

**MASSACHUSETTS MATHEMATICS  
CONTEST 6 - MARCH 2013 SOLUTION KEY**

**Team Round**

$$A) \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 1 & k \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -1 \\ 2 & k-3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 \cdot 4 + 2 \cdot 2 & 3 \cdot (-1) + 2(k-3) \\ 1 \cdot 4 + 2k & 1 \cdot (-1) + k(k-3) \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 16 & 2k-9 \\ 2k+4 & k^2-3k-1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Taking the determinant,

$$16(k^2 - 3k - 1) - (2k + 4)(2k - 9) = 16k^2 - 48k - 16 - 4k^2 + 10k + 36 = 12k^2 - 38k + 20 = 60$$

Therefore,

$$12k^2 - 38k - 40 = 2(6k^2 - 19k - 20) = 2(k - 4)(6k + 5) = 0$$

Thus,  $k = 4, -\frac{5}{6}$ .

Alternative solution:

Invoking the theorem  $\det(AB) = \det(A) \cdot \det(B)$ , we have

$$\det \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 1 & k \end{bmatrix} = 3k - 2, \quad \det \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -1 \\ 2 & k-3 \end{bmatrix} = 4k - 12 + 2 = 4k - 10$$

Then:  $(3k - 2)(4k - 10) = 60 \Rightarrow 12k^2 - 38k - 40 = 0$  and the same result follows.

It is left to you as an exercise to prove the theorem that

for all  $2 \times 2$  matrices  $A$  and  $B$ ,  $\det(AB) = \det(A) \cdot \det(B)$ .

Is this true for any square matrices?

Prove (or disprove) your contention.

Send your proof or counterexamples to [olson.re@gmail.com](mailto:olson.re@gmail.com).

The best write-ups will be included in the solution set of the next contest.

Everyone likes to see themselves in print, except certain babies who don't like cash!