

CONGRUENCE PROPERTIES OF THE COEFFICIENTS OF THE CLASSICAL MODULAR POLYNOMIALS

HAIYANG WANG

ABSTRACT. The classical modular polynomials $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ give plane curve models for the modular curves $X_0(\ell)/\mathbb{Q}$ and have been extensively studied. In this article, we provide closed formulas for ℓ nontrivial coefficients of the classical modular polynomials $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ in terms of the Fourier coefficients of the modular invariant function $j(z)$ for a prime ℓ . Our interest in the formulas were motivated by our conjectures on congruences modulo powers of the primes 2, 3 and 5 satisfied by the coefficients of these polynomials. We deduce congruences from these formulas supporting the conjectures.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let ℓ be a prime. Let $\Phi_\ell(X, Y) \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ be the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial. Recall that

$$\Phi_\ell(X, Y) = X^{\ell+1} + Y^{\ell+1} + \sum_{0 \leq m, n \leq \ell} a_{m, n} X^m Y^n,$$

for some $a_{m, n} \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $a_{m, n} = a_{n, m}$. See [16], Ch. 5, Theorem 3 and [20] Theorem II.6.3.

Let $j(z)$ be the modular invariant function (see [20] p. 34). Let $q := e^{2\pi iz}$ and let

$$(1) \quad j(z) = \sum_{i=-1}^{\infty} c_i q^i = \frac{1}{q} + 744 + 196884q + \dots$$

be the Fourier expansion of $j(z)$. In this paper, we provide the following closed formulas for ℓ nontrivial coefficients of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ in terms of the Fourier coefficients of $j(z)$. Recall that it is well known that $a_{\ell, \ell} = -1$ (see [16] Theorem 3, iii) and p. 57).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\ell \geq 3$ be a prime and $0 < m \leq \ell$. Let $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$ be the coefficient of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$.*

(i) *If $0 < m < \ell$, then*

$$(2) \quad a_{\ell, \ell-m} = \sum_{\substack{t_1 r_1 + \dots + t_\lambda r_\lambda = m \\ 0 < r_1 < \dots < r_\lambda, 1 \leq t_i \\ u := t_1 + \dots + t_\lambda - 1}} (-1)^u \frac{u!}{t_1! \dots t_\lambda!} \ell \binom{\ell - m + u}{u} c_{r_1 - 1}^{t_1} \dots c_{r_\lambda - 1}^{t_\lambda}.$$

(ii) *If $m = \ell$, then*

$$(3) \quad a_{\ell, 0} = -(\ell + 1)c_0 + \sum_{\substack{t_1 r_1 + \dots + t_\lambda r_\lambda = \ell \\ 0 < r_1 < \dots < r_\lambda, 1 \leq t_i \\ u := t_1 + \dots + t_\lambda - 1}} (-1)^u \frac{u!}{t_1! \dots t_\lambda!} \ell c_{r_1 - 1}^{t_1} \dots c_{r_\lambda - 1}^{t_\lambda}.$$

(iii) Let $0 < m \leq \ell$. Assume that $0 < r_1 < \cdots < r_\lambda$ and $t_i \geq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$ satisfying $t_1 r_1 + \cdots + t_\lambda r_\lambda = m$. Let $u := t_1 + \cdots + t_\lambda - 1$. Then $\frac{u!}{t_1! \cdots t_\lambda!} \ell^{\binom{\ell-m+u}{u}}$ is an integer.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is found in Section 2.3. Yui introduced an algorithm for computing $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ using the coefficients of the j -function in [27]. However, the paper does not deduce closed formulas for the coefficients of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Different algorithms for computing $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ are found in [4], [6], and [11].

Our interest in the formulas was motivated by our conjecture below on congruences modulo powers of the primes 2, 3 and 5 satisfied by the coefficients of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$.

Conjecture 1.2. Let ℓ be a prime and let $a_{m,n}$ be the coefficient of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Assume that $\ell + 1 > m + n$ and let $c := \ell + 1 - m - n$. Then the following is true.

- (a) If $\ell \neq 2$, then $a_{m,n} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{15c}}$.
- (b) If $\ell \neq 3$, then $a_{m,n} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^{3c}}$. Moreover, if $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then $a_{m,n} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^{\lceil \frac{9}{2}c \rceil}}$.
- (c) If $\ell \neq 5$, then $a_{m,n} \equiv 0 \pmod{5^{3c}}$.

Related congruences for the coefficients of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ of the form $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$ are found in Proposition 2.10, Proposition 2.11, and Conjecture 2.12.

