

Competitive Programming and Mathematics Society

Introduction to Competitive Mathematics Workshop 1, Week 4, Term 1, 2021

CPMSoc Mathematics

Overview



1 Overview

2 What is Competitive Mathematics?

- Competitive Mathematics at UNSW
- Competition Format
- Problems vs Exercises

3 Learning Competitive Mathematics

- How to Learn Problem-solving
- Resources

4 Proof by Contradiction

General Form

What is Competitive Mathematics?

Competitive Mathematics at UNSW



- Simon Marais Mathematics Competition (SMMC)
 - Happens in mid-October
 - Sign up by August through the university
 - Mathematics department posts information for signing up closer to the date
 - More than \$50,000 in individual prizes, and internship offers.

Competitive Mathematics at UNSW



- Simon Marais Mathematics Competition (SMMC)
 - Happens in mid-October
 - Sign up by August through the university
 - Mathematics department posts information for signing up closer to the date
 - More than \$50,000 in individual prizes, and internship offers.
- Meet people
- Having fun
- Being employable
- Solving real-world problems

"Mathematics is distilled thinking" - Poh Shen-Loh

Simon Marais Mathematics Competition



- Broken up into two sessions, 3 hours each
- Each session has 4 questions, for a total of 8

Simon Marais Mathematics Competition



- Broken up into two sessions, 3 hours each
- Each session has 4 questions, for a total of 8
- Each problem is worth 7 marks regardless of difficulty
- Can include an open problem marks awarded for reasonable progress

Simon Marais Mathematics Competition



- Broken up into two sessions, 3 hours each
- Each session has 4 questions, for a total of 8
- Each problem is worth 7 marks regardless of difficulty
- Can include an open problem marks awarded for reasonable progress

The Problems

- Proof-based
- Solutions are much easier to explain than to invent
- Require unusual techniques, observations, or combinations
- Usually chosen to be aesthetically pleasing

Subject areas



- Number theory
- Geometry
- Polynomials
- Vectors
- Complex numbers
- Calculus
- Functional equations

- Inequalities
- Combinatorics & probability
- Combinatorial games
- Analysis
- Trigonometry
- Graph theory
- Group theory



"An **exercise** is a question that tests the student's mastery of a narrowly focused technique ... the **path towards solution is always apparent**. In contrast, a **problem** is a question that cannot be answered immediately. Problems are often open-ended, paradoxical, and sometimes unsolvable, and **require investigation before one can come close to a solution**. Problems and problem solving are at the heart of mathematics."

Paul Zeitz

Learning Competitive Mathematics

How to Learn Problem-solving



- Practice strategically
- Read solutions

How to Learn Problem-solving



- Practice strategically
- Read solutions

Strategies

- Select good notation
- Modify the problem
- Work backwards
- Consider concrete examples
- Make conjectures

How to Learn Problem-solving



- Practice strategically
- Read solutions

Strategies

- Select good notation
- Modify the problem
- Work backwards
- Consider concrete examples
- Make conjectures

Techniques

- Induction
- Invariants
- Cases/exhaustion
- Pigeonhole principle
- Extremal principle
- Telescoping
- Symmetry
- Generating functions

Resources



Books

- Problem Solving Tactics (Pasquale et. al., 2014)
- The Art and Craft of Problem Solving (Zeitz, 2007)
- Putnam and Beyond (Gelca & Andreescu, 2007)
- Solving Mathematical Problems (Tao, 2006)

Resources

СРМЗОС

Books

- Problem Solving Tactics (Pasquale et. al., 2014)
- The Art and Craft of Problem Solving (Zeitz, 2007)
- Putnam and Beyond (Gelca & Andreescu, 2007)
- Solving Mathematical Problems (Tao, 2006)

Other

- YouTube
- The Putnam Archive
- Wikipedia
- Discord (discord.gg/rPFkGg3PT6)

Proof by Contradiction

Suppose *P*. *Q* follows from *P*.

- \bigcirc Q is false.
- 4 P is false.

Theorem (Law of Contraposition)

 $P \to Q \iff \neg Q \to \neg P$

General Form

Proof by Contradiction



 $(P \implies Q)$ $\neg Q$





Prove that there are infinitely many primes.

