f_i \rightarrow g_j)$ or $x(g_i \rightarrow g_j)$, as defined in the example.

We will assume $s_{W+1}$ and $s_W$ are relatively prime (this only comes up in Claim 3 below). This is fine because if they have a common factor $d$, we can just use the procedure for the $\frac{s_{W+1}}{d}$, $\frac{s_W}{d}$ case repeated $d$ times.

Call the $s_W$ $W$-students $g_1, \ldots, g_{s_W}$.

Call the $s_{W+1}$ $(W + 1)$-students $f_1, \ldots, f_{s_{W+1}}$.

Claim 1:

(1) If $s_{W+1} < s_W$ then $\frac{W + 1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} > \frac{m}{s} - \frac{W}{3}$.

(2) If $s_W < s_{W+1}$ then $\frac{W + 1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} > \frac{m}{s} - \frac{W}{3}$.

Proof of Claim 1:

$$s_{W+1} \times \frac{W + 1}{3} + s_W \times \frac{W}{3} = m$$

$$s_{W+1} \times \left(\frac{m}{s} + \frac{W + 1}{3} - \frac{m}{s}\right) + s_W \left(\frac{m}{s} + \frac{W}{3} - \frac{m}{s}\right) = m$$

$$\left(s_{W+1} + s_W\right) \frac{m}{s} + s_{W+1} \left(\frac{W + 1}{3} - \frac{m}{s}\right) + s_W \left(\frac{W}{3} - \frac{m}{s}\right) = m$$

$$s \frac{m}{s} + s_{W+1} \left(\frac{W + 1}{3} - \frac{m}{s}\right) + s_W \left(\frac{W}{3} - \frac{m}{s}\right) = m$$

$$\frac{W + 1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} = \frac{s_{W+1}}{s_W} \left(\frac{m}{s} - \frac{W}{3}\right)$$
Both parts follow.

**End of Proof of Claim 1**

We give the procedure to obtain \( f(m, s) \leq \frac{1}{3} \). There are two cases.

**Case 1:** \( s_{W+1} < s_W \). Hence by Claim 1 \( \frac{W+1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} > \frac{m}{s} - \frac{W}{3} \).

1. Let \( x = \frac{W+1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} \). Note that \( x \leq \frac{1}{3} \). Do \( x(f_1 \rightarrow g_1) \). Now \( f_1 \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \). YEAH. However, \( g_1 \) has \( \frac{W}{3} + \frac{W+1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} > \frac{m}{s} \). (This is where we use \( s_{W+1} < s_W \), or more accurately the consequence of that from Claim 1.)

2. Let \( x = \frac{2W+1}{3} - 2 \times \frac{m}{s} \). Do \( x(g_1 \rightarrow g_2) \). Now \( g_1 \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \). YEAH.

3. If \( g_2 \) has \( > \frac{m}{s} \) then \( g_2 \) gives enough to \( g_3 \) so that \( g_2 \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \). Keep up this chain of \( g_1, g_2, g_3, \ldots \) until there is a \( g_i \) such that \( g_i \) end up with \( < \frac{m}{s} \) (though more than the \( \frac{W}{3} \) that \( g_i \) had originally). This happens because \( g_{i-1} \) gives \( g_i \) what it can, so \( g_{i-1} \) ends with exactly \( \frac{m}{s} \), but its just not enough for \( g_i \) to have \( \frac{m}{s} \) as well :-(

4. Do \( x(f_2 \rightarrow g_i) \) where \( x \) is such that \( g_i \) will now have \( \frac{m}{s} \).

5. Do \( x(f_2 \rightarrow g_{i+1}) \) where \( x \) is such that \( f_2 \) will now have \( \frac{m}{s} \).

Repeat the above steps until you are done.

We need to show that (1) there is never a piece of size \( < \frac{1}{3} \), and (2) the process ends with every student getting \( \frac{m}{s} \).

**Claim 2:** The first gift is \( \leq \frac{1}{4} \) and no gift is larger.

**Proof of Claim 2:** Let \( C = \frac{W+1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} \) which is the size of the first gift. By equation (2) \( C \leq \frac{1}{4} \).

Assume that all gifts so far have been \( \leq C \). We analyze the three kinds of gifts and show that in all cases the gift is \( \leq C \).