We have verified that Conjecture 1.2 is true for all primes $\ell < 400$ (see Proposition 2.1), through examining the explicit computations of the modular polynomials obtained by Sutherland [23].

Remark 1.3. Computations suggest that Conjecture 1.2 is sharp. For instance, computations suggest that for any given ℓ , there exists $m, n \geq 0$ with $c := \ell + 1 - m - n > 0$ such that $\text{ord}_2(a_{m,n}) = 15c$.

Theorem 1.1 can be applied to yield the following congruences, which provide evidence supporting Conjecture 1.2 when taking $m = \ell$.

Proposition 2.10. Let ℓ be an odd prime and let $0 < m \leq \ell$ be an integer. Let $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$ be the coefficient of the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Then

- (i) If $m \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$, then $a_{\ell, \ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$.
- (ii) If $m \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, then $a_{\ell, \ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^2}$.
- (iii) If $m \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$, then $a_{\ell, \ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^3}$.
- (iv) If $m \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$, then $a_{\ell, \ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^4}$.
- (v) If $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $a_{\ell, \ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^5}$.

Proposition 2.11. Let ℓ be a prime and let $0 < m \leq \ell$ be an integer. Let $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$ be the coefficient of the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Then

- (i) If $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then $a_{\ell, \ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$.
- (ii) If $m \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, then $a_{\ell, \ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^2}$.

Remark 1.4. Computations seem to suggest that in general $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$ is not divisible by 2 when $m \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ and not divisible by 3 when $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$.

Further evidence for Conjecture 1.2 is provided by Proposition 2.16, which proves in particular that the coefficient $a_{0,0}$ of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ is always divisible by $2^{15}3^35^3$ for any prime $\ell > 5$.

Our initial interest in formulating Conjecture 1.2 came from considerations about elliptic curves and is discussed briefly at the end of Section 2.

Acknowledgements. Much of this work is contained in the author's doctoral thesis at the University of Georgia. The author would like to thank his advisor, Dino Lorenzini, for his very helpful guidance and feedback. The author also thanks Pete Clark for his suggestions on Propositions 2.15 and 2.16.

2. COEFFICIENTS OF THE MODULAR POLYNOMIALS

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.1 and deduce some congruences satisfied by the coefficients of the modular polynomials from the theorem.

Proposition 2.1. *Conjecture 1.2 is true for $\ell \leq 400$.*

Proof. By applying the algorithms in [4] and [5], Sutherland computed the modular polynomials $\Phi_N(X, Y)$ for small N [23]. In particular, he computed $\Phi_N(X, Y)$ for $N \leq 400$. Note that the coefficients of $a_{m,n}$ are often of massive size. For instance, the constant coefficient of $\Phi_5(X, Y)$ is divisible already by 2^{90} . By checking the coefficients of modular polynomials from [23], we verified that Conjecture 1.2 is true for all primes $\ell \leq 400$. Our computations were done using Magma [3]. \square

Remark 2.2. We briefly discuss here the history of computing $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ for prime ℓ . The polynomial $\Phi_2(X, Y)$ was given explicitly in 1922 by Fricke in his book [8] on page 372. We could not find the first reference for $\Phi_2(X, Y)$. The case $\ell = 3$ was done by Smith in 1878 [22]. It seems fair to say that the case $\ell = 2$ must have been known to Smith at the time. The case $\ell = 5$ was due to Berwick ([1], 1916). It is interesting to note that the case $\ell = 7$ seems to have been computed only in 1975 by Herrmann [10]. Note that Herrmann seemed to have been unaware of Berwick's computation of the case $\ell = 5$ in 1916. The case $\ell = 11$ was obtained by Kaltofen and Yui ([13], 1984). More recently, Sutherland has computed $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ for all primes $\ell < 1000$ (see [23]) using the algorithm in [4]. Due to the generally massive size of the coefficients of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$, we only verified Conjecture 1.2 up to 400 using Sutherland's computations.

To illustrate Conjecture 1.2, we list the factored coefficients of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ for $\ell = 5$ (see [10] page 193, or [23]).