Suppose there are finitely many primes.



- Suppose there are finitely many primes.
- Let these primes be $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n$.



- Suppose there are finitely many primes.
- Let these primes be $p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots, p_n$. Then there exists $q = p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdot p_3 \cdots p_n + 1$.



- Suppose there are finitely many primes.
- Let these primes be $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n$. Then there exists $q = p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdot p_3 \cdots p_n + 1$. Note that q is larger than any prime, so must be composite.



- Suppose there are finitely many primes.
- Let these primes be $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n$.
 - Then there exists $q = p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdot p_3 \cdots p_n + 1$.
 - Note that q is larger than any prime, so must be composite.
 - Note also that q is not divisible by any prime, since division by p_i leaves remainder 1.



- Suppose there are finitely many primes.
- Let these primes be $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_n$. Then there exists $q = p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdot p_3 \cdots p_n + 1$. Note that q is larger than any prime, so must be composite. Note also that q is not divisible by any prime, since division by p_i leaves remainder 1.
- Any composite number is divisible by a prime, so q is divisible by a prime.



- Suppose there are finitely many primes.
- Let these primes be p₁, p₂, p₃,..., p_n.
 Then there exists q = p₁ · p₂ · p₃ · ... p_n + 1.
 Note that q is larger than any prime, so must be composite.
 Note also that q is not divisible by any prime, since division by p_i leaves remainder 1.
- Any composite number is divisible by a prime, so q is divisible by a prime.
- Therefore, *q* does not exist. So, there must be infinitely many primes.





Let a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n be a rearrangement of the numbers $1, 2, \ldots, n$. Show that if n is odd then $A = (a_1 - 1)(a_2 - 2) \cdots (a_n - n)$ is even.

Suppose *A* is odd.



- Suppose *A* is odd.
- Then each of $(a_1 1), (a_2 2), \dots, (a_n n)$ are odd.



- Suppose *A* is odd.
- Then each of $(a_1 1), (a_2 2), \ldots, (a_n n)$ are odd. This means $a_1, a_3, a_5, \ldots, a_n$ are even, and $a_2, a_4, a_6, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ are odd.



- Suppose *A* is odd.
- Then each of $(a_1 1), (a_2 2), \ldots, (a_n n)$ are odd. This means $a_1, a_3, a_5, \ldots, a_n$ are even, and $a_2, a_4, a_6, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ are odd. So a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n contains (n+1)/2 even numbers and (n-1)/2 odd numbers.



- Suppose *A* is odd.
- Then each of $(a_1 1), (a_2 2), \ldots, (a_n n)$ are odd. This means $a_1, a_3, a_5, \ldots, a_n$ are even, and $a_2, a_4, a_6, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ are odd. So a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n contains (n+1)/2 even numbers and (n-1)/2 odd numbers.
- 1, 2, 3, ..., n contains (n-1)/2 even numbers and (n+1)/2 odd numbers.



- Suppose *A* is odd.
- Then each of $(a_1 1), (a_2 2), \ldots, (a_n n)$ are odd. This means $a_1, a_3, a_5, \ldots, a_n$ are even, and $a_2, a_4, a_6, \ldots, a_{n-1}$ are odd. So a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n contains (n+1)/2 even numbers and (n-1)/2 odd numbers.
- 1, 2, 3, ..., n contains (n-1)/2 even numbers and (n+1)/2 odd numbers.
- Thus, *A* is even.



The union of nine planar surfaces, each of area equal to 1, has a total area equal to 5. Prove that the overlap of some two of these surfaces has an area greater than or equal to 1/9.



The union of nine planar surfaces, each of area equal to 1, has a total area equal to 5. Prove that the overlap of some two of these surfaces has an area greater than or equal to 1/9.

Suppose that the overlap of every two surfaces is less than 1/9.



The union of nine planar surfaces, each of area equal to 1, has a total area equal to 5. Prove that the overlap of some two of these surfaces has an area greater than or equal to 1/9.

- Suppose that the overlap of every two surfaces is less than 1/9.
- Number the surfaces arbitrarily S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_9 .


