

Mathematicorum

Crux

Published by the Canadian Mathematical Society.




<http://crux.math.ca/>

The Back Files

The CMS is pleased to offer free access to its back file of all issues of Crux as a service for the greater mathematical community in Canada and beyond.

Journal title history:

- The first 32 issues, from Vol. 1, No. 1 (March 1975) to Vol. 4, No.2 (February 1978) were published under the name *EUREKA*.
- Issues from Vol. 4, No. 3 (March 1978) to Vol. 22, No. 8 (December 1996) were published under the name *Crux Mathematicorum*.
- Issues from Vol 23., No. 1 (February 1997) to Vol. 37, No. 8 (December 2011) were published under the name *Crux Mathematicorum with Mathematical Mayhem*.
- Issues since Vol. 38, No. 1 (January 2012) are published under the name *Crux Mathematicorum*.



CRUX MATHEMATICORUM

Vol. 12, No. 10
December 1986

Published by the Canadian Mathematical Society/
Publié par la Société Mathématique du Canada

The support of the University of Calgary Department of Mathematics and Statistics is gratefully acknowledged.

*

*

*

CRUX MATHEMATICORUM is a problem-solving journal at the senior secondary and university undergraduate levels for those who practise or teach mathematics. Its purpose is primarily educational, but it serves also those who read it for professional, cultural, or recreational reasons.

It is published monthly (except July and August). The yearly subscription rate for ten issues is \$22.50 for members of the Canadian Mathematical Society and \$25 for nonmembers. Back issues: \$2.75 each. Bound volumes with index: Vols. 1 & 2 (combined) and each of Vols. 3-10: \$20. All prices quoted are in Canadian dollars. Cheques and money orders, payable to CRUX MATHEMATICORUM, should be sent to the Managing Editor.

All communications about the content of the journal should be sent to the Editor. All changes of address and inquiries about subscriptions and back issues should be sent to the Managing Editor.

Founding Editors: Léo Sauvé, Frederick G.B. Maskell.

Editor: G.W. Sands, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Calgary, 2500 University Drive N.W., Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4.

Managing Editor: Dr. Kenneth S. Williams, Canadian Mathematical Society, 577 King Edward Avenue, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, K1N 6N5.

ISSN 0705 - 0348.

Second Class Mail Registration No. 5432. Return Postage Guaranteed.

*

*

*

CONTENTS

To Murray Klamkin - With Thanks	263
The Olympiad Corner: 80	M.S. Klamkin 263
Problems: 1191-1200	281
Solutions: 1054-1061	284
- Index to Volume 12, 1986	294

TO MURRAY KLAMKIN - WITH THANKS

Kenneth S. Williams

Managing Editor, *Crux Mathematicorum*

This is the last issue of *Crux Mathematicorum* in which the Olympiad Corner will be edited by Professor Murray Klamkin. The first Olympiad Corner appeared in Volume 5 (1979) of *Crux*. Since then Murray has written a total of 80 Corners for *Crux*. Over the years Murray has established the Olympiad Corner as a lively and interesting part of *crux*. In it he has provided a wealth of information about the many mathematical competitions taking place in countries around the world, in particular the International, Canadian and U.S.A. Mathematical Olympiads. Murray has also provided hundreds of stimulating practice problems for interested students and teachers to try, as well as many elegant solutions of his own. Murray is certainly one of the very best mathematical problem solvers in Canada today.

On behalf of the Canadian Mathematical Society and the subscribers to *Crux*, I would like to thank Murray for his many years of editing the Olympiad Corner for *Crux Mathematicorum*.

Beginning with the January 1987 issue of *Crux*, the Olympiad Corner will be edited by R.E. Woodrow of the University of Calgary.

*

*

*

THE OLYMPIAD CORNER: 80

M.S. KLAMKIN

All communications about this column should now be sent to the new editor, R.E. Woodrow, Department of Mathematics, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, T2N 1N4.

In late 1978, Léo Sauvé, the founding editor of this journal, invited me to contribute material on mathematical competitions on a regular basis. Little did I know what I was getting into when I agreed to do so. The first Olympiad Corner appeared in the January 1979 issue and the present 80th Corner after 8 years will be my last one. Please continue sending contributions but send them to the new editor named above. Nevertheless, I will still be pleased to hear from former correspondents and to receive copies of

mathematical competitions from around the world.

To me, the problems covered in this Corner have been simultaneously interesting, challenging, frustrating, and time consuming. The presentations of these Corners through 1985 had been invariably improved by the dedicated editing of Léo Sauvé who rarely let me get away with any "hand-waving arguments". It is fitting that I dedicate my last Corner to him.

Corner 78 [1986: 197-202] contained a written version of my talk on the William Lowell Putnam Mathematics Competition given at the symposium "A Kaleidoscope of Competitions", which was held at the Fifth International Congress of Mathematical Education (I.C.M.E.-5), Adelaide, Australia, August 24-30, 1984. Also at that congress, Professor Arthur Engle and I were invited by Peter O'Halloran, Director of the Australian Mathematics Competitions, and organizer for the congress talks on competitions, to give talks on Problem Creation. Since only brief summaries of these two talks were published (*Proceedings of I.C.M.E.-5*, Birkhäuser Boston Inc., 1986, pp.243-244), I now give the complete version of my paper (not all of which was given at the congress due to time constraints).

*

PROBLEM PROPOSING AND MATHEMATICAL CREATIVITY

There are very many mathematical competitions, at many levels, being given around the world each year. For a treatment of a number of these, see the *Proceedings* of the congress mentioned above and the bibliography in [1]. As a consequence of these very many competitions, there have been quite a number of duplications of the problems, either inadvertently or in some cases by direct copying. Also, many contest problems have appeared previously in well known books and journals. Since these competitions have apparently become increasingly more important, there are training sessions which help prepare for a number of them. In view of all this, competition examination committees now have to be much more vigilant than ever before in setting their competitions. They must now continually keep abreast of problems set in other competitions. They have to be very careful about duplicating problems from books and journal problem sections. Even if the book or journal used is not too well known, the problems used could have already been duplicated in other books and journals that are well known. To play safe, problems should either be new or else based on some nice result from some non-recent mathematical paper. This brings us back to the theme of this congress session, "How does

one create new problems?".

In almost all my previous papers concerned with problem solving and proposing, I have highly recommended the following five books of George Pólya. To me they are still the best books around dealing with the subject.

How to Solve It, Doubleday, New York, 1957.

Mathematical Discovery, Vol. I, Wiley, New York, 1962.

Mathematical Discovery, Vol. II, Wiley, New York, 1965.

Induction and Analogy in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1954.

Patterns of Plausible Inference, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1954.

In this paper, I will be concerned with the creative aspects of problem solving and proposing. Although the psychological aspects of creativity in mathematics are important, I will dwell mostly on the mathematical aspects. This is mainly due to the fact that I do not know much about the psychological aspects.

In solving or creating problems it is certainly quite helpful to have a good memory and to be observant. George Pólya makes the analogy of finding a precious uncut stone on the shore and tossing it away since it is not recognized as being valuable. One has to do a certain amount of cutting and polishing before the value of the stone is recognized, although an expert usually can get away with just a careful examination. So in regard to a problem which has just been solved or whose solution has been looked up, we should not immediately pass on to something else. Rather, we should "stand back" and re-examine the problem in light of its solution and ask ourselves whether or not the solution really gets to the "heart" of the problem. Mathematically, one of the points being made here is to check whether or not the hypotheses of the problem are necessary for the result. (That the hypotheses are sufficient follows from the validity of the result.) Additionally, although our solution may be valid, there may be and usually are better ways of looking at the problem which make the result and the proof more transparent and can as well lead to extensions. Consequently, it should be easier to understand the result and the proof as well as to give a non-trivial extension. I will illustrate these remarks by considering a number of elementary mathematical results and will show how, by careful re-examination, one can be led to more general results, some of which are considerably more sophisticated. How well one will succeed in this process will of course


depend on one's powers of observation, knowledge, memory, and persistence, in addition to any natural creative ability.

1. Chords and Diagonals

For the first illustration, let us consider the intuitive and known result that the largest chord of a circle is a diameter. One simple proof follows by connecting the end points A, B of the chord to the center O of the circle and using the triangle inequality:

$$AB < AO + BO = \text{diameter}.$$

1.1 Usually, many students and teachers do not bother with the proof, and those that do usually pass on quickly to something else since the proof is so simple. However, as mentioned previously, let us "stand back" and examine the result in light of its proof. One of the questions to ask ourselves is "are all the properties of the circle necessary for this result?" One possibility for a generalization is to enlarge the class of figures from circles to those which are centrosymmetric. Again it is intuitive (but perhaps not as much as before) that the largest chord must contain the center. The following proof is just a slight modification of the previous one. Referring to the figure, we see that



$$AB < AO + BO \leq 2 \max\{AO, BO\} = \max\{AA', BB'\}.$$

It is to be noted that this last result is valid for any centrosymmetric set of points in any dimension. Basically, what has been proved is that the longest chord of a parallelogram is the longest diagonal.

