# The [NameRemoved] Determinant Identity is Purely Routine

*Doron ZEILBERGER*[1]

**Note (Dec. 24, 2011)** This note replaces a previous version that mentioned a specific person's name. In this version that person is called [NameRemoved].

Would you imagine a mathematical article spending 17 pages on several proofs of the identity $23 \cdot 21 = 483$? A first proof could be by explicitly drawing a rectangle of 23 by 21 dots, and asking the reader to count the number of dots. A more advanced proof could be

$$23 \cdot 21 = (20+3)\dot{(}20+1) = 20 \cdot 20 + 20 \cdot 1 + 3 \cdot 20 + 3 \cdot 1 = 400 + 20 + 60 + 3 = 400 + 80 + 3 = 483 \quad ,$$

and a really clever and elegant proof, using the advanced algebraic identity $(a-b)(a+b) = a^2 - b^2$ is as follows:

$$23 \cdot 21 = (22+1)\dot{(}22-1) = 22^2 - 1^2 = (2 \cdot 11)^2 - 1 = 4 \cdot 11^2 - 1 = 4 \cdot 121 - 1 = 484 - 1 = 483 \quad .$$

Of course not! *numerical* identities, and even *algebraic* identities (e.g. $(a+b)^2 = a^2 + 2ab + b^2$) and even *trig* identities (e.g. $\sin^2 x + \cos^2 x = 1$) are *nowadays* considered **routine**, since there exist **algorithms** for proving them (learned in third grade in the US and first grade in China).

Yet something analogous appeared in the recent article [NameRemoved] by [NameRemoved]. The main "theorem" follows *immediately* and **routinely** from Dodgson's condensation identity. Indeed calling the left side and right side of Eq. (1.14) of that paper $L(n,t)$ and $R(n,t)$ respectively, it follows, thanks to Rev. Charles, that $L(n,t) = (L(n-1,t)L(n-1,t+2) - L(n-1,t+1)^2)/L(n-2,t+2)$, and it is purely routine to check that the same identity holds with $L(n,t)$ replaced by $R(n,t)$, since this boils down to a certain routine polynomial identity in the variables $a, b, q^n$. Once this is done the "theorem" follows by induction since $L(0,t) = R(0,t)$ and $L(1,t) = R(1,t)$ (check!).

I recommend that the authors of this paper, and other people too, who wax insightful combinatorics on such routinely provable identities, read my article:

`http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~zeilberg/mamarim/mamarimhtml/opa.html` ,

as well as the excellent paper by Tewodros Amdeberhan and myself:

`http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~zeilberg/mamarim/mamarimhtml/greg.html` . □

**Added Dec. 23, 2011**: [NameRemove] just drew my attention to the fact that the above comment is actually mentioned in their paper! So they give several proofs to an identity that they *actually*

[1] Department of Mathematics, Rutgers University (New Brunswick), Hill Center-Busch Campus, 110 Frelinghuysen Rd., Piscataway, NJ 08854-8019, USA. `zeilberg at math dot rutgers dot edu` , `http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~zeilberg/` . Dec. 22, 2011. Exclusively published in the Personal Journal of Shalosh B. Ekhad and Doron Zeilberger `http://www.math.rutgers.edu/~zeilberg/pj.html` . Supported in part by the NSF.

knew was utterly trivial. They should have mentioned it in the abstract, and not bury it in a comment on p.12 .