- \( x(f_i \rightarrow g_j) \) where (1) initially \( f_i \) has \( > \frac{m}{s} \), \( g_j \) has \( < \frac{m}{s} \), and (2) after the gift \( f_i \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \). When this occurs it is \( f_i \)'s first or second gift giving. (This happens in steps 1 and 5 above, and later as well.) Before the gift \( f_i \) has at least \( \frac{m}{s} \) but at
most \( \frac{W+1}{3} \), so this gift has size at most \( \frac{W+1}{3} - \frac{m}{s} = C \).  

- \( x(g_i \to g_{i+1}) \) where (1) initially \( g_i \) has > \( \frac{m}{s} \), \( g_j \) has < \( \frac{m}{s} \), and (2) after the gift \( g_i \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \). When this occurs, \( g_i \) has received a gift once and this is \( g_i \)'s first time giving. (This happens in steps 2 and in the chain referred to in step 5.) Since \( g_i \) just received a gift of size \( \leq C \) she has \( \leq \frac{W}{3} + C \). Hence the gift is \( \leq \frac{W}{3} - \frac{m}{s} + C \leq C \).  

- \( x(f_i \to g_j) \) where (1) initially \( f_i \) has > \( \frac{m}{s} \), \( g_j \) has < \( \frac{m}{s} \), and (2) after the gift \( g_j \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \). This will be \( f_i \)'s first time giving. (This happens in step 4 above.) Before the gift \( f_i \) has at least \( \frac{W}{3} \) but at most \( \frac{m}{s} \), so this gift has size at most \( \frac{m}{s} - \frac{W}{3} \leq C \) (by Claim 1).  

**Claim 3:** If \( sW \) and \( sW+1 \) are relatively prime then the process terminates with all students having \( \frac{m}{s} \).  

**Proof of Claim 3:**  
In each step all of the \( f_i \) have at least \( \frac{m}{s} \). In each step the number of students who have the correct amount of muffin goes up. One may be worried that at some point we will try to do step 4 (for example) of the procedure and there will be no \( g_i \) left who need more muffin. But this is not possible because until the process terminates the \( f \)'s always have more muffins than they need, so there is always a \( g \) with less muffins than they need.  

One may also be worried that eventually we will get all of the \( f \)'s to have \( \frac{m}{s} \), but the \( g \)'s will not all have \( \frac{m}{s} \). This is not possible either, because whenever we only make gifts from \( f \) to \( g \), there is no \( g \) with more than \( \frac{m}{s} \).  

Finally, if \( sW \) and \( sW+1 \) are not relatively prime, it is possible that the procedure will terminate early because in step 5 the size of the donation \( x \) is 0. If this occurred it would mean that there is some subset of \( F \) \( f \)'s and \( G \) \( g \)'s each of which has exactly \( \frac{m}{s} \) and only made donations amongst themselves. But then \( \frac{\bar{N}}{\bar{N}} = \frac{sW+1}{sW} \), a contradiction.  

**End of Proof of Claim 3**
\[ m \geq s \text{ then } f(m, s) \geq \frac{1}{3} \]

**Case 2:** \( s_W < s_{W+1} \). This is similar to Case 1 except that instead of \( f_1 \) giving \( g_1 \) so that \( f_1 \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \), \( f_1 \) gives to \( g_1 \) so that \( g_1 \) has \( \frac{m}{s} \). Hence we have a chain of \( f_i \)'s instead of a chain of \( g_i \)'s.

---

### 1.2 Conjectures About Extensions

We first restate the main theorem:

**Theorem 1.3.** For all \( m \geq s \), if \( V \geq 3 \) then \( f(m, s) \geq \frac{1}{3} \).

What if \( V = 4 \)? \( V = 5 \)?

**Conjecture 1.4.** There exists a function \( a(V) \) such that the following is true: For all \( m \geq s \), if \( V \geq V \) then \( f(m, s) \geq a(V) \).

What might \( a(V) \) look like? We know that \( a(3) = \frac{1}{3} \) and empirically it seems that \( \lim_{V \to \infty} a(V) = \frac{1}{2} \). One candidate is

\[ a(V) = \frac{V + 1}{2V + 6} \]