1.2 Again there may be a temptation to either rest or pass on to something else. But let us be persistent and see if we cannot extend the last result. Naturally, how well we succeed here is a function of our persistence, our knowledge, our experience, etc. Usually, there will be many false starts and lots of wasted paper, but that is all part of the process.

The parallelogram idea leads one to consider the analogous problem of determining the longest chord of a polygon or even a polytope in any dimension. We will show that the endpoints of the longest chord are two of the vertices of the polygon or polytope. This is also a known result. A

geometric proof for polygons is given by Rademacher and Toeplitz [2] and a vector proof for polytopes is given in [3]. For completeness here, we give the vector proof.

We need only consider convex polytopes. For if the result is valid for the convex hull of an arbitrary polytope, it is also valid for the polytope. Let $\vec{v}_1, \vec{v}_2, \dots, \vec{v}_n$ denote vectors from a common origin to the vertices of the polytope. Then


$$\vec{r}' = \sum w'_i \vec{v}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \vec{r} = \sum w_j \vec{v}_j,$$

where $w'_i, w_j \geq 0$ and $\sum w'_i = \sum w_j = 1$, will denote two vectors from the common origin to two points within or on the boundary of the polytope. Using the triangle inequality repeatedly and the properties of w'_i and w_j , we get the following sequence of inequalities:


$$\begin{aligned} |\vec{r}' - \vec{r}| &= \left| \sum_i w'_i (\vec{v}_i - \vec{r}) \right| \leq \sum_i w'_i |\vec{v}_i - \vec{r}| \leq \max_i |\vec{v}_i - \vec{r}| \\ &\leq \max_{i,j} \left| \sum_j w_j (\vec{v}_i - \vec{v}_j) \right| \leq \max_i \sum_j w_j |\vec{v}_i - \vec{v}_j| \leq \max_{i,j} |\vec{v}_i - \vec{v}_j|. \end{aligned}$$

1.3 At this stage, we may again be tempted to pass on to something else. However, we will still persist in looking for other extensions. Here is where a knowledge base and memory comes in. After a while, triggered off by the above results, I remembered the result that for any convex quadrilateral there is at least one side which is smaller than the greater of the diagonals of the quadrilateral [4]. Then after playing around (experimenting), I conjectured that for any convex n -gon, there are at least $n - 2$ sides which are shorter than the longest diagonal, and furthermore, $n - 2$ is best possible. After more playing around, I came up with the following proof. For simplicity, I illustrate the proof for a hexagon; however, the proof carries through for an n -gon.

Our proof is indirect. We assume that there are at least three sides of the hexagon which are greater than or equal to the longest diagonal. Labelling these three sides as a, b, c we have the following possible configurations:



The "worst" configuration for our proof will be the first one. Since in a triangle the greatest angle is opposite the greatest side, we have: in $\triangle ABC$, $\angle B \leq \pi/3$; in $\triangle ABCD$, $\angle C \leq \pi/3$; in $\triangle ACDE$, $\angle D \leq \pi/2$; in $\triangle DEF$, $\angle E \leq \pi$; in $\triangle EFA$, $\angle F \leq \pi$; and in $\triangle FAB$, $\angle A \leq \pi/2$. This leads to a contradiction since the sum of the interior angles of an n -gon is $(n - 2)\pi$. For the other two configurations, the sum of the interior angles would be bounded by a number even smaller than $11\pi/3$. The next figure shows that $n - 2$ is best possible (for $n = 6$).



No doubt a person with more persistence, knowledge and creativity can find further extensions of the previous results. The subsequent illustrations will be treated in a less extended way.


2. Equilateral and Equiangular Polygons [5].

It is a well known elementary result that all equilateral triangles are equiangular and, conversely, that all equiangular triangles are equilateral. One simple proof follows by considering the equilateral or equiangular triangle to be congruent to itself in different ways. Since the proof is nice and simple and the result does not extend to polygons, we usually pass on to something else. Note that a rhombus need not be a square and a rectangle need not be a square.

2.1 Before quitting the search for an extension, we should check whether or not we have inadvertently left out some conditions. One difference between triangles and higher order polygons is that a triangle always has a

circumcircle. So let us restrict the class of polygons to those which can be inscribed in a circle. Now it follows easily that all inscribed equilateral polygons are equiangular but not conversely (which again follows by considering the rectangle).

2.2 Let us re-examine why the rectangle is a counterexample. Referring to the figure, where it is assumed the n -gon is equiangular, we obtain the simultaneous set of linear equations



$$\theta_1 + \theta_2 = k,$$

$$\theta_2 + \theta_3 = k,$$

⋮

$$\theta_n + \theta_1 = k,$$

from which

$$\theta_1 = \theta_3 = \theta_5 = \dots = \theta_{n-1},$$

$$\theta_2 = \theta_4 = \theta_6 = \dots = \theta_n.$$

If n is odd, the angles are constant and the polygon is regular; if n is even, the polygon need not be regular. This latter result is ascribed by H.S.M. Coxeter to M. Riesz.

2.3 The figure and the set of equations suggest an extension of the result of Riesz. We first define a d -diagonal of an n -gon, with $2d \leq n$, as a diagonal which "skips" $d - 1$ vertices (e.g., in the above figure, A_1A_2 is a 1-diagonal and A_1A_4 is a 3-diagonal). One can now show that if all the d -diagonals (d fixed) of an inscribed n -gon are congruent and $(n, d) = 1$, then the polygon is regular (when $d = 2$, we get Riesz's result). For a proof and similar results for circumscribed polygons, see [2].

2.4 Instead of going from a triangle to a polygon, we can consider the 3-dimensional extension to tetrahedra. Here if all the edges are congruent, it follows easily that all the face angles are congruent and that all the dihedral angles are congruent. I leave it as an exercise to show that if all the dihedral angles are congruent then the tetrahedron is regular, and to extend this result to n -dimensional simplexes, for which there are many

different sets of angles to consider.

3. Intersecting Curves on a Surface [6].

It is well known that two great circles of a sphere always intersect in two points which are antipodal. The usual proof follows by noting that the planes of the two circles must both contain the center of the sphere and thus the planes have a line of intersection which includes a common diameter of the two great circles.

3.1 Although a first proof of a given result can lead to an extension, in many cases it is an alternate proof that more readily leads to the extension. Another proof which appears more basic is that since each circle divides the surface into two congruent regions, the circles must intersect. This gives the following generalization whose proof is identical except for the replacing of "circles" by "curves":

If two simple closed centrosymmetric curves lie on a simple closed centrosymmetric surface homeomorphic to a sphere, with all three having the same center, then the two curves intersect.

By centrosymmetry, the points of intersection will occur in pairs of antipodal points. Also, it is to be noted that the result is not valid on a multiconnected surface, e.g., a torus.

3.2 On looking back at the previous proof it will be seen that the condition of centrosymmetry is not necessary. It was essential only that the surface and the two curves each be mapped into themselves by a reflection through a common point. We now formalize these ideas. Let O denote an interior point of a three-dimensional region starlike with respect to O , and with boundary S , and consider a mapping f of S into itself such that each point of S goes into its antipodal point with respect to O . The result in 3.1 can now be extended to:

If C_1 and C_2 are two simple closed curves on S such that C_1 and C_2 each map into themselves under the mapping f , then C_1 and C_2 intersect in pairs of antipodal points with respect to O .

3.3 On re-examination of this result and its proof, we see that a wider generalization is possible which is given by:

If C_1 and C_2 are two simple closed curves on a simple closed surface S and f is a continuous mapping, without fixed points, of S into itself such that $C_1 = f(C_1)$ and $C_2 = f(C_2)$, then $C_1 \cap C_2 \neq \emptyset$.

A proof follows by using the Brouwer fixed point theorem; see [6].

Even though what one should be looking for in the re-examination of known results has been indicated in the above examples, re-examination does not automatically lead to further non-trivial results. To aid in this re-examination, we consider some heuristics given by Pólya in his books mentioned earlier, namely: *specialize, generalize and make analogies*. I now give some further illustrations.