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{0,0} &= 2^{90} \cdot 3^{18} \cdot 5^3 \cdot 11^9 \\
a_{0,1} &= 2^{77} \cdot 3^{16} \cdot 5^3 \cdot 11^6 \cdot 31 \cdot 1193 \\
a_{1,1} &= -2^{62} \cdot 3^{13} \cdot 11^3 \cdot 26984268714163 \\
a_{0,2} &= 2^{60} \cdot 3^{13} \cdot 5^2 \cdot 11^3 \cdot 13^2 \cdot 3167 \cdot 204437 \\
a_{1,2} &= 2^{47} \cdot 3^{10} \cdot 5^4 \cdot 53359 \cdot 131896604713 \\
a_{2,2} &= 2^{30} \cdot 3^8 \cdot 5^4 \cdot 7 \cdot 13 \cdot 1861 \cdot 6854302120759 \\
a_{0,3} &= 2^{48} \cdot 3^9 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 31 \cdot 1193 \cdot 24203 \cdot 2260451 \\
a_{1,3} &= -2^{31} \cdot 3^7 \cdot 5^3 \cdot 327828841654280269 \\
a_{2,3} &= 2^{17} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^3 \cdot 2311 \cdot 2579 \cdot 3400725958453 \\
a_{3,3} &= -2^2 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 11 \cdot 17 \cdot 131 \cdot 1061 \cdot 169751677267033 \\
a_{0,4} &= 2^{30} \cdot 3^7 \cdot 5 \cdot 13^2 \cdot 3167 \cdot 204437 \\
a_{1,4} &= 2^{20} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5^3 \cdot 12107359229837
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{2,4} &= 3 \cdot 5^3 \cdot 167 \cdot 6117103549378223 \\
a_{3,4} &= 2^5 \cdot 3 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 197 \cdot 227 \cdot 421 \cdot 2387543 \\
a_{4,4} &= 2^3 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 257 \cdot 32412439 \\
a_{0,5} &= 2^{17} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5 \cdot 31 \cdot 1193 \\
a_{1,5} &= -2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 1644556073 \\
a_{2,5} &= 2^5 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 13 \cdot 195053 \\
a_{3,5} &= -2^2 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 131 \cdot 193 \\
a_{4,5} &= 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 31
\end{aligned}$$

2.3. Now we will give the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Fix a prime $\ell \geq 3$. From (1), we know that

$$j(\ell z) = \sum_{i=-1}^{\infty} c_i q^{\ell i}.$$

By construction, $\Phi_\ell(X, Y) = X^{\ell+1} + Y^{\ell+1} + \sum_{0 \leq r, s \leq \ell} a_{r,s} X^r Y^s$, and

$$(4) \quad \Phi_\ell(j(\ell z), j(z)) = 0.$$

We now prove 1.1 (i). Observe that (2) is equivalent to the following:

$$(5) \quad a_{\ell, \ell-m} = \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_m=m \\ 0 \leq t_i, u:=t_1+\dots+t_m-1}} (-1)^u \frac{u!}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_i!} \ell \binom{\ell-m+u}{u} c_0^{t_1} \dots c_{m-1}^{t_m}.$$

We prove (5) by induction on m . Since $a_{\ell, \ell} = -1$, it is immediate that (5) holds for $m = 0$. Assume that (5) is true for $a_{\ell, \ell-1}, \dots, a_{\ell, \ell-m+1}$ for some $m-1$ satisfying $1 \leq m-1 \leq \ell-2$. In the following, we show that it is true for $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$. Recall the notion of multinomial coefficients. Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $g_1, \dots, g_\eta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfying $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \eta} g_i = f$. Define $\binom{f}{g_1, \dots, g_\eta} := \frac{f!}{g_1! \dots g_\eta!}$.

Claim 2.4. The coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2-\ell+m}$ in the q -expansion of the left-hand side of (4), i.e. $j(\ell z)^{\ell+1} + j(z)^{\ell+1} + \sum_{0 \leq r, s \leq \ell} a_{r,s} j(\ell z)^r j(z)^s$, is

$$(6) \quad a_{\ell, \ell-m} + \sum_{0 \leq n \leq m-1} a_{\ell, \ell-n} \left(\sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_{m-n}=m-n \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{m-n}, \ell-n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m-n} t_i} c_0^{t_1} \dots c_{m-n-1}^{t_{m-n}} \right).$$

Indeed, the coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2-\ell+m}$ in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)^{\ell+1}$ is 0 because all the powers in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)$ are divisible by ℓ and $1 \leq m \leq \ell-1$.

Assume that $0 \leq r \leq \ell$ and $0 \leq s \leq \ell+1$ satisfy one of the following three conditions: (a) $r = 0$ and $s = \ell+1$; (b) $0 \leq r < \ell$ and $0 \leq s \leq \ell$; (c) $r = \ell$ and $0 \leq s < \ell-m$. Then the lowest degree in the q -expansion of $a_{r,s} j(\ell z)^r j(z)^s$ is greater than $-\ell^2 - \ell + m$.

The coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2-\ell+m}$ in the q -expansion of $a_{\ell, \ell-m} j(\ell z)^\ell j(z)^{\ell-m}$ is $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$.

Claim 2.5. Let $0 \leq n < m$ and let A_n denote the coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2-\ell+m}$ in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)^\ell j(z)^{\ell-n}$. Then

$$A_n = \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+2+\dots+t_{m-n} \\ t_i \geq 0}}^{(m-n)=m-n} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{m-n}, \ell-n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m-n} t_i} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{m-n-1}^{t_{m-n}}.$$

Because $j(z) = \sum_{i=-1}^{\infty} c_i q^i = q^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^i$ and $j(\ell z) = \sum_{i=-1}^{\infty} c_i q^{\ell i} = q^{-\ell} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^{\ell i}$, we have that

$$j(\ell z)^\ell j(z)^{\ell-n} = q^{-\ell^2-\ell+n} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^{\ell i} \right)^\ell \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^i \right)^{\ell-n}.$$

In the q -expansion of $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^{\ell i} \right)^\ell$, the lowest degree term is 1, and the second lowest degree is ℓ . So A_n equals the coefficient of q^{m-n} in the q -expansion of $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^i \right)^{\ell-n}$.

Let $j_1(z) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-n} c_{i-1} q^i$ and $j_2(z) = \sum_{i=m-n+1}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^i$. Then $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1} q^i \right)^{\ell-n} = (j_1(z) + j_2(z))^{\ell-n} = \sum_{k=0}^{\ell-n} \binom{\ell-n}{k} (j_1(z))^{\ell-n-k} (j_2(z))^k$.

If $k > 0$, then the lowest degree in the q -expansion of $j_2(z)^k$ is $k(m-n+1) > m-n$. So A_n equals the coefficient of the term q^{m-n} in the q -expansion of $(j_1(z))^{\ell-n}$.

$$\begin{aligned} (j_1(z))^{\ell-n} &= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-n} c_{i-1} q^i \right)^{\ell-n} \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{=} \sum_{\substack{t_1+\dots+t_{m-n+1}=\ell-n \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{m-n}, t_{m-n+1}} (c_0 q)^{t_1} (c_1 q^2)^{t_2} \cdots (c_{m-n-1} q^{m-n})^{t_{m-n}} 1^{t_{m-n+1}} \\ &= \sum_{\substack{t_1+\dots+t_{m-n} \leq \ell-n \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{m-n}, \ell-n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m-n} t_i} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{m-n-1}^{t_{m-n}} q^{t_1+t_2+2+\dots+t_{m-n}(m-n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $(*)$ is by the Multinomial Theorem. It follows that Claim 2.5 is true. So the coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2-\ell+m}$ in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)^{\ell+1} + j(z)^{\ell+1} + \sum_{0 \leq r, s \leq \ell} a_{r,s} j(\ell z)^r j(z)^s$ is (6). Therefore Claim 2.4 is true.

Since $\Phi_\ell(j(\ell z), j(z)) = 0$ in (4), we find that the expression (6) equals 0. Therefore,

$$(7) \quad a_{\ell, \ell-m} = - \sum_{0 \leq n \leq m-1} a_{\ell, \ell-n} \left(\sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+2+\dots+t_{m-n} \\ t_i \geq 0}}^{(m-n)=m-n} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{m-n}, \ell-n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m-n} t_i} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{m-n-1}^{t_{m-n}} \right).$$

Our next step is to use the induction hypothesis to express $a_{\ell, \ell-n}$ when $n \leq m-1$. For convenience, let us introduce the following notation.

For any $\lambda > 0$ and $0 \leq r_1 < r_2 < \dots < r_\lambda \leq \ell$ and $0 \leq t_1, \dots, t_\lambda \leq \ell$ such that $0 \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i r_i \leq \ell$, we define

$$d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_1, \dots, t_\lambda} := \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i!} \right) \ell \left(\frac{(\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i r_i + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i)!}{(\ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i r_i)!} \right),$$

so that (5) becomes

$$(8) \quad a_{\ell, \ell-m} = \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_m=m \\ 0 \leq t_i, u:=t_1+\dots+t_{m-1}}} d_{1, \dots, m}^{t_1, \dots, t_m} c_0^{t_1} \dots c_{m-1}^{t_m}.$$

