



## A Tricky Convergence: 10614

Grigore-Raul Tataru; GCHQ Problems Group

*The American Mathematical Monthly*, Vol. 106, No. 3. (Mar., 1999), pp. 270-271.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9890%28199903%29106%3A3%3C270%3AATC1%3E2.0.CO%3B2-D>

*The American Mathematical Monthly* is currently published by Mathematical Association of America.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/maa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

---

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

varying the  $z_i$  does not change  $\alpha_1$ , so we may choose a sequence for which  $\beta_1$  approaches its infimum. A subsequence either degenerates to a lower dimensional simplex or leads to a counterexample with  $\beta_1$  minimal. If the limit is degenerate, then a computation shows that there is a counterexample for lower  $m$ , contradicting the minimality of  $m$ .

Therefore we may consider a counterexample that has  $\beta_1$  minimal under varying the  $z_i$ . Assume that  $F_1$  lies in the affine subspace  $S = \{(a, x_2, \dots, x_m)\}$ , and let  $P_1^*$  be the projection of  $P_1$  into this subspace. Arguing as for the 3-dimensional case, we see that  $P_1^*$  is in the interior of  $F_1$  and is equidistant from all the faces of  $F_1$ . Let this common distance be  $b$ . Let  $F$  be a face of  $F_1$ , let  $T$  be the  $(m-2)$ -dimensional affine subspace containing  $F$ , and let  $Q$  be the orthogonal projection of  $P_1$  into  $T$ . Let  $f(r)dr$  be the solid angle generated from  $P_1^*$  by the points of  $T$  whose distance from  $Q$  is between  $r$  and  $r+dr$ . Let  $S(r)$  be the sphere of radius  $r$  about  $Q$  in  $T$ , and define  $g_F(r) = \text{area}(F \cap S(r))/\text{area}(S(r))$ . Note that  $g_F(r)$  is nonincreasing, by convexity of  $F$ . If a solid angle  $\Phi$  in  $S$  with vertex  $P_1^*$  meets  $T$  at a distance from  $Q$  of between  $r$  and  $r+dr$ , then let  $h_b(r)$  be the measure of the solid angle from  $P_1$  generated by the portion of  $\Phi$  bounded by  $T$ . With these definitions,  $F$  generates a solid angle of  $\int_0^\infty g_F(r)f(r)dr$  from  $P_1^*$  in  $S$ , and the portion of  $F_1$  between  $F$  and  $P_1^*$  generates a solid angle of  $\int_0^\infty g_F(r)h_b(r)f(r)dr$  from  $P_1$ .

Since  $g_F(r)$  is nonincreasing and nonconstant, and since  $h_b(r)$  is increasing, we have

$$\int_0^\infty f(r)dr \int_0^\infty g_F(r)h_b(r)f(r)dr < \int_0^\infty h_b(r)f(r)dr \int_0^\infty g_F(r)f(r)dr.$$

Let  $A_t$  be the  $(t-1)$ -dimensional area of the  $t$ -dimensional sphere of radius 1. Summing the last inequality over all faces of  $F_1$  gives

$$A_m \alpha_1 \int_0^\infty f(r)dr < A_{m-1} \int_0^\infty h_b(r)f(r)dr. \quad (2)$$

The same calculation applies if  $F_1$  is replaced by the slab  $G = \{(a, x_2, \dots, x_m) : |x_2| \leq b\}$ , except that (1) we now get equality, since for both faces  $H$  of  $G$ , the function  $g_H$  is identically 1, and (2)  $\alpha_1$  is replaced by  $\phi$ , the probability that the ray from  $O$  through a random point  $v = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$  on the unit sphere hits  $G$ . Hence

$$A_m \phi \int_0^\infty f(r)dr = A_{m-1} \int_0^\infty h_b(r)f(r)dr. \quad (3)$$