4. Maximum Number of Terms in a Sequence.

(IMO, 1977, #2) *In a finite sequence of real numbers, the sum of any seven successive terms is negative, and the sum of any eleven successive terms is positive. Determine the maximum number of terms in the sequence.*

Let the sequence be A_1, A_2, \dots . By considering the array

$$\begin{array}{cccc} A_1 & A_2 & \dots & A_7 \\ A_2 & A_3 & \dots & A_8 \\ A_3 & A_4 & \dots & A_9 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{17} \end{array}$$

it follows that the number of terms is less than 17, and by an explicit construction it can be shown that 16 is the maximum.

4.1 One possible generalization is to vary the numbers given in the problem. This was done by the English contestant John Rickard, who deservedly won a special prize for it. He replaced 7 and 11 by two relatively prime integers p and q and then showed that the maximum number is $p + q - 2$. A further extension appeared in *Mathematical Spectrum* 12 (1979/80) 61 where now $(p, q) = d$. A still further extension is to require the additional condition that the sum of any r successive terms is zero.

5. Isoperimetric Inequality [7].

It is known that the isoperimetric quotient $I.Q. = A/P^2$ for triangles of area A and perimeter P is a maximum for the equilateral case.

5.1 On "playing around" with this, one is led to the following:

Given that A_1 is an interior point of an equilateral triangle ABC and A_2 is an interior point of triangle A_1BC , then

$$I.Q.(A_1BC) > I.Q.(A_2BC).$$

One expects this inequality since one feels intuitively that A_1BC is "closer" to being an equilateral triangle than A_2BC is.

5.2 By increasing the dimensionality of the problem, one can consider the analogous inequalities for a simplex in E^n , for which there are many different isoperimetric quotients. In particular for E^3 , given that A_1 is an interior point of a regular tetrahedron $ABCD$ and that A_2 is an interior point of tetrahedron A_1BCD , then $I.Q.(A_1BCD) > I.Q.(A_2BCD)$ where here the isoperimetric quotient of a tetrahedron T is defined by

$$I.Q.(T) = \text{Vol}(T)/[\text{Area}(T)]^{3/2}.$$

A proof is given in [4]. For another isoperimetric quotient, replace Area ^{3/2} by the total edge length cubed.

6. Maximum Volume of a Tetrahedron.

(IMO, 1967, #2) *Prove that if one and only one edge of a tetrahedron is greater than 1, then its volume is $\leq 1/8$.*

6.1 We can extend the problem simultaneously in two different ways as in [8]:

Determine the maximum volume of an n -dimensional simplex if at most r edges are greater in length than 1 ($r = 1, 2, \dots, n$).

This problem is still open. The special case $n = 3$, $r = 2$ or 3 is solved in [9]. For the $r = 3$ case it is also assumed that the 3 edges longer than 1 cannot all be concurrent, otherwise the volume can be unbounded.

7. A Two Triangle Inequality.

(Putnam, 1982, B-6) *If $K(x,y,z)$ denotes the area of a triangle of sides $x, y, and z$, prove that*

$$\sqrt{K(a,b,c)} + \sqrt{K(a',b',c')} \leq \sqrt{K(a+a',b+b',c+c')}.$$

This inequality is a special case of one derived by me in [10], and I now give the motivation for its derivation. A well known elementary inequality for the sides a, b, c of a triangle is

$$abc \geq (a+b-c)(b+c-a)(c+a-b) \quad (1)$$

with equality if and only if $a = b = c$. For a variety of different proofs of this, and for other references, see [8]. One of the simplest proofs is to square both sides and note that $a^2 \geq a^2 - (b-c)^2$, etc. Apparently this proof does not readily lead to any significant extensions. However, by interpreting (1) geometrically, we are led to several generalizations by an averaging process over the sides of the triangle.

We consider here another triangle $A'B'C'$ where

$$a' = (b + c)/2, \quad b' = (c + a)/2, \quad c' = (a + b)/2.$$

Since $s = s'$ (equal semi-perimeters), and triangle $A'B'C'$ is "closer" to an equilateral triangle than ABC , we should expect that $K(A'B'C') \geq K(ABC)$. Since $8K^2(A'B'C') = abcs$, the latter inequality is equivalent to (1).

More generally, we should expect the same area inequality for any reasonable averaging transformation which makes triangle $A'B'C'$ "more equilateral" than ABC . More precisely, if

$$a' = ua + vb + wc,$$

$$b' = va + wb + uc,$$

$$c' = wa + ub + vc,$$

where

$$u + v + w = 1, \quad u, v, w \geq 0,$$

then $s' = s$ and $K(A'B'C') \geq K(ABC)$. This last triangle inequality is equivalent to

$$(xa+yb+zc)(ya+zb+xc)(za+xb+yc) \geq (a+b-c)(b+c-a)(c+a-b)$$

where

$$x + y + z = 1, \quad -1 \leq x, y, z \leq 1.$$

7.1. We can generalize further by letting a_i, b_i, c_i denote the sides of n triangles $A_i B_i C_i$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$). Then the three numbers

$$a = \sum w_i a_i, \quad b = \sum w_i b_i, \quad c = \sum w_i c_i,$$

where $\sum w_i = 1$, $w_i \geq 0$, are possible sides for a triangle ABC . Then,

$$K(ABC)^2 = \sum w_i s_i \cdot \sum w_i (s_i - a_i) \cdot \sum w_i (s_i - b_i) \cdot \sum w_i (s_i - c_i)$$

and $s = \sum w_i s_i$. Applying Cauchy's inequality twice yields

$$\sqrt{K(ABC)} \geq \sum w_i \sqrt{K(A_i B_i C_i)}$$

with equality if and only if the n triangles are directly similar. Further inequalities can be obtained by averaging over the angles of the triangle [7].

8. Weierstrass Product Inequality.

In a recent problem-solving paper by Schoenfeld [12], there is a discussion about the following problem:

Let a, b, c , and d be given numbers in $[0, 1]$. Prove that

$$(1 - a)(1 - b)(1 - c)(1 - d) \geq 1 - a - b - c - d.$$

(We have changed the problem insignificantly by taking a closed interval

rather than an open one.) Schoenfeld notes: "Virtually all of the mathematicians I've watched solving it begin by proving the inequality $(1 - a)(1 - b) \geq 1 - a - b$. Then they multiply this inequality, in turn, by $(1 - c)$ and $(1 - d)$ to prove the three- and four-variable versions of it". Incidentally, this corresponds to Pólya's heuristic, *specialize*. The proof for the n -variable version follows inductively. In a competition or on an exam, any method which works fairly quickly is just fine. However, if one wishes to get to the heart of the inequality, inductive proofs are usually not the way to go. This may be one of the subconscious reasons that many students shun such proofs.

An important property of the above inequality is that it is linear in each of the variables. Therefore, the inequality holds since it holds when each variable is at an endpoint of the interval $[0,1]$. Not only is this proof more satisfactory than the inductive one, it leads to the following generalizations quite easily.

8.1 The right hand side of the n -variable inequality

$$(1 - x_1)(1 - x_2) \dots (1 - x_n) \geq 1 - x_1 - x_2 - \dots - x_n$$

(where $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$) is just the constant term plus the linear part of the product of the left hand side. So why stop with the linear terms! If we define T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n by

$$(t + x_1)(t + x_2) \dots (t + x_n) \equiv t^n + T_1 t^{n-1} + T_2 t^{n-2} + \dots + T_n ,$$

then for $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$,

$$1 - T_1 + T_2 - \dots + T_{2r} \geq \prod_{i=1}^n (1 - x_i) \geq 1 - T_1 + T_2 - \dots - T_{2s+1}$$

where $r = 0, 1, \dots, [n/2]$, $s = 0, 1, \dots, [(n - 1)/2]$. This last result is obviously valid if all the x_i are zero. If $m (> 0)$ of the x_i are 1 and the rest are zero, then all we need show is that

$$\begin{bmatrix} m \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} m \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots + \begin{bmatrix} m \\ 2r \end{bmatrix} \geq 0 \geq \begin{bmatrix} m \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} m \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} + \dots - \begin{bmatrix} m \\ 2s+1 \end{bmatrix} ,$$

which follows by the unimodal and symmetric character of the binomial coefficients.

9. An Inequality.

If $1 \geq a, b, c \geq 0$, then

$$\frac{a}{b+c+1} + \frac{b}{c+a+1} + \frac{c}{a+b+1} + (1-a)(1-b)(1-c) \leq 1.$$

This inequality is a special case of a more general one due to Andre Giroux and first established by him using sophisticated methods. Subsequently he, and independently A. Meir and I, obtained simpler proofs. I then set the proof of the special case above as a problem in the 1980 U.S.A. Mathematical Olympiad. Most of the proofs given in the Olympiad were of the "direct brutal assault" kind not leading easily to extension. A simple proof follows by first noting that the function on the left hand side of the inequality is convex in each of the variables a, b, c . Thus the function takes on its maximum value at the extreme value 0 or 1 for each of the variables, i.e., at some vertex (a,b,c) of a cube whose coordinates are 0's and 1's. Since the value of the function is 1 at each vertex of the cube, we are done.