The union of nine planar surfaces, each of area equal to 1, has a total area equal to 5. Prove that the overlap of some two of these surfaces has an area greater than or equal to 1/9.

- Suppose that the overlap of every two surfaces is less than 1/9.
- Number the surfaces arbitrarily S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_9 .
- Then $S_1 \cup S_2$ has area greater than 1 + (1 1/9) = 1 + 8/9.



The union of nine planar surfaces, each of area equal to 1, has a total area equal to 5. Prove that the overlap of some two of these surfaces has an area greater than or equal to 1/9.

- Suppose that the overlap of every two surfaces is less than 1/9.
- Number the surfaces arbitrarily S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_9 .
- Then $S_1 \cup S_2$ has area greater than 1 + (1 1/9) = 1 + 8/9.
- Similarly, $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$ has area greater than $1 + \frac{8}{9} + (1 \frac{1}{9} \frac{1}{9}) = 1 + \frac{8}{9} + \frac{7}{9}$.



The union of nine planar surfaces, each of area equal to 1, has a total area equal to 5. Prove that the overlap of some two of these surfaces has an area greater than or equal to 1/9.

- Suppose that the overlap of every two surfaces is less than 1/9.
- Number the surfaces arbitrarily S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_9 .
- Then $S_1 \cup S_2$ has area greater than 1 + (1 1/9) = 1 + 8/9.
- Similarly, $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$ has area greater than $1 + \frac{8}{9} + (1 \frac{1}{9} \frac{1}{9}) = 1 + \frac{8}{9} + \frac{7}{9}$.
- This pattern continues, so that $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \cdots \cup S_9$ has area greater than

$$1 + \frac{8}{9} + \frac{7}{9} + \dots + \frac{1}{9} = 5.$$



The union of nine planar surfaces, each of area equal to 1, has a total area equal to 5. Prove that the overlap of some two of these surfaces has an area greater than or equal to 1/9.

- Suppose that the overlap of every two surfaces is less than 1/9.
- Number the surfaces arbitrarily S_1, S_2, \ldots, S_9 .
- Then $S_1 \cup S_2$ has area greater than 1 + (1 1/9) = 1 + 8/9.
- Similarly, $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$ has area greater than $1 + \frac{8}{9} + (1 \frac{1}{9} \frac{1}{9}) = 1 + \frac{8}{9} + \frac{7}{9}$.
- This pattern continues, so that $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup \cdots \cup S_9$ has area greater than

$$1 + \frac{8}{9} + \frac{7}{9} + \dots + \frac{1}{9} = 5.$$

■ This is a contradiction, so the overlap of some two surfaces must be at least 1/9.





Let p(x) be a polynomial with even degree and positive leading coefficient. Show that if $p(x) - p''(x) \ge 0$, then $p(x) \ge 0$ for all real x.

Note firstly that since the polynomial is of even degree, $p(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \pm \infty$. So, the polynomial has a minimum value which is finite.



- Note firstly that since the polynomial is of even degree, $p(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \pm \infty$. So, the polynomial has a minimum value which is finite.
- Now, suppose that p(x) < 0 for some real x.



- Note firstly that since the polynomial is of even degree, $p(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \pm \infty$. So, the polynomial has a minimum value which is finite.
- Now, suppose that p(x) < 0 for some real x. Then certainly the minimum of the polynomial is negative. Let a be a minimum.



- Note firstly that since the polynomial is of even degree, $p(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \pm \infty$. So, the polynomial has a minimum value which is finite.
- Now, suppose that p(x) < 0 for some real x. Then certainly the minimum of the polynomial is negative. Let a be a minimum.
- Then $p''(a) \ge 0$, since *a* is a minimum.



- Note firstly that since the polynomial is of even degree, $p(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \pm \infty$. So, the polynomial has a minimum value which is finite.
- Now, suppose that p(x) < 0 for some real x. Then certainly the minimum of the polynomial is negative. Let a be a minimum.
- Then $p''(a) \ge 0$, since *a* is a minimum.
- So p(a) p''(a) < 0, which is a contradiction.



