# Rod Cutting

#### Manuel Serna-Aguilera

### Introduction

Given a rod of length n units and a table of prices  $p_i$  for i = 1, 2, ..., n, determine the maximum revenue  $r_n$  obtainable by cutting up the rod and selling the pieces.

Note that a rod of length n can be cut in  $2^{(n-1)}$  different ways.

Next, an example from the book (with the last couple of columns removed for brevity's sake) is used.

## Example

We are given a table of lengths and associated prices.

length $i$	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
price $p_i$	1	5	8	9	10	17	17	20

Now, with the following formula we can find the optimal cost  $r_i$  of the cutting a rod of length i, where  $p_i$  is the price for a rod of length i.

$$r_i = \max_{1 \le i < j} \{ p_i + r_{j-i} \}$$

Now, start the procedure, starting from

$$r_0 = 0$$

$$r_1 = 1$$

$$r_2 = \{1 + r_{2-1} = 1 + r_1 = 1 + 1 = 2, 5 + r_{2-2} = 5 + r_0 = 5 + 0 = 5\}$$
  
=5

$$r_3 = \{1 + r_{3-1} = 1 + r_2 = 1 + 5 = 6,$$
  
 $5 + r_{3-2} = 5 + r_1 = 5 + 1 = 6,$   
 $8 + r_{3-3} = 8 + r_0 = 8 + 0 = 8\}$   
 $= 8$ 

$$r_4 = \{1 + r_3 = 1 + 8 = 9$$

$$5 + r_2 = 5 + 5 = 10$$

$$8 + r_1 = 8 + 1 = 9$$

$$9 + r_0 = 9 + 0 = 9\}$$

$$= 10$$

Now, simplifying the process to only show the max values.

$$r_5 = 13$$

$$r_6 = 17$$

$$r_7 = 18$$

$$r_8 = \{1 + r_{8-1} = 1 + r_7 = 1 + 18 = 19,$$

$$= 5 + r_{8-2} = 5 + r_6 = 5 + 17 = 22,$$

$$= 8 + r_{8-3} = 8 + r_5 = 8 + 13 = 21,$$

$$= 9 + r_{8-4} = 9 + r_4 = 9 + 10 = 19,$$

$$= 10 + r_{8-5} = 10 + r_3 = 10 + 8 = 18,$$

$$= 17 + r_{8-6} = 17 + r_2 = 17 + 5 = 22,$$

$$= 17 + r_{8-7} = 17 + r_1 = 17 + 1 = 18,$$

$$= 20 + r_{8-8} = 20 + r_0 = 20 + 0 = 20\}$$

$$= 22$$

So lengths 6 and 2 combined give the highest profit. The max value of  $r_2$  and  $r_6$  are themselves, so no more cutting. The ordering of the rods of length 2 or 6 does not matter.

## Solving with code

A regular recursive solution, even for small inputs, may have exponential running time due to repeating many calculations. Instead, use a little more memory to store calculation results. Remember that the bottom-down approach to dynamic programming is often better.