9.1 In a similar way, we can establish the more general inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^u}{1+s-x_i} + \prod_{i=1}^n (1-x_i)^v \leq 1$$

where $0 \leq x_i \leq 1$; $u, v \geq 1$; and $x_1 + x_2 + \dots + x_n = s$. Giroux's inequality, corresponding to $u = v = 1$, later reappeared as a proposed problem [13].

10. Summations.

Determine the sum $\frac{1}{2!} + \frac{2}{3!} + \dots + \frac{n}{(n+1)!}$.

Schoenfeld [12] notes that most students will begin by doing the addition and placing all the terms over a common denominator, whereas the typical expert will calculate a few cases from which the inductive pattern is clear and easy. If all you want is the answer, this is okay. If you want more, then inductive proofs are not good enough as was indicated above in 8. I would also want the student to learn something about summation of series in general. Summation is analogous to definite integration, where by virtue of the fundamental theorem of calculus, one first tries to obtain the anti-derivative of the integrand. This search is simplified by having a table of integrals which is obtained in a reverse fashion. One merely takes a set of functions and differentiates them, which is an easy direct operation. Then one simply reverses the table to give the integral table. One can do the same thing with discrete sums. The fundamental theorem of finite summation is

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \{F(k) - F(k-1)\} = F(n) - F(0). \quad (2)$$

So to find the above sum, "all we need to do" is express the summand as an "anti-derivative", i.e., as a difference $F(k) - F(k-1)$. Since the summand is

$$\frac{k}{(k+1)!} = \frac{k+1}{(k+1)!} - \frac{1}{(k+1)!} = \frac{1}{k!} - \frac{1}{(k+1)!},$$

the sum is immediately $1 - 1/(n+1)!$.

In general, however, finding the summation anti-derivative can be a difficult problem. To aid in this process, as in integration, we make a summation table in reverse fashion. This is done in books on finite differences, in particular see [14]. Here we start with (2) and make a table by considering various functions F . Finally, we reverse the order of the table. As examples, we have the following:

$$F(k) = (k+1)! \quad \text{yields} \quad \sum_{k=1}^n k \cdot k! = (n+1)! - 1,$$

$$F(k) = \sin(ak + \frac{\alpha}{2} - \frac{\pi}{2}) \quad \text{yields} \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \sin ak = \frac{\sin an/2}{\sin \alpha/2} \cdot \sin \frac{\alpha(n+1)}{2},$$

$$F(k) = \sin(ak + \frac{\alpha}{2}) \quad \text{yields} \quad \sum_{k=1}^n \cos ak = \frac{\sin an/2}{\sin \alpha/2} \cdot \cos \frac{\alpha(n+1)}{2},$$

$$F(k) = k^{m+1} \quad \text{yields}$$

$$\sum_{k=1}^n k^m = \frac{1}{m+1} \left\{ n^{m+1} + \left[\begin{matrix} m+1 \\ 2 \end{matrix} \right] \sum_{k=1}^n k^{m-1} - \left[\begin{matrix} m+1 \\ 3 \end{matrix} \right] \sum_{k=1}^n k^{m-2} + \dots \right\}.$$

Continuing in the same way, we can obtain the sums

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tan^{-1} \left[\frac{x}{n^2 + n + x^2} \right] = \tan^{-1} x,$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n}{2n^4 + 1} = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Derivations of the latter two sums and related ones are given in [15].

It is to be noted that there are times when the inductive method does lead to an essential part of a given result. For example, consider the geometric theorem of T. Hayashi:

If a convex polygon inscribed in a circle be divided into triangles from one of its vertices, then the sum of the radii of the circles in these triangles is the same, whichever vertex is chosen.

An inductive proof leads one to consider the case of a quadrilateral first. In this case, it is the essential and hard part of the proof. The rest is easy.

For our final illustration, we consider an applied problem.

11. Flying in a Wind Field.

It is a known elementary result that if an airplane flies an up and back straight course with a constant speed relative to a constant wind along the course, then the time of flight is greater than if there were no wind. One loses more time on the upwind part of the course than one gains on the downwind part, that is,

$$t = \frac{d}{v+w} + \frac{d}{v-w} = \frac{2vd}{v^2 - w^2} > \frac{d}{v} + \frac{d}{v},$$

where v = constant speed of the airplane, w = constant wind speed, $2d$ = total length of the course, t = time of flight.

11.1 To extend the previous result, let the airplane fly any path and then back along it in an arbitrary continuous stationary wind field. Here the wind speed and direction can vary in space but not in time. By considering the flight back and forth over any small element of the path and by using the above result, slightly modified, we obtain the same time inequality.

11.2 If we examine the expression for t above, we see that it is an increasing function of the wind speed, as is to be expected intuitively. To extend this result to 11.1, we replace the wind field \vec{W} there by $k\vec{W}$ where k is a positive constant. We now wish to show that the time of flight in 11.1 is an increasing function of k .

First we obtain an expression for the total time of flight. Also, for comparison with a subsequent extension, we will assume that the path is a closed one. This is not necessary for the result here.

Let the arc length s denote the position of the plane on its path and let $w(s)$, $\theta(s)$ denote respectively the speed and the direction of the wind field \vec{W} with respect to the tangent line to the path at position s . We will take the plane's speed as 1 and assume that $1 > kw$, otherwise the plane could not make the traverse. By resolving $k\vec{W}$ into components along and normal to the tangent line of the plane's path, the airplane's ground speed is

$$\sqrt{1 - k^2 w^2 \sin^2 \theta + kw \cos \theta}$$

and then the time of flight is given by

$$T(k) = \int_0^L \frac{ds}{\sqrt{1 - k^2 w^2 \sin^2 \theta + kw \cos \theta}} + \int_0^L \frac{ds}{\sqrt{1 - k^2 w^2 \sin^2 \theta - kw \cos \theta}}.$$

By the A.M.-G.M. inequality, the sum of the integrands is greater than or equal to $2(1 - k^2 w^2)^{-1/2} \geq 2$ which shows that $T(k) \geq T(0)$ with equality if and only if $kw = 0$. Then one can show that $T'(0) = 0$ and $T''(k) > 0$ since the integrand will consist solely of positive terms. Thus $T(k)$ is increasing in k .

11.3 The following nice extension was given by T.H. Matthews as a proposed problem [16]:

If an aircraft travels at a constant airspeed, and traverses (with respect to the ground) a closed curve in a horizontal plane, the time taken is always less when there is no wind, than when there is any constant wind.

The solution given here leads immediately to another extension. If we let \vec{W} be the wind velocity and \vec{V} the actual plane velocity (which is tangential to the flight path), then $|\vec{V} - \vec{W}|$ is the constant speed of the airplane (without wind) and will be taken as unity for convenience.

We now have to show that

$$\int \frac{ds}{|\vec{V}|} \geq \int \frac{ds}{1}. \quad (3)$$

By the Schwarz-Buniakowski inequality,

$$\int |\vec{V}| ds \cdot \int \frac{ds}{|\vec{V}|} \geq \{\int ds\}^2. \quad (4)$$

Since

$$\int |\vec{V}| ds = \int \vec{V} \cdot d\vec{R} = \int (\vec{V} - \vec{W}) \cdot d\vec{R} + \int \vec{W} \cdot d\vec{R}$$

and

$$\int \vec{W} \cdot d\vec{R} = \vec{W} \cdot \int d\vec{R} = 0,$$

we get

$$\int |\vec{V}| ds \leq \int |\vec{V} - \vec{W}| |d\vec{R}| = \int ds. \quad (5)$$

(3) now follows from (4) and (5).

It is to be noted that in the above proof the closed horizontal curve can be replaced by a space curve and that the wind field \vec{W} need not be constant; it can be irrotational since we still have

$$\oint \vec{W} \cdot d\vec{R} = 0.$$

11.4 The latter result can be extended as in 11.2. Let the wind field be $k\vec{W}$ where \vec{W} is irrotational; then the time of flight is given by

$$T(k) = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{ds}{\sqrt{1 - k^2 w^2 \sin^2 \theta + kw \cos \theta}} .$$

Then since $T'(0) = 0$ and $T''(k) > 0$, $T(k)$ is increasing in k .

For other related airplane problems, see [17, 18, 19, 20].