From (2) and (3), we infer that  $\alpha_1 < \phi$ . The random ray from  $O$  hits  $G$  if and only if  $y_1 > 0$  and  $|y_2|/y_1 \leq b/a$ . This depends only on the direction of  $(y_1, y_2)$ , which is uniformly distributed. Thus  $\alpha_1 < \phi = \alpha'_1$ , where  $\alpha'_1$  is the value of  $\alpha_1$  for the (2-dimensional) isosceles triangle  $J$  with altitude  $a$  and base  $2b$ . Since  $J$  has the same value of  $\beta_1$  as  $G$  has, we are reduced to the 2-dimensional case. Since we can approximate  $G$  by  $F_1$ ,  $f(\pi\alpha_1)$  is the best possible lower bound for  $\beta_1$ .

### A Tricky Convergence

**10614** [1997, 767]. *Proposed by Grigore-Raul Tataru, University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania.* Fix  $p > 1$ . Suppose that  $a_1, a_2, \dots$  is a sequence of positive real numbers such that  $a_n a_{n+1} a_{n+2}^p + a_{n+2} - a_n = 0$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Show that  $\{a_n\}$  is convergent.

*Solution by the GCHQ Problems Group, Cheltenham, U. K.* Since  $a_n - a_{n+2} = a_n a_{n+1} a_{n+2}^p$  is positive, the even and odd subsequences are decreasing and therefore convergent, say to  $x$  and  $y$  respectively. Taking limits gives  $yx^{p+1} = 0 = xy^{p+1}$ , so at least one of  $x$  and  $y$  must be 0. Without loss of generality, we may assume  $x = 0$ . If  $y > 0$ , then  $a_{2n-1} - a_{2n+1} > y^{p+1} a_{2n}$ , so the series  $\sum a_{2n}$  converges. Let  $m$  be large enough that  $a_{2m+1} < 2y$  and  $a_{2m} < 1$ . Let  $\epsilon = a_{2m}$ . For  $n \geq m$ , we have  $a_{2n} - a_{2n+2} < 2y\epsilon^{p+1}$ , so the number of integers  $n$  with  $\epsilon/2 \leq a_{2n} < \epsilon$  is at least  $(\epsilon/2)/(2y\epsilon^{p+1}) = 1/(4y\epsilon^p) > 1/(4y\epsilon)$ , and

the sum of these terms is therefore at least  $1/(8y)$ . Thus there are infinitely many disjoint blocks of terms, each of which sums to at least  $1/(8y)$ . This contradicts the fact that  $\sum a_{2n}$  converges. Therefore  $x = y = 0$ , and  $a_n \rightarrow 0$ .

Solved also by J. Anglesio (France), S. S. Kim (Korea), K.-W. Lau (Hong Kong), J. H. Lindsey II, M. Shemesh (Israel), NSA Problems Group, and the proposer.

### Tails of an Alternating Series

**10624** [1997, 871]. *Proposed by William F. Trench, Trinity University, San Antonio, TX.* Suppose that  $a_0 > a_1 > a_2 > \dots$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n = 0$ . Define  $S_n = \sum_{j=n}^{\infty} (-1)^{j-n} a_j = a_n - a_{n+1} + a_{n+2} - \dots$ . Show that  $\sum a_n S_n < \infty$  if and only if  $\sum a_n^2 < \infty$ .

*Solution by Douglas B. Tyler, Hughes Aircraft Company, El Segundo, CA.* More generally, we prove that the three series  $\sum S_n^2$ ,  $\sum a_n S_n$ , and  $\sum a_n^2$  converge or diverge together. By the alternating series test,  $S_n$  exists and satisfies  $0 < S_n < a_n$ . Thus  $\sum S_n^2 < \sum a_n S_n < \sum a_n^2$ . So it suffices to show that finiteness of  $\sum S_n^2$  implies finiteness of  $\sum a_n^2$ . To prove it, use  $S_n = a_n - S_{n+1}$  and the inequality  $(x + y)^2 \leq 2(x^2 + y^2)$  to infer

$$\sum a_n^2 = \sum (S_n + S_{n+1})^2 \leq \sum 2(S_n^2 + S_{n+1}^2) = 2 \sum S_n^2 + 2 \sum S_{n+1}^2 < 4 \sum S_n^2.$$

