# Teacher Guide for the BLOSSOMS Learning Video: 

## Are Random Triangles Acute or Obtuse?

## By Professor Gilbert Strang, MIT

This video lesson is a question in "geometrical probability." It has been asked before. A paper by Richard Guy tells something of the history -- which I just learned! (reference to Guy paper below). While mentioning references, I add that a joint paper with Alan Edelman is in preparation and will be available from my website and his. The novel part of that paper will show that the 3:1 obtuse: acute ratio still applies when corners are chosen at random following a normal distribution. (We lose 3:1 if they use a uniform distribution, as in Guy's paper. We recover 3:1 when *angles* are chosen uniformly -that is the object of this module!)

Here is one more reference, this time to "Bertrand's Paradox," as on Wikipedia. This is about the length of a random chord in a unit circle. The answer again depends on the meaning of random -- three different answers, all completely reasonable.

Teaching from the BLOSSOMS module:
I hope that the triangle drawn on the blackboard, and its physical form as a triangle inside a cube, will become clear as the class thinks about the equation "sum of angles = 180." I chose degrees instead of radians to avoid any unnecessary difficulty (but a remark about this point could be useful). The key idea is that ** a linear equation in 3 dimensions produces a plane**.

Although I have taught linear algebra for (too) many years, I don't have a perfect way to help students see this. Maybe the point is that if two sets of angles add to 180 , then their average does too -- geometrically, if two points are on our graph, then so is the point halfway between. This makes the graph flat: a plane.

A valuable discussion to develop with the class: Draw a righttriangle and label edges $a, b, c$ and recall that $a^{\wedge} 2+b^{\wedge} 2=c^{\wedge} 2$. What happens to this equation when the angle grows beyond 90 degrees ?? The class can guess: $c^{\wedge} 2$ is now larger than $a^{\wedge} 2+b^{\wedge} 2$. This is the test for an obtuse triangle. It can be applied in a sampling test of random triangles (after identifying the longest side).

There is an option to continue to the Law of Cosines, which gives the exact difference 2 a $b \cos \left(\right.$ theta) between $c^{\wedge} 2$ and $a^{\wedge} 2+b^{\wedge} 2$. My comments connecting this problem to the more famous Broken Stick problem in Professor Larson's BLOSSOMS module had to be brief -- it is terrific that the two different problems reduce to the same picture: a triangle within a triangle, leading to probabilities $3 / 4$ and $1 / 4$. In both cases we have a linear equation for the sum of the parts -- the pieces of the stick or the angles in my triangle.

In my final segment (not necessarily for the class), I ask about taking three lengths independently -- each can be anywhere from 0 to 1 , instead of a known sum for the Broken Stick. Then the question again arises whether the three random lengths can be the sides of a triangle. Those lengths $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}$, have to satisfy the triangle inequality $\mathrm{a}<\mathrm{b}+$ c ( and two more, $\mathrm{b}<\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{c}$ and $\mathrm{c}<\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{b}$ ).

The numbers $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}$ give a point in the unit cube. The borderline case $\mathrm{a}=\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{c}$ gives a plane in 3D. That plane cuts off a little pyramid (or tetrahedron, the base is a triangle) from the cube. Its volume is $1 / 6$ (base has area $1 / 2$ ). Three of those pyramids make volume $1 / 2$, so the chances are $50-50$ that $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}$ satisfy the 3 inequalities and make a triangle. Again a nice answer.
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