

1. • Couldn't find the Gaddis HW pages, will try later

2. - Compute $\arg\max \prod_i \vec{v}$ where $\vec{v} = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i]$ such that $v_i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\sum_i \vec{v} = n$

Proof by induction:

Suppose we have $\vec{v} = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l]$ satisfying $\sum_i \vec{v} = n$

One optimization that we can make is that for any \vec{v} with elements $v_i \neq v_j$, we can construct a vector $\vec{\lambda}$, where $\lambda_i = \lambda_j = \frac{v_i + v_j}{2}$, and $\lambda_{a \neq i, a \neq j} = v_a$. We can then argue that

$$\prod_i \vec{\lambda} > \prod_i \vec{v}$$

Proof

Let $p = \prod_i \vec{v}$. We can say that $\prod_i \vec{\lambda} = \frac{p}{v_i v_j} \cdot \lambda_i \lambda_j$. Therefore, $\frac{\prod_i \vec{\lambda}}{p} = \frac{\frac{p}{v_i v_j} \cdot \lambda_i \lambda_j}{p} = \frac{\lambda_i \lambda_j}{v_i v_j}$

To prove that $\prod_i \vec{\lambda} > \prod_i \vec{v}$, we can prove that $\frac{\lambda_i \lambda_j}{v_i v_j} > 1$

$$\lambda_i \lambda_j = \left(\frac{v_i + v_j}{2}\right)^2$$

$$\frac{\lambda_i \lambda_j}{v_i v_j} > 1$$

$$\frac{\left(\frac{v_i + v_j}{2}\right)^2}{v_i v_j} > 1$$

$$\frac{(v_i + v_j)^2}{4v_i v_j} > 1$$

$$(v_i + v_j)^2 > 4v_i v_j$$

$$v_i^2 + 2v_i v_j + v_j^2 > 4v_i v_j$$

$$v_i^2 - 2v_i v_j + v_j^2 > 0$$

$$(v_i - v_j)^2 > 0$$

Since $v_i \neq v_j$, $v_i - v_j$ cannot be 0, therefore its square will always be greater than 0.

This proves that the optimal list (allowing $v_i \in \mathbb{Q}, v_i \geq 1$) has all elements equal.

Solving for v_i

Now that we know all entries of \vec{v} are equal, we can solve for the value of any entry, which we will denote v_i .

$$\sum_i \vec{v} = n$$

$$\sum_i^l v_i = n$$

$$l \cdot v_i = n$$

$$v_i = \frac{n}{l}$$

The next thing to determine is the optimal length. Since we know that all elements of the vector are the same, we now have a simple expression for the term we want to maximize

$$\prod_i \vec{v} = \prod_i v_i = v_i^l = \left(\frac{n}{l}\right)^l$$

Where $1 \leq l \leq n$

To optimize this term, we can use simple calculus. Let $f(x) = \left(\frac{n}{x}\right)^x$. To find the extrema, we just find the zeroes of $f'(x)$

$$\begin{aligned} f'(x) &= \frac{d}{dx} \left(\frac{n}{x}\right)^x \\ &= \frac{d}{dx} \left(e^{x \ln \frac{n}{x}}\right) \\ &= e^{x \ln \frac{n}{x}} \cdot \left(\ln\left(\frac{n}{x}\right) - 1\right) \end{aligned}$$

A power term can never be zero, so for this to be zero, $\ln\left(\frac{n}{x}\right) - 1 = 0$

This means that $\ln\left(\frac{n}{x}\right) = 1$, so $\frac{n}{x} = e$, so $x = \frac{n}{e}$

l must be an integer, so we can say that $l = \text{round}\left(\frac{n}{e}\right)$

This gives us our final (unrounded) vector

$$\vec{v} = [v_1, v_2, \dots, v_l]$$

such that $l = \text{round}\left(\frac{n}{e}\right)$ and for $i \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq i \leq l$, $v_i = \frac{n}{l}$

Rigorous definition of $\text{round}(x)$:

$$\text{round}(x) : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} = \begin{cases} \lfloor x \rfloor & \text{if } x - \lfloor x \rfloor < \frac{1}{2} \\ \lceil x \rceil & \text{if } x - \lfloor x \rfloor > \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}$$

$\text{round}(x)$ is not defined for $x = w \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$, but this is not a problem for our use case.