- Note firstly that since the polynomial is of even degree, $p(x) \to \infty$ as $x \to \pm \infty$. So, the polynomial has a minimum value which is finite.
- Now, suppose that p(x) < 0 for some real x. Then certainly the minimum of the polynomial is negative. Let a be a minimum.
- Then $p''(a) \ge 0$, since *a* is a minimum.
- So p(a) p''(a) < 0, which is a contradiction.
- Thus, $p(x) \ge 0$ for all real x.





Show that the interval [0, 1] cannot be partitioned into two disjoint sets A and B such that B = A + a for some real number a.

Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.



- Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.
- Now, $[0, a) \subseteq A$ since if some b < a were in B, we would require b a < 0 to be in A.



- Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.
- Now, $[0, a) \subseteq A$ since if some b < a were in B, we would require b a < 0 to be in A.
- This means that $[a, 2a) \subseteq B$, and we can continue this pattern using induction.



- Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.
- Now, $[0, a) \subseteq A$ since if some b < a were in B, we would require b a < 0 to be in A.
- This means that $[a, 2a) \subseteq B$, and we can continue this pattern using induction. Specifically, if $[2ka, (2k+1)a) \subseteq A$, then $[(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a) \subseteq B$. If $b \in [(2k+2)a, (2k+3)a)$ were to be in *B* as well, then $b - a \in [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a)$ would be in *A*, contradicting that *A* and *B* are a partition.



- Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.
- Now, $[0, a) \subseteq A$ since if some b < a were in B, we would require b a < 0 to be in A.
- This means that $[a, 2a) \subseteq B$, and we can continue this pattern using induction. Specifically, if $[2ka, (2k+1)a) \subseteq A$, then $[(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a) \subseteq B$. If $b \in [(2k+2)a, (2k+3)a)$ were to be in *B* as well, then $b - a \in [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a)$ would be in *A*, contradicting that *A* and *B* are a partition.
- So A must be made up of the sets [2ka, (2k+1)a), and B of the sets [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a).



- Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.
- Now, $[0, a) \subseteq A$ since if some b < a were in B, we would require b a < 0 to be in A.
- This means that $[a, 2a) \subseteq B$, and we can continue this pattern using induction. Specifically, if $[2ka, (2k+1)a) \subseteq A$, then $[(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a) \subseteq B$. If $b \in [(2k+2)a, (2k+3)a)$ were to be in *B* as well, then $b - a \in [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a)$ would be in *A*, contradicting that *A* and *B* are a partition.
- So A must be made up of the sets [2ka, (2k+1)a), and B of the sets [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a).
- We know $A \cup B = [0, 1]$ so one of these sets contains 1, but then $1 \in [na, (n+1)a)$ for some natural number n, and this interval must contain a number larger than 1.



- Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.
- Now, $[0, a) \subseteq A$ since if some b < a were in B, we would require b a < 0 to be in A.
- This means that $[a, 2a) \subseteq B$, and we can continue this pattern using induction. Specifically, if $[2ka, (2k+1)a) \subseteq A$, then $[(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a) \subseteq B$. If $b \in [(2k+2)a, (2k+3)a)$ were to be in *B* as well, then $b - a \in [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a)$ would be in *A*, contradicting that *A* and *B* are a partition.
- So A must be made up of the sets [2ka, (2k+1)a), and B of the sets [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a).
- We know $A \cup B = [0, 1]$ so one of these sets contains 1, but then $1 \in [na, (n+1)a)$ for some natural number n, and this interval must contain a number larger than 1.



- Since we can swap the role of A and B if a is negative, we can assume a > 0.
- Now, $[0, a) \subseteq A$ since if some b < a were in B, we would require b a < 0 to be in A.
- This means that $[a, 2a) \subseteq B$, and we can continue this pattern using induction. Specifically, if $[2ka, (2k+1)a) \subseteq A$, then $[(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a) \subseteq B$. If $b \in [(2k+2)a, (2k+3)a)$ were to be in *B* as well, then $b - a \in [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a)$ would be in *A*, contradicting that *A* and *B* are a partition.
- So A must be made up of the sets [2ka, (2k+1)a), and B of the sets [(2k+1)a, (2k+2)a).
- We know $A \cup B = [0, 1]$ so one of these sets contains 1, but then $1 \in [na, (n+1)a)$ for some natural number n, and this interval must contain a number larger than 1.
- \blacksquare Thus, we cannot partition [0,1] in this way.