Solved also by S. A. Ali, K. F. Andersen (Canada), R. Barbara (France), G. L. Brody (U. K.), P. Bracken (Canada), P. Budney, D. Callan, R. J. Chapman (U. K.), J. E. Dawson (Australia), M. N. Deshpande (India), Z. Franco, T. Goebeler & T. Siemers, T. Hermann, V. Hernandez & J. Martin (Spain), S. S. Kim (Korea), R. A. Kopas, O. Kouba (Syria), M. Kumar (India), J. H. Lindsey II, N. Lord (U. K.), P. Mengert, R. Mortini (France), M. Omarjee (France), L. Opperman, G. Peng, H. Salle (The Netherlands), K. Schilling, H.-J. Seiffert (Germany), N. C. Singer, A. Stenger, S. J. Swiniarski, N. S. Thornber, A. Tissier (France), P. Trojovský (Czech Republic), M. Woltermann, C. Xiong, GCHQ Problems Group (U. K.), NSA Problems Group, WMC Problems Group, and the proposer.

### Cosecants and Near-Integers

**10630** [1997, 975]. *Proposed by Richard Stong, Rice University, Houston, TX.* It is possible to show that  $\csc(3\pi/29) - \csc(10\pi/29) = 1.999989433 \dots$ . Prove that there are no integers  $j, k, n$  with  $n$  odd satisfying  $\csc(j\pi/n) - \csc(k\pi/n) = 2$ .

*Solution by Allen Stenger, Tustin, CA.* Suppose that there exist such integers  $j, k, n$ . Let  $\omega_m = e^{2\pi i/m}$  be a primitive  $m$ th root of unity. Then

$$\frac{2i}{\omega_{2n}^j - \omega_{2n}^{-j}} - \frac{2i}{\omega_{2n}^k - \omega_{2n}^{-k}} = 2,$$

which rearranges to

$$i = \frac{(\omega_{2n}^k - \omega_{2n}^{-k})(\omega_{2n}^j - \omega_{2n}^{-j})}{(\omega_{2n}^k - \omega_{2n}^{-k}) - (\omega_{2n}^j - \omega_{2n}^{-j})}.$$

This implies that  $i$  is in  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n})$ , the cyclotomic field of order  $2n$  over the rationals.

We now claim that adjoining  $i$  to  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n})$  produces  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n}, i) = \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{4n})$ . To show this, observe that  $\omega_{2n} = \omega_{4n}^2 \in \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{4n})$ ,  $i = \omega_{4n}^n \in \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{4n})$ , and  $\omega_{4n} = \omega_{4n}^{n+1} / \omega_{4n}^n = \omega_{2n}^{(n+1)/2} / i \in \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n}, i)$ . (This is where we need the hypothesis that  $n$  is odd.)

This produces the contradiction: If it were true that  $i \in \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n})$ , then we would have  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n}) = \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n}, i) = \mathbb{Q}(\omega_{4n})$ , but this is impossible because the degrees of  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_{2n})$  and  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega_{4n})$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$  are known to be  $\phi(2n)$  and  $\phi(4n) = 2\phi(2n)$ , respectively.

*Editorial comment.* Gerry Myerson proved more: If  $j, k, n$  are positive integers with no common factor and  $\csc(j\pi/n) - \csc(k\pi/n)$  is a nonzero rational number  $r$ , then  $n$  is 2 or 6 and  $r$  is  $\pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3$ , or  $\pm 4$ .

Solved also by R. J. Chapman (U. K.), J. H. Lindsey II, G. Myerson (Australia), and the proposer.