To become proficient in problem creating, as in any other non-trivial activity, one must have lots of practice. At the U.S.A. Mathematical Olympiad training sessions, I required the students not only to solve challenging problems but also to submit original reasonable proposed problems. I did this since I completely agree with Pólya who points out in his books that these activities go hand in hand. Since most of these students had had little or no practice in problem creating, their first efforts were usually poor. However, with continual practice their submissions improved markedly. Here are two examples (for other ones, see [21]):

A quick proof that the rationality of p , q and $\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{q}$ implies the rationality of \sqrt{p} is furnished by the identity

$$2\sqrt{p} = \frac{(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{q})^2 + p - q}{\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{q}} .$$

Prove, in a similar fashion, that if p , q , r and $\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{q} + \sqrt{r}$ are rational, then so is \sqrt{p} .

(By Gregg Patruno, now a graduate student at Columbia University. He has recently extended the result to n rational numbers.)

Three disjoint spheres whose centers are not collinear are such that there exist eight planes each tangent to all three spheres. The points of tangency of each of these planes are vertices of a triangle. Prove that the circumcenters of these eight triangles are collinear.

(By Noam Elkies, now a graduate student at Harvard University.)

Finally, to conclude this paper, I adapt a quotation of G. Pólya.

"Proposing problems is a practical art like swimming or skiing, or playing the piano: you can learn it only by imitation and practice. This paper cannot offer you a magic key that opens all the doors and proposes all the problems, but it offers you good examples for imitation and many opportunities for practice; if you wish to learn swimming you have to go into the water, and if you wish to become a problem proposer you have to propose problems."

References

1. *Crux Mathematicorum* 5 (1979) 220-227.
2. H. Rademacher and O. Toeplitz, *The Enjoyment of Mathematics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1957, p.139.
3. M.S. Klamkin, Vector proofs in solid geometry, *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 77 (1970) 1051-1065.
4. O. Bottema et al, *Geometric Inequalities*, Noordhoff, Groningen, 1969, p.128.
5. M.S. Klamkin, On equilateral and equiangular polygons, *Crux Mathematicorum* 7 (1981) 2-5.
6. M.S. Klamkin, Intersecting curves on a surface, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 75 (1968) 876-877.
7. Problem 82-15, *SIAM Review* 25 (1983) 406-407.
8. Problem 84-9*, *Math. Intelligencer* 6 (1984) 39.
9. *Crux Mathematicorum* 6 (1980) 246-247.
10. M.S. Klamkin, Notes on inequalities involving triangles and tetrahedrons, *Univ. Beograd Publ. Electrotehn. Fak. Ser. Mat. Fiz.* No. 330 (1970) 1-15.
11. *Crux Mathematicorum* 10 (1984) 46-48.
12. A.H. Schoenfeld, Teaching problem-solving skills, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 87 (1980) 794-805.
13. Aufgabe 873, *Elem. der Math.* 37 (1982) 27.
14. C. Jordan, *Calculus of Finite Differences*, Chelsea, New York, 1947, p.104.
15. M.L. Glasser and M.S. Klamkin, On some inverse tangent summations, *Fibonacci Quarterly* 14 (1976) 385 - 388.
16. Problem 4132, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 52 (1962) 584-585.

17. M.S. Klamkin and D.J. Newman, Flying in a wind field I, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 76 (1969) 16-23.
18. M.S. Klamkin and D.J. Newman, Flying in a wind field II, *Amer. Math. Monthly* 76 (1969) 1013-1019.
19. M.S. Klamkin, On extreme length flight paths, *SIAM Review* 18 (1976) 486-488.
20. M.S. Klamkin, On Chaplygin's problem, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 8 (1977) 288-289.
21. *Crux Mathematicorum* 6 (1980) 210; 8 (1982) 99-100, 300-301; 10 (1984) 74.

Acknowledgement: I am very grateful to the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation for supporting this work.

*

*

*

P R O B L E M S

Problem proposals and solutions should be sent to the editor, whose address appears on the front page of this issue. Proposals should, whenever possible, be accompanied by a solution, references, and other insights which are likely to be of help to the editor. An asterisk (*) after a number indicates a problem submitted without a solution.

Original problems are particularly sought. But other interesting problems may also be acceptable provided they are not too well known and references are given as to their provenance. Ordinarily, if the originator of a problem can be located, it should not be submitted by somebody else without his or her permission.

To facilitate their consideration, your solutions, typewritten or neatly handwritten on signed, separate sheets, should preferably be mailed to the editor before July 1, 1987, although solutions received after that date will also be considered until the time when a solution is published.

1191. Proposed by Hidetosi Fukagawa, Yokosuka High School, Aichi, Japan.

Let ABC be a triangle, and let points D, E, F be on sides BC, CA, AB respectively such that triangles AEF, BFD , and CDE all have the same inradius r . Let r_1 and r_2 denote the inradii of DEF and ABC respectively. Show that $r + r_1 = r_2$.

1192. Proposed by Richard K. Guy, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta.

Let ABC be an equilateral triangle and v, w be arbitrary

positive real numbers. S (resp. T, U) is the Apollonius circle which is the locus of points whose distances from A and B (resp. A and C, B and C) are in the ratio $v:w$ (resp. $v: v+w, w: v+w$). Prove that S, T, U have just one point in common, and that it lies on the circumcircle of $\triangle ABC$.

1193. * *Proposed by Stanley Rabinowitz, Digital Equipment Corp., Nashua, New Hampshire.*

Is there a Heronian triangle (sides and area rational) with one side twice another?

1194. *Proposed by Richard I. Hess, Rancho Palos Verdes, California.*

My uncle's ritual for dressing each morning except Sunday includes a trip to the sock drawer where he (1) picks out three socks at random, (2) wears any matching pair and returns the third sock to the drawer, (3) returns the three socks to the drawer if he has no matching pair and repeats steps (1) and (3) until he completes step (2). The drawer starts with 16 socks each Monday morning (8 blue, 6 black, 2 brown) and ends up with 4 socks each Saturday evening.

(a) On which day of the week does he average the longest time at the sock drawer?

(b) On which day of the week is he least likely to get a matching pair from the first three socks chosen?

1195. * *Proposed by Clark Kimberling, University of Evansville, Evansville, Indiana.*


Let ABC be a triangle with medians m_a, m_b, m_c and circumcircle Γ . Let DEF be the triangle formed by the parallels to BC, CA, AB through A, B, C respectively, and let Γ' be the circumcircle of DEF . Let $A'B'C'$ be the triangle formed by the tangents to Γ at the points (other than A, B, C) where m_a, m_b, m_c meet Γ . Finally let A'', B'', C'' be the points (other than D, E, F) where m_a, m_b, m_c meet Γ' . Prove that lines $A'A'', B'B'', C'C''$ concur in a point on the Euler line of ABC .

1196. *Proposed by Jordi Dou, Barcelona, Spain.*

Let I be the incentre and O the circumcentre of $\triangle ABC$. Let D on AC and E on BC be such that $AD = BE = AB$. Prove that DE is perpendicular to OI .

1197. *Proposed by Peter Andrews and Edward T.H. Wang, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario.*

In the network illustrated by the figure below, where there are n adjacent squares, what is the number of paths (not necessarily shortest) from A to B which do not pass through any intersection twice?



1198. *Proposed by J.T. Groenman, Arnhem, The Netherlands.*

Let ABC be a triangle with incenter I , Gergonne point G , and Nagel point N , and let J be the isotomic conjugate of I . Prove that G , N , and J are collinear.

- 1199.* *Proposed by D.S. Mitrinovic and J.E. Pecaric, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Yugoslavia. (Dedicated to Léo Sauvé.)*

Prove that for acute triangles,

$$s^2 \leq \frac{27R^2}{27R^2 - 8r^2} (2R + r)^2,$$

where s , r , R are the semiperimeter, inradius, and circumradius, respectively.

1200. *Proposed by M.S. Klamkin, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.*

In a certain game, the first player secretly chooses an n -dimensional vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ all of whose components are integers. The second player is to determine \mathbf{a} by choosing any n -dimensional vectors \mathbf{x}_i , all of whose components are also integers. For each \mathbf{x}_i chosen, and before the next \mathbf{x}_i is chosen, the first player tells the second player the value of the dot product $\mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{a}$. What is the least number of vectors \mathbf{x}_i the second player has to choose in order to be able to determine \mathbf{a} ? [Warning: this is somewhat "tricky"!]

*

*

*

SOLUTIONS

No problem is ever permanently closed. The editor will always be pleased to consider for publication new solutions or new insights on past problems.

1054. [1985: 188] Proposed by Peter Messer, M.D., Mequon, Wisconsin.

A paper square $ABCD$ is divided into three strips of equal area by the parallel lines PQ and RS , as shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1




Figure 2

The square is then folded so that C falls on AB and S falls on PQ , as shown in Figure 2. Determine the ratio AC/CB in Figure 2.