Prove that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5}$ is an irrational number.

Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where r is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational. Again, we see that $\sqrt{30}$ must be rational.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational. Again, we see that $\sqrt{30}$ must be rational.

So,
$$\sqrt{30} = p/q$$
 where $gcd(p,q) = 1$ and $q \neq 0$.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational. Again, we see that $\sqrt{30}$ must be rational.

So,
$$\sqrt{30} = p/q$$
 where $gcd(p,q) = 1$ and $q \neq 0$.
Squaring and rearranging gives $p^2 = 30q^2$.



Prove that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5}$ is an irrational number.

- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational. Again, we see that $\sqrt{30}$ must be rational.

So,
$$\sqrt{30} = p/q$$
 where $gcd(p,q) = 1$ and $q \neq 0$.
Squaring and rearranging gives $p^2 = 30q^2$.

Then p^2 is even, and so p is too. But then p^2 has a factor of 4.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational. Again, we see that $\sqrt{30}$ must be rational.
- So, $\sqrt{30} = p/q$ where gcd(p,q) = 1 and $q \neq 0$. Squaring and rearranging gives $p^2 = 30q^2$.
- Then p^2 is even, and so p is too. But then p^2 has a factor of 4.
- Since $q^2 = p^2/30$, q^2 has a factor of 2, so q is even.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational. Again, we see that $\sqrt{30}$ must be rational.
- So, $\sqrt{30} = p/q$ where gcd(p,q) = 1 and $q \neq 0$. Squaring and rearranging gives $p^2 = 30q^2$.
- Then p^2 is even, and so p is too. But then p^2 has a factor of 4.
- Since $q^2 = p^2/30$, q^2 has a factor of 2, so q is even.
- Thus, $gcd(p,q) \neq 1$, deriving a contradiction.



- Suppose that $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5} = r$, where *r* is rational.
- Then rearranging and squaring both sides, we get $5 + 2\sqrt{6} = r^2 + 5 2r\sqrt{5}$. But then $\sqrt{6} + r\sqrt{5}$ must be rational.
- Squaring this gives $6 + 5r^2 + 2r\sqrt{30}$, which must be rational. Again, we see that $\sqrt{30}$ must be rational.
- So, $\sqrt{30} = p/q$ where gcd(p,q) = 1 and $q \neq 0$. Squaring and rearranging gives $p^2 = 30q^2$.
- Then p^2 is even, and so p is too. But then p^2 has a factor of 4.
- Since $q^2 = p^2/30$, q^2 has a factor of 2, so q is even.
- Thus, $gcd(p,q) \neq 1$, deriving a contradiction.
- That is, $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} + \sqrt{5}$ is irrational.

CAD ODMCOO

Example

We call a 5-tuple of integers arrangeable if its elements can be labelled a, b, c, d, e in some order so that a - b + c - d + e = 29. Determine all 2017-tuples of integers $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{2017}$ such that if we place them in a circle in clockwise order, then any 5-tuple of numbers in consecutive positions on the circle is arrangeable.

CAD ODUCOO

Example

We call a 5-tuple of integers arrangeable if its elements can be labelled a, b, c, d, e in some order so that a - b + c - d + e = 29. Determine all 2017-tuples of integers $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{2017}$ such that if we place them in a circle in clockwise order, then any 5-tuple of numbers in consecutive positions on the circle is arrangeable.

First note that we can subtract 29 from each n_i so that the condition becomes a - b + c - d + e = 0 instead.

CAD ODMCOO

Example

We call a 5-tuple of integers arrangeable if its elements can be labelled a, b, c, d, e in some order so that a - b + c - d + e = 29. Determine all 2017-tuples of integers $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{2017}$ such that if we place them in a circle in clockwise order, then any 5-tuple of numbers in consecutive positions on the circle is arrangeable.