Proof by contradiction:

Suppose we did have an undefined value for $\text{round}(x)$ in our math. The only place we use

$\text{round}(x)$ is in $\text{round}\left(\frac{n}{e}\right)$, so that would imply that $\frac{n}{e} = w \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n}{e} &= \frac{2w+1}{2} \\ n &= e \frac{2w+1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

$$e = \frac{2n}{2w+1}$$

This would imply that $e \in \mathbb{Q}$, since it equals the ratio of 2 whole numbers. However, e is known to be transcendental, and therefore we have a contradiction. Therefore, we will never run into the edge case for $\text{round}(x)$; it will always be defined for our inputs.

The above equations always give the optimal result, but they do it for elements in the rational numbers, not the integers. I thought I had a system for rounding that always produced the optimal output (shown below), but I found some counterexamples, and I can't figure out how to move forward. I apologize for taking so long on this homework (and not even completing it fully), while also not answering this question satisfactorily. For a computer algorithm, one could start with the guess generated by the above equations, and just test a few different combinations of lengths and entries near the given values. I don't think I'm quite skilled enough at math to figure out a closed form solution for solving this with natural number entries.

To round these terms, we can write $v_i = w + \frac{a}{b}$, where $w \in \mathbb{N}$. This is valid since we know that v_i is a rational number, being a ratio of two integers. We can then say that for a vector $\vec{\lambda}$ with rounded terms, $\lambda_i = w$ when $(i - 1 \bmod b) \leq b - a$, and $w + 1$ otherwise. For example, the vector $\vec{v} = [3\frac{1}{3}, 3\frac{1}{3}, 3\frac{1}{3}]$ would round to $[3, 3, 4]$, and the vector $\vec{v} = [3\frac{2}{3}, 3\frac{2}{3}, 3\frac{2}{3}]$ would round to $[3, 4, 4]$. We can also explicitly solve for the elements. The two unique values in the vector, λ_a and λ_b , can be solved for easily.

$$\lambda_a = \lfloor v_i \rfloor, \lambda_b = \lceil v_i \rceil$$

We also need to solve for the number of each term, in order to calculate $\prod_i \vec{\lambda}$.

Let $(\lambda_a)^\alpha \cdot (\lambda_b)^\beta = \prod_i \vec{\lambda}$, and $\alpha + \beta = l$

First, notice that because $v_i = w + \frac{a}{b} = \frac{n}{l}$, $l = \frac{n}{w + \frac{a}{b}} = \frac{n}{\frac{wb+a}{b}} = b \frac{n}{wb+a}$, which means that

$l \bmod b = 0$. This means that stepping through all values of i , from 0 to l , always completes $\frac{l}{b}$ cycles. During each cycle, the number of i values that get mapped to λ_a is the number of $1 \leq i \leq b$ values that satisfy $i - 1 \leq b - a$, which just equals $b - a$. Therefore, we have $\frac{l}{b}$ cycles, each with $b - a$ values that map to λ_a , so

$$\alpha = \frac{l}{b}(b - a)$$

We can now easily solve for β

$$\alpha + \beta = l$$

$$\beta = l - \alpha$$

$$\beta = l - \frac{l}{b}(b - a)$$

$$\beta = l - \frac{l(b - a)}{b}$$

$$\beta = \frac{lb - l(b - a)}{b}$$

$$\beta = \frac{lb - lb + la}{b}$$

$$\beta = \frac{la}{b}$$

Therefore, we find that

$$\prod_i \vec{\lambda} = \lfloor v_i \rfloor^{\frac{l}{b}(b-a)} \cdot \lceil v_i \rceil^{\frac{la}{b}}$$