Solution by Stanley Rabinowitz, Digital Equipment Corp., Nashua, New Hampshire.

In Figure 2, label the lower right vertex T . Let $AC = x$ and $CB = 1$, so that we are asked to find x . Let $BT = y$. Since the side of the square is $1 + x$, this means that $CT = 1 + x - y$. Thus

$$1 + y^2 = (1 + x - y)^2 = 1 + x^2 + y^2 + 2x - 2y - 2xy$$

or

$$y = \frac{x^2 + 2x}{2x + 2} . \quad (1)$$

Since $AP = (1 + x)/3$, we have

$$PC = x - \frac{1 + x}{3} = \frac{2x - 1}{3} .$$

Also, $CS = (1 + x)/3$. Since triangles PCS and BTC are similar, we have

$$\frac{(1 + x)/3}{(2x - 1)/3} = \frac{CS}{PC} = \frac{CT}{BT} = \frac{1 + x - y}{y}$$

so

$$\frac{1 + x}{2x - 1} = \frac{1 + x}{y} - 1$$

or

$$\frac{1+x}{y} = \frac{1+x}{2x-1} + 1 = \frac{3x}{2x-1}$$

or

$$y = \frac{(1+x)(2x-1)}{3x} = \frac{2x^2 + x - 1}{3x}. \quad (2)$$

From (1) and (2),

$$(2x+2)(2x^2+x-1) = 3x(x^2+2x)$$

$$4x^3 + 6x^2 - 2 = 3x^3 + 6x^2$$

and hence

$$x^3 = 2.$$

Thus $x = \sqrt[3]{2}$.

Also solved by SHUZO FUJIMOTO, Taki-gun, Hyogo-ken, Japan; JACK GARFUNKEL, Flushing, New York; RICHARD I. HESS, Rancho Palos Verdes, California; WALTHER JANOUS, Ursulinengymnasium, Innsbruck, Austria; FRIEND H. KIERSTEAD JR., Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio; BASIL C. RENNIE, James Cook University of North Queensland, Townsville, Australia; D.J. SMEENK, Zaltbommel, The Netherlands; J. SUCK, Essen, Federal Republic of Germany; and the proposer. Approximate solutions were sent in by FRANK P. BATTLES, Massachusetts Maritime Academy, Buzzards Bay, Massachusetts; JORDI DOU, Barcelona, Spain; J.G. FLATMAN, Timmins, Ontario; and J.T. GROENMAN, Arnhem, The Netherlands.

Editor's Note: It is interesting that the answer, $\sqrt[3]{2}$, is nonconstructible by ruler and compasses. If further evidence of the superiority of paper-folders over geometers is needed, the proposer mentions that two articles in *British Origami* (no.107, August 1984, p.14-15 and no.108, October 1984, p.9) contain methods of trisecting angles by folding.

*

*

*

1055. [1985: 188] Proposed by Allan Wm. Johnson Jr., Washington, D.C.

Prove that every fourth-order magic square can be written in the form

$F + y$	$G + x + t + u$	$G - x - t - u$	$F - y$
$G - w - t$	$F + z + v$	$F - z + t$	$G + w - v$
$F + x + t$	$G + y - t$	$G - y - v$	$F - x + v$
$G + z$	$F - w - u - v$	$F + w + u + v$	$G - z$

where $w = x + y + z$.

Note. Deleting the variables t , u and v from this square leaves an algebraic form that represents every *pandiagonal* fourth-order magic square (see Problem 605 [1982: 22-23]).

Solution by the proposer.

Every fourth-order magic square can be written in Bergholt's General Form (see page 211 of W.W. Rouse Ball and H.S.M. Coxeter, *Mathematical Recreations & Essays*, Twelfth Edition, University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1974):

$A - a$	$C + a + c$	$B + b - c$	$D - b$
$D + a - d$	B	C	$A - a + d$
$C - b + d$	A	D	$B + b - d$
$B + b$	$D - a - c$	$A - b + c$	$C + a$

This is of the required form, as can be seen by putting

$$F = \frac{1}{2}(A + D - a - b)$$

$$G = \frac{1}{2}(B + C + a + b)$$

$$t = \frac{1}{2}(-A + B + C - D) + b$$

$$u = \frac{1}{2}(A - B - C + D) + c - d$$

$$v = \frac{1}{2}(-A + B + C - D) + a$$

$$w = \frac{1}{2}(A - D - a + b) - b + d$$

$$x = \frac{1}{2}(-B + C + a - b) - b + d$$

$$y = \frac{1}{2}(A - D - a + b)$$

$$z = \frac{1}{2}(B - C - a + b)$$

into the form of the problem proposal.

*

*

*

1056. [1985: 188] Proposed by Edward T.H. Wang, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario.

Let ABC be a triangle with sides a, b, c in the usual order. Side BC is divided into n (≥ 2) equal parts by the points P_i , $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Let

$$S_n = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (AP_i)^2$$

be the average value of the squared lengths of the segments AP_i . Show that the sequence $\{S_n\}_{n=2}^{\infty}$ is monotonically increasing and evaluate $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n$ in terms of a, b, c .

Solution by Kee-wai Lau, Hong Kong.

Let $\angle ABC = \theta$, so that by the cosine law

$$\begin{aligned} AP_i^2 &= AB^2 + BP_i^2 - 2AB \cdot BP_i \cos \theta \\ &= c^2 + \left[\frac{ai}{n} \right]^2 - \frac{2ca}{n} \cos \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} S_n &= c^2 + \frac{a^2}{(n-1)n^2} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i^2 - \frac{2ac \cos \theta}{(n-1)n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i \\ &= c^2 + \frac{a^2}{6(n-1)n^2} \cdot (n-1)n(2n-1) - \frac{ac \cos \theta}{(n-1)n} \cdot n(n-1) \\ &= c^2 + \frac{1}{3}a^2 - ac \cos \theta - \frac{a^2}{6n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus S_n is monotonically increasing and

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} S_n &= c^2 + \frac{1}{3}a^2 - ac \cos \theta \\ &= c^2 + \frac{1}{3}a^2 - ac \left[\frac{a^2 + c^2 - b^2}{2ac} \right] \\ &= \frac{3b^2 + 3c^2 - a^2}{6}. \end{aligned}$$

Also solved by JORDI DOU, Barcelona, Spain; R.H. EDDY, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland; J.T. GROENMAN, Arnhem, The Netherlands; RICHARD I. HESS, Rancho Palos Verdes, California; WALTER JANOUS, Ursulinengymnasium, Innsbruck, Austria; FRIEND H. KIERSTEAD JR., Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio; R.C. LYNNESS, Southwold, Suffolk, England; and the proposer.

*

*

*

1057. [1985: 189] *Proposed by Jordi Dou, Barcelona, Spain.*

Let Ω be a semicircle of unit radius, with diameter AA_0 . Consider a sequence of circles γ_i , all interior to Ω , such that γ_1 is tangent to Ω and to AA_0 , γ_2 is tangent to Ω and to the chord AA_1 tangent to γ_1 , γ_3 is tangent to Ω and to the chord AA_2 tangent to γ_2 , etc. Prove that

$$r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + \dots < 1,$$

where r_i is the radius of γ_i .

Editor's Comment: It was to be assumed, although it was not explicitly stated, that $A_{i+1} \neq A_i$ and that γ_i and γ_{i+1} are on opposite sides of AA_i for each i .

Solution by the proposer.

We may assume that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} A_i = A$.


Let C be any point on the arc $A_{i-1}A_i$ of Ω such that $CA_i < AA_i$.

Let β , δ be the incircles of the "triangles" $AA_{i-1}C$ and ACA_i , respectively, where $A_{i-1}C$ and CA_i are the arcs of Ω . We first prove that $r_\beta + r_\delta > r_i$, where r_β and r_δ are the radii of β and δ .

Let F , G , H be the contact points of γ_i on AA_{i-1} , Ω , AA_i ; B_1 , B_2 the contact points of β on AA_{i-1} , Ω ; and D_1 , D_2 the contact points of δ on AA_i , Ω .

Then


$$A_{i-1}B_1 < A_{i-1}F, \quad A_{i-1}B_2 < A_{i-1}G, \quad A_iD_1 < A_iH, \quad A_iD_2 < A_iG.$$



Thus the arcs B_1B_2 of β and D_1D_2 of δ are exterior to γ_i . Consider the tangent d to δ parallel to AC . Since the tangent to δ at D_1 is A_iA , and since (from $CA_i < A_iA$) the tangent to δ at D_2 will cut AC extended, d is tangent to δ at a point between D_1 and D_2 . Thus d is exterior to γ_i . Similarly, the tangent b to β parallel to AC is exterior to γ_i . Thus the distance between b and d , namely $2r_\beta + 2r_\delta$, is greater than $2r_i$, and so $r_\beta + r_\delta > r_i$.