Given $t_{i,1}$ with $0 \leq t_{i,1} \leq t_i$, let $t_{i,2} := t_i - t_{i,1}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\ell, \ell-m} &= - \sum_{0 \leq n \leq m-1} \left(\sum_{\substack{\bar{t}_1+\bar{t}_2+\dots+\bar{t}_m=n \\ 0 \leq \bar{t}_i, u:=\bar{t}_1+\dots+\bar{t}_{m-1}}} (-1)^u \frac{u!}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \bar{t}_i!} \ell \binom{\ell-n+u}{u} c_0^{\bar{t}_1} \dots c_{m-1}^{\bar{t}_m} \right) \\ &\quad \left(\sum_{\substack{\hat{t}_1+\hat{t}_2+\dots+\hat{t}_m=m-n \\ 0 \leq \hat{t}_i}} \binom{\ell-n}{\hat{t}_1, \dots, \hat{t}_m, \ell-n-\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \hat{t}_i} c_0^{\hat{t}_1} \dots c_{m-1}^{\hat{t}_m} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{0 \leq n \leq m-1} \sum_{\substack{\bar{t}_1+\bar{t}_2+\dots+\bar{t}_m=n \\ \hat{t}_1+\hat{t}_2+\dots+\hat{t}_m=m-n \\ \bar{t}_i \geq 0, \hat{t}_i \geq 0}} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \bar{t}_i} \right) \left(\frac{(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \bar{t}_i)!}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \bar{t}_i!} \right) \ell \binom{\ell-1-n + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \bar{t}_i}{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \bar{t}_i}. \\ &\quad \left(\binom{\ell-n}{\hat{t}_1, \dots, \hat{t}_m, \ell-n-\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \hat{t}_i} c_0^{\bar{t}_1+\hat{t}_1} \dots c_{m-1}^{\bar{t}_m+\hat{t}_m} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_m=m \\ 0 \leq t_i}} \sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{\beta,1} \leq t_\beta \\ \text{for } 1 \leq \beta \leq m \\ (t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{m,1}) \neq \\ (t_1, \dots, t_m)}} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1})!}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1}!} \right) \ell. \\ &\quad \left(\binom{\ell-1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1}i + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1}}{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\binom{\ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1}i}{t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{m,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1}i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,2}} \right) c_0^{t_1} \dots c_{m-1}^{t_m} \end{aligned}$$

$$= - \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_m=m \\ 0 \leq t_i}} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{\beta,1} \leq t_\beta \\ \text{for } 1 \leq \beta \leq m \\ (t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{m,1}) \neq \\ (t_1, \dots, t_m)}} d_{1, \dots, m}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{m,1}} \left(t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{m,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} t_{i,2} \right) \right) c_0^{t_1} \dots c_{m-1}^{t_m}.$$

To prove (8), it is now enough to prove that

$$(9) \quad d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_1, \dots, t_\lambda} = - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1 \\ \dots \\ 0 \leq t_{\lambda,1} \leq t_\lambda \\ (t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}) \neq \\ (t_1, \dots, t_\lambda)}} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \right)$$

for any $\lambda > 0$, $0 < r_1 < \dots < r_\lambda$ and $t_1, \dots, t_\lambda \geq 1$ such that $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} r_i t_i = m$. The formula (9) is proved below using Claim 2.6. First, we need the following.

For $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{s}(d, n)$ and $\mathbf{S}(d, n)$ denote the Stirling number of the first and of the second kind, respectively. Recall that $\mathbf{s}(d, n)$ is $(-1)^{d-n}$ multiplies the number of elements in the symmetric group S_d with n disjoint cycles and $\mathbf{S}(d, n)$ is the number of ways to partition a set of d elements into n non-empty subsets. If $0 \leq d < n$, then $\mathbf{S}(d, n) = 0$ by the definition. The numbers $\mathbf{s}(d, n)$ and $\mathbf{S}(d, n)$ are characterized by Equations (10) and (11) below, respectively.

For $n \geq 1$, we have that

$$(10) \quad \prod_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} (x-i) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} \mathbf{s}(n, i) x^i.$$

See [19] p. 33 (34). For $d \geq 0$ and $n \geq 0$, we have that

$$(11) \quad \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} (n-i)^d = n! \mathbf{S}(d, n).$$

See [19] p. 33 (38) and Example 12 on p. 13. By changing i to $n-i$, we get that

$$(12) \quad \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} i^d = (-1)^n n! \mathbf{S}(d, n).$$

For the rest of the proof of Theorem 1.1 (i), fix $\lambda > 0$, $0 < r_1 < \dots < r_\lambda$ and $t_1, \dots, t_\lambda \geq 1$ such that $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} r_i t_i = m$.