- First note that we can subtract 29 from each n_i so that the condition becomes a b + c d + e = 0 instead.
- **Now if we add five consecutive** n_i , we get

$$n_i + n_{i+1} + n_{i+2} + n_{i+3} + n_{i+4} = (n_i - n_{i+1} + n_{i+2} - n_{i+3} + n_{i+4}) + 2(n_{i+1} + n_{i+3})$$

= 2(n_{i+1} + n_{i+3}),

which is even.

CAD ODMCOO

Example

We call a 5-tuple of integers arrangeable if its elements can be labelled a, b, c, d, e in some order so that a - b + c - d + e = 29. Determine all 2017-tuples of integers $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{2017}$ such that if we place them in a circle in clockwise order, then any 5-tuple of numbers in consecutive positions on the circle is arrangeable.

- First note that we can subtract 29 from each n_i so that the condition becomes a b + c d + e = 0 instead.
- **Now if we add five consecutive** n_i , we get

$$n_i + n_{i+1} + n_{i+2} + n_{i+3} + n_{i+4} = (n_i - n_{i+1} + n_{i+2} - n_{i+3} + n_{i+4}) + 2(n_{i+1} + n_{i+3})$$

= 2(n_{i+1} + n_{i+3}),

which is even.

Replacing *i* with i + 1 and subtracting, we find that $n_i - n_{i+5}$ is also even.
CAD ODUCOO

Example

We call a 5-tuple of integers arrangeable if its elements can be labelled a, b, c, d, e in some order so that a - b + c - d + e = 29. Determine all 2017-tuples of integers $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{2017}$ such that if we place them in a circle in clockwise order, then any 5-tuple of numbers in consecutive positions on the circle is arrangeable.

Since $n_i - n_{i+5}$ is even, n_i and n_{i+5} have the same parity.

Example

- Since $n_i n_{i+5}$ is even, n_i and n_{i+5} have the same parity.
- Then $n_1, n_6, \ldots, n_{2016}$ have the same parity. But the numbers are arranged clockwise, so n_{2016} and n_4 have the same parity, and the pattern continues, until we find that every n_i has the same parity.

Example

- Since $n_i n_{i+5}$ is even, n_i and n_{i+5} have the same parity.
- Then $n_1, n_6, \ldots, n_{2016}$ have the same parity. But the numbers are arranged clockwise, so n_{2016} and n_4 have the same parity, and the pattern continues, until we find that every n_i has the same parity.
- Now, since $n_i + n_{i+1} + n_{i+2} + n_{i+3} + n_{i+4}$ is even, we can conclude that every n_i is even.

Example

- Since $n_i n_{i+5}$ is even, n_i and n_{i+5} have the same parity.
- Then $n_1, n_6, \ldots, n_{2016}$ have the same parity. But the numbers are arranged clockwise, so n_{2016} and n_4 have the same parity, and the pattern continues, until we find that every n_i has the same parity.
- Now, since $n_i + n_{i+1} + n_{i+2} + n_{i+3} + n_{i+4}$ is even, we can conclude that every n_i is even.
- Now we can suppose that we have some solution for which $\sum_{i=1}^{2017} |n_i| = S$ is minimal.

Example

We call a 5-tuple of integers arrangeable if its elements can be labelled a, b, c, d, e in some order so that a - b + c - d + e = 29. Determine all 2017-tuples of integers $n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_{2017}$ such that if we place them in a circle in clockwise order, then any 5-tuple of numbers in consecutive positions on the circle is arrangeable.

Since every n_i is even, we can take $n_i/2$ as a new solution.

Example

- Since every n_i is even, we can take $n_i/2$ as a new solution.
- If S > 0, then this solution has a smaller absolute sum of S/2, so must contradict the minimality of the original solution.

Example

- Since every n_i is even, we can take $n_i/2$ as a new solution.
- If S > 0, then this solution has a smaller absolute sum of S/2, so must contradict the minimality of the original solution.
- Thus, S = 0, but then $n_i = 0$.

Example

- Since every n_i is even, we can take $n_i/2$ as a new solution.
- If S > 0, then this solution has a smaller absolute sum of S/2, so must contradict the minimality of the original solution.
- Thus, S = 0, but then $n_i = 0$.
- We subtracted 29 from each n_i originally, so the only solution is then $n_i = 29$ for all *i*.