Now subdivide indefinitely the triangles $AA_{i-1}A_i$ by points C such that the condition $CA_i < A_iA$ is always preserved and such that Ω is cut into arcs whose lengths all tend to zero. From the above, the sum of the inradii of these triangles will tend to a definite integral I which will be greater than ∞ . $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} r_i$. We finish the proof by showing that $I = 1$.

Let X, Y be on Ω and let $\angle A_0AX = \alpha, \angle A_0AY = \alpha + d\alpha$. Let O be the centre of Ω , C the centre of the incircle of AXY , and r the inradius of AXY . Then $CO = 1 - r$ and $CA = r \csc \frac{d\alpha}{2}$, and from $\triangle COA$,



$$(1 - r)^2 = 1^2 + r^2 \csc^2 \frac{d\alpha}{2} - 2r \csc \frac{d\alpha}{2} \cos(\alpha + \frac{d\alpha}{2}),$$

$$2r \csc \frac{d\alpha}{2} (\cos \alpha \cos \frac{d\alpha}{2} - \sin \alpha \sin \frac{d\alpha}{2}) - 2r = r^2 (\csc^2 \frac{d\alpha}{2} - 1),$$

$$r \cot^2 \frac{d\alpha}{2} = 2(\cos \alpha \cot \frac{d\alpha}{2} - \sin \alpha - 1),$$

$$\begin{aligned} r &= 2 \tan^2 \frac{d\alpha}{2} (\cos \alpha \cot \frac{d\alpha}{2} - \sin \alpha - 1) \\ &= 2 \cos \alpha \tan^2 \frac{d\alpha}{2} - 2(\sin \alpha + 1) \tan^2 \frac{d\alpha}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\lim_{d\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{r}{d\alpha} = \cos \alpha.$$

Thus

$$I = \int_0^{\pi/2} \cos \alpha \, d\alpha = 1.$$

*

*

*


1058. [1985: 189] *Proposed by Jordan B. Tabov, Sofia, Bulgaria.*

Two points X and Y are chosen at random, independently and uniformly with respect to length, on the edges of a unit cube. Determine the probability that

$$1 < XY < \sqrt{2}.$$

Solution by Friend H. Kierstead Jr., Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio.

Let the cube be labelled as shown. We may without loss of generality assume that point X is on edge AB . There are then five different cases to consider with respect to the placement of point Y :



Case	Edges	Range of XY	Probability that $1 < XY < \sqrt{2}$
1	AB	0 to 1	0
2	AC, BD, AE, BF	0 to $\sqrt{2}$	p_2
3	CD, EF	1 to $\sqrt{2}$	1
4	CG, DH, EG, FH	1 to $\sqrt{3}$	p_4
5	GH	$\sqrt{2}$ to $\sqrt{3}$	0

It is clear that only two of the five cases require more than trivial calculations.

Let x be the distance from X to the vertex (A or B) nearest to the edge containing Y , and y be the distance from Y to the vertex, on the same edge as Y , nearest AB . Then it is easily seen that p_2 is equal to the probability that $x^2 + y^2 > 1$. Likewise, p_4 is equal to the probability that $x^2 + 1 + y^2 < 2$, i.e. that $x^2 + y^2 < 1$. Therefore $p_2 + p_4 = 1$, and the probability that $1 < XY < \sqrt{2}$ is

$$\frac{4}{12} p_2 + \frac{2}{12} + \frac{4}{12} p_4 = \frac{1}{2}.$$

Also solved by JORDI DOU, Barcelona, Spain; J.T. GROENMAN, Arnhem, The Netherlands; RICHARD I. HESS, Rancho Palos Verdes, California; WALTHER JANOUS, Ursulinengymnasium, Innsbruck, Austria; and the proposer.

*

*

*

1059. [1985: 189] *Proposed by Clark Kimberling, University of Evansville, Indiana.*

In his book, *The Modern Geometry of the Triangle* (London,

1913), W. Gallatly denotes by J the circumcentre of triangle $I_1I_2I_3$, whose vertices are the excentres of the reference triangle ABC . On pages 1 and 21 are figures in which J appears to be collinear with the incentre and circumcentre of triangle ABC . Are these points really collinear?

Solution by Roland E. Eddy, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Newfoundland.

The answer is yes, since the point J , the incenter I of $\triangle ABC$, and the circumcenter O of $\triangle ABC$ all lie on the Euler line of $\triangle I_1I_2I_3$. t is the orthocenter of $\triangle I_1I_2I_3$. Also, the vertices of $\triangle ABC$ are the feet of the altitudes of $\triangle I_1I_2I_3$, and hence O is the nine-point center of $\triangle I_1I_2I_3$.

Also solved by JORDI DOU, Barcelona, Spain; C. FESTRAETS-HAMOIR, Bruxelles, Belgique; J.T. GROENMAN, Arnhem, The Netherlands; WALTHER JANOUS, Ursulinengymnasium, Innsbruck, Austria; R.C. LYNES, Southwold, Suffolk, England; BASIL C. RENNIE, James Cook University, Townsville, Australia; D.J. SMEENK, Zaltbommel, The Netherlands; ESTHER SZEKERES, University of New South Wales, Kensington, Australia; JORDAN B. TABOV, Sofia, Bulgaria; and the proposer.

*

*

*

1060. [1985: 189] *Proposed by M.S. Klamkin, University of Alberta.*

If ABC is an obtuse triangle, prove that

$$\sin^2 A \tan A + \sin^2 B \tan B + \sin^2 C \tan C < 6 \sin A \sin B \sin C.$$

I. *Solution by Walther Janous, Ursulinengymnasium, Innsbruck, Austria.*

We show indeed that the stronger inequality

$$\Sigma \sin^2 A \tan A + 3\pi \sin A < 0 \quad (1)$$

holds in any obtuse triangle. First,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma \sin^2 A \tan A &= \Sigma \tan A - \Sigma \cos^2 A \tan A \\ &= \Sigma \tan A - \Sigma \cos A \sin A \\ &= \Sigma \tan A - \frac{1}{2} \Sigma \sin 2A \\ &= \pi \tan A - 2\pi \sin A \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where we used the well-known relations

$$\Sigma \sin 2A = 4\pi \sin A$$

and

$$\Sigma \tan A = \pi \tan A,$$

which hold in any triangle. From (2), (1) reads equivalently

$$\pi \tan A < -\pi \sin A,$$

that is,

$$\pi \sec A < -1,$$

which is just 2.24 (for obtuse triangles) of Bottema et al, *Geometric Inequalities*.

II. Solution by the proposer.

We multiply by $\pi \cos A$ and show more generally that

$$4 \sum \sin^3 A \cos B \cos C \geq 3\pi \sin 2A \quad (3)$$

holds for all triangles, with equality if and only if $A = B = C$.

Since

$$\sin A = \frac{a}{2R}, \text{ etc.}$$

and

$$\cos A = \frac{b^2 + c^2 - a^2}{2bc}, \text{ etc.,}$$

(3) is equivalent to

$$\sum a^2(a^2 + b^2 - c^2)(a^2 - b^2 + c^2) \geq 3\pi(b^2 + c^2 - a^2) \quad (4)$$

and after some manipulation to

$$a^2(a^2 - b^2)(a^2 - c^2) + b^2(b^2 - c^2)(b^2 - a^2) + c^2(c^2 - a^2)(c^2 - b^2) \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

Inequality (5) is just a special case of Schur's inequality and holds for any three real numbers a, b, c regardless of whether or not they are sides of a triangle. For a proof, assume without loss of generality that $a^2 \geq b^2 \geq c^2$.

Then

$$a^2(a^2 - b^2)(a^2 - c^2) \geq b^2(a^2 - b^2)(b^2 - c^2)$$

and

$$c^2(c^2 - a^2)(c^2 - b^2) \geq 0.$$

There is equality in (5) if and only if $a = b = c$.

A more appealing form of (4) is

$$\frac{a^2}{b^2 + c^2 - a^2} + \frac{b^2}{c^2 + a^2 - b^2} + \frac{c^2}{a^2 + b^2 - c^2} \geq 3 \text{ or } \leq 3$$

according as ABC is acute or obtuse. A short proof of the acute case follows by letting

$$b^2 + c^2 - a^2 = 2x^2, \quad c^2 + a^2 - b^2 = 2y^2, \quad a^2 + b^2 - c^2 = 2z^2$$

to give

$$\left[\frac{x^2}{y^2} + \frac{y^2}{x^2} \right] + \left[\frac{y^2}{z^2} + \frac{z^2}{y^2} \right] + \left[\frac{z^2}{x^2} + \frac{x^2}{z^2} \right] \geq 6.$$

Also solved by C. FESTRAETS-HAMOIR, Bruxelles, Belgique; J.T. GROENMAN.

