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## Solution

(i) The other 4 orderings can be written out as follows, where a X indicates an unsafe packing order:

|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B | 4 | 4 |  |
| C | 12 | 9 | 4 Y |
| A | 5 | 6 | 16 X |


|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C | 12 | 9 |  |
| B | 4 | 4 | 12 X |
| A | 5 | 6 | 16 X |


|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| A | 5 | 6 |  |
| C | 12 | 9 | 5 Y |
| B | 4 | 4 | 17 X |


|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| C | 12 | 9 |  |
| A | 5 | 6 | 12 X |
| B | 4 | 4 | 17 X |

So none of the 4 are safe.
(ii) [It is slightly unclear whether we are supposed to be dealing with the general case here, or just the Apples, Bread \& Carrots case. However, there is only one safe order for the Apples, Bread \& Carrots example, and this occurs with the weights in the suggested order (ie heaviest at the bottom etc) - thereby not providing a counter-example).

The following provides a counter-example:

|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| X | 4 | 4 |  |
| Y | 5 | 11 |  |
| Z | 6 | 8 | $4+5>8 X$ |


|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| X | 4 | 4 |  |
| Z | 6 | 8 | $4<8 Y$ |
| Y | 5 | 11 | $4+6<11 Y$ |

(iii) The following provides a counter-example:

|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| X | 2 | 4 |  |
| Y | 5 | 5 |  |
| Z | 3 | 6 | $2+5>6 X$ |


|  | $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ | weight above |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| X | 2 | 4 |  |
| Z | 3 | 6 | $2<6 Y$ |
| Y | 5 | 5 | $2+3=5 Y$ |

(iv)
Before

| W |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $w_{j}$ | $s_{j}$ |
| $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ |

After

| W |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $w_{i}$ | $s_{i}$ |
| $w_{j}$ | $s_{j}$ |

where W is the weight above the $j$ th item initially

The only item that could be adversely affected by the swap is item $j$. After the swap the order will still be safe if $W+w_{i} \leq s_{j}$ or $s_{j}-w_{i}-W \geq 0$

We are told that $w_{j}-s_{i} \geq w_{i}-s_{j}$
and also, because the initial order was safe from the point of view of item $i), W+w_{j} \leq s_{i}$ (2)

From (1), $s_{j}-w_{i} \geq s_{i}-w_{j}$
And from (2), $-W \geq w_{j}-s_{i}$
So $s_{j}-w_{i}-W \geq\left(s_{i}-w_{j}\right)+\left(w_{j}-s_{i}\right)=0$, as required.
(v) $w_{j}-s_{i} \geq w_{i}-s_{j}$ is equivalent to $w_{j}+s_{j} \geq w_{i}+s_{i}$

So, from (iv), an order is not made worse (ie changing from a safe order to an unsafe one) by swapping rows so that the higher value of $w_{r}+s_{r}$ is moved to the lower row.

We can therefore start with the rows ordered by the size of $w_{r}+s_{r}$, with the smallest value at the top (order X say), and this cannot be worse than any other order.

If a safe order exists then order $X$ will be one of them (it may be the only one though, as in the case of the fruit example).