Arnhem, The Netherlands; VEDULA N. MURTY, Pennsylvania State University, Middletown, Pennsylvania; BOB PRIELIPP, University of Wisconsin, Oshkosh, Wisconsin; and the proposer.

Murty and Prielipp both observed that, using (2) above and the known inequality

$$\cos A \cos B \cos C \leq \frac{1}{8}$$

true in acute triangles (2.24 in Geometric Inequalities), it follows that the reverse inequality

$$\sin^2 A \tan A + \sin^2 B \tan B + \sin^2 C \tan C \geq 6 \sin A \sin B \sin C$$

holds for acute triangles, with equality when $A = B = C$.

*

*

*

1061. [1985: 219] Proposed by Allan Wm. Johnson Jr., Washington, D.C.

Later this year, Halley's comet will visit the earth for the first time since 1910. The following paragraph is taken from an article by Thomas O'Toole in *The Washington Post*, 8 August 1985.

Mark Twain, the humorist and author, was born Samuel Langhorne Clemens in the year the comet arrived in 1835 and died when it reappeared in 1910. A year before he died, Twain said, "I came into this world with Halley's comet. It's coming again pretty soon, and I expect to go out with it. It will be the greatest disappointment of my life if I don't go out with Halley's comet".

Commemorate the sesquicentennial of Mark Twain's birth and the diamond anniversary of his death by solving independently the alphametical sums

MARK	TWAIN
BORN	DIED
1835 ,	1910 ,
COMET	COMET

where the 1835 COMET is to be maximized (since it was bigger then) while the 1910 COMET is to be minimized (since it lost weight on its circuit through space during Mark Twain's lifetime).

Solution.

$$\begin{array}{rcl} 9234(6) & & 14985 \\ 7836(4) & & 6806 \\ \hline 1835 & \text{and} & 1910 \\ \hline 18905 & & 23701. \end{array}$$

Found by J.A. MCCALLUM, Medicine Hat, Alberta; GLEN E. MILLS, Valencia Community College, Orlando, Florida; J. SUCK, Essen, Federal Republic of Germany; and the proposer. There was one partially correct solution received.

*

*

*

I N D E X T O V O L U M E 1 2 , 1 9 8 6

ARTICLES AND NOTES

Dedication and Tributes to Léo Sauvé	163
Geoffrey James Butler 1944-1986	203
Little Trigonometry, A. Kenneth S. Williams	168
Message from the Canadian Mathematical Society, A	227
Message from the Editor, A	37, 65
Message from the Managing Editor, A	17
Olympiad Corner, The: 71-80. M.S. Klamkin . . 2, 19, 39, 67, 97, 131, 169, 197, 229, 263	
Question from the Managing Editor, A	195
Strens Memorial Conference	25
To Murray Klamkin - With Thanks	263

PROPOSALS AND SOLUTIONS

January: proposals 1080, 1101-1110; solutions 979, 984, 985	
February: proposals 1111-1120; solutions 982, 983, 986-989	
March: proposals 1121-1130; solutions 990-993, 995-998	
April: proposals 1116, 1131-1140; solutions 999, 1001-1009	
May: proposals 1141-1150; solutions 994, 1000, 1010-1016	
June: proposals 1141, 1151-1160; solutions 897, 976, 1017-1021, 1023-1027	
September: proposals 1137, 1161-1170; solutions 870, 1013, 1014, 1016, 1022, 1025, 1028-1031	
October: proposals 1171-1180; solutions 1033-1038, 1040-1047	
November: proposals 1181-1190; solutions 1010, 1048-1053	
December: proposals 1191-1200; solutions 1054-1061	

PROPOSERS AND SOLVERS

The numbers refer to the pages in which the corresponding name appears with a problem proposal, a solution, or a comment.

Ahlburg, Hayo: 87, 247	Erdős, P.: 27
Andrews, Peter: 241, 283	Festraets-Hamoir, C: 160
Avital, Shmuel: 125, 182	Fisher, J.C.: 15
Baethge, Sam: 58, 156	Freitag, Herta T.: 60, 179
Bankoff, Leon: 59, 80	Fukagawa, Hidetosi: 50, 58, 89, 106, 119, 138, 140, 178, 181, 281
Battles, Frank P.: 82, 155	Garfunkel, Jack: 12, 26, 33, 51, 79, 80, 108, 138, 206, 249
Bilchev, Svetoslav: 140, 242	Gibbs, Richard A.: 82
Bos, Len: 227	Gilbert, Peter: 51
Bottema, O.: 86, 177, 184	Gislason, Gary: 206
Bulman-Fleming, Sydney: 107	Grabiner, David: 27, 77
Chavdarov, N.: 126	Groenman, J.T.: 12, 26, 35, 51, 78, 107, 128, 138, 153, 159, 177, 193, 205, 220, 242, 247, 283
Coxeter, H.S.M.: 109	Guinand, Andrew P.: 65, 128, 184
Cross, Donald: 52	Gupta, H.N.: 15
Csirmaz, László: 12	Guy, Richard K.: 50, 109, 139, 190, 243, 281
Dou, Jordi: 12, 27, 65, 79, 107, 159, 193, 205, 216, 217, 282, 288	
Eckert, Ernest J.: 109	
Eddy, Roland E.: 291	

- Havermann, Hans: 91
Henderson, G.P.: 31, 34, 116
Hess, Richard I.: 92, 152, 214,
 242, 282
Ivády, Péter: 51
Izard, Roger: 11, 51, 140, 241
Janous, Walther: 35, 52, 56, 79,
 107, 113, 129, 139, 145, 177,
 190, 192, 205, 223, 226, 242,
 243, 253, 291
Johnson, Allan Wm., Jr.: 26, 53,
 95, 148, 153, 194, 219, 285,
 293
Kantrowitz, Mark: 60, 81, 86
Kelleher, Laura L.: 82, 155
Kestelman, H.: 216
Khorrami, Farshad: 191
Kierstead, Friend H., Jr.: 113,
 115, 290
Killgrove, R.B.: 13
Kimberling, Clark: 79, 140, 179,
 205, 217, 219, 282, 290
Klamkin, M.S.: 13, 19, 28, 56, 58,
 77, 85, 108, 141, 160, 178,
 189, 193, 206, 215, 223, 249,
 252, 283, 291
Klein, Edwin M.: 153, 155
Kravitz, Sidney: 180
Larson, Loren C.: 62, 78
Lau, Kee-Wai: 192, 242, 287
Li, Weixuan: 152
Liu, Andy: 179
Lu, Yang: 126
Martinez, John J.: 16
McCallum, J.A.: 250
Mercier, Armel: 185
Messer, Peter: 156, 189, 221, 284
Meyers, Leroy F.: 32, 91, 92, 180,
 261
Mitrinovic, D.S.: 11, 12, 27, 51,
 204, 241, 251, 283
Murty, Vedula N.: 82, 141
Newman, Steve: 179
Parmenter, M.: 154
Pecaric, J.E.: 204, 241, 251, 283
Pedoe, William Tunstall: 155
Pounder, J.R.: 206
Priellipp, Bob: 52, 61
Rabinowitz, Stanley: 11, 27, 32, 51,
 78, 108, 140, 158, 242, 250, 261,
 282, 284
Rennie, Basil: 33, 36
Ruderman, Harry D.: 54
Salvatore, Gali: 215
Satyanarayana, Kesiraju: 220
Schiffler, Kurt: 36, 150
Seimiya, Tosio: 59
Semenko, Lanny: 108
Singmaster, David: 183, 189
Smeenk, D.J.: 13, 31, 128, 177
Sokolowsky, Dan: 90, 119, 157, 178,
 182, 216, 242
Somer, L: 86
Sturtevant, Helen: 27
Szekeres, George: 255
Tabov, Jordan B.: 62, 85, 93, 126, 147,
 179, 217, 225, 290
Thoro, Dmitri: 15
Trigg, Charles W.: 115
Trinity College: 154, 214, 255
Tsintsifas, George: 11, 16, 26, 28, 52,
 79, 107, 140, 145, 178, 205, 222,
 250
Upton, L.J.: 79
Utz, W.R.: 207
van der Spek, W.A.: 150
Veldkamp, G.R.: 150
Velikova, Emilia: 242
Walsh, Gary: 245
Wang, Edward T.H.: 27, 107, 152, 207,
 241, 283, 287
Wilke, Kenneth M.: 53, 95, 190, 211,
 221
Williams, Kenneth S.: 178, 205