Claim 2.6. Let $\lambda > 0$ and let α be an integer with $0 \leq \alpha \leq \lambda$. For each integer i with $\alpha + 1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, fix $t_{i,1}$ with $0 \leq t_{i,1} \leq t_i$. Then the following is true.

(a) If $\alpha = 0$, then

$$d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left((-1)^{-1+\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 1 \leq i \leq \lambda}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\quad (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) If $1 \leq \alpha < \lambda$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
(13) \quad &\sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1, \\ \dots \\ 0 \leq t_{\alpha,1} \leq t_\alpha}} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i \\ t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \end{array} \right) \\
&= \left((-1)^{-1+\sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 1 \leq i \leq \lambda}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\quad \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq k < j} v_k \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \alpha}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\quad (\ell - 1 - \sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha} v_i} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \left(\begin{array}{c} v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j \\ v_i \end{array} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

(c) If $\alpha = \lambda$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
(14) \quad &\sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1 \\ \dots \\ 0 \leq t_{\lambda,1} \leq t_\lambda}} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i \\ t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \end{array} \right) \\
&= -\ell \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 1 \leq i \leq \lambda}} \left(\mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) (\ell - 1)^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} v_i} \cdot \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq k < j} v_k \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \lambda}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) (\ell - 1)^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} v_i} \cdot \right. \\
&\quad \left. \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \left(\begin{array}{c} v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j \\ v_i \end{array} \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of Claim 2.6. (a) Assume that $\alpha = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i \\ t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \end{array} \right) \\
&= \left((-1)^{-1+\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1})!}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}!} \right) \ell \left(\begin{array}{c} \ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} \\ -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} \end{array} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \binom{\ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i}{t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2}} \\
&= \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \ell \prod_{0 \leq j \leq -2 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i} (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} (r_i - 1) - j) \\
&\stackrel{\text{use (10)}}{=} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \ell \sum_{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\hspace{15em} (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} (r_i - 1))^{v_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

(b) We use induction on α . Let $\alpha = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \binom{\ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i}{t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2}} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\hspace{15em} (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} t_{i,1} (r_i - 1))^{v_0} \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\hspace{10em} \sum_{0 \leq v_1 \leq v_0} \binom{v_0}{v_1} (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} (r_i - 1))^{v_0 - v_1} (t_{1,1} (1 - r_1))^{v_1} \\
&= \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_1 \leq v_0}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\hspace{10em} (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} (r_i - 1))^{v_0 - v_1} (1 - r_1)^{v_1} \binom{v_0}{v_1} \frac{1}{t_1!} \sum_{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1} (-1)^{t_{1,1}} \binom{t_1}{t_{1,1}} t_{1,1}^{v_1} \\
&\stackrel{\text{use (12)}}{=} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_1 \leq v_0}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - v_1} (1 - r_1)^{v_1} \binom{v_0}{v_1} (-1)^{t_1} \mathbf{S}(v_1, t_1) \\
= & \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_1 \leq v_0}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
& (\ell - 1 - \sum_{1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - v_1} (-1)^{t_1} (1 - r_1)^{v_1} \mathbf{S}(v_1, t_1) \binom{v_0}{v_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

So the base case $\alpha = 1$ is true. Assume that Claim 2.6 is true up to $\alpha - 1 \leq \lambda - 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1, \\ \dots \\ 0 \leq t_{\alpha,1} \leq t_\alpha}} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \right) \\
= & \sum_{0 \leq t_{\alpha,1} \leq t_\alpha} \left(\sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1, \\ \dots \\ 0 \leq t_{\alpha-1,1} \leq t_{\alpha-1}}} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \right) \right) \\
\stackrel{(*)}{=} & \sum_{0 \leq t_{\alpha,1} \leq t_\alpha} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{\alpha-1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{\alpha-1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k < j \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \alpha-1}} v_k}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
& (\ell - 1 - \sum_{\alpha-1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha-1} v_i} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha-1} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j}{v_i} \\
= & \sum_{0 \leq t_{\alpha,1} \leq t_\alpha} \left((-1)^{-1 + \sum_{\alpha-1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{\alpha-1 < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k < j \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \alpha-1}} v_k}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
& \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_\alpha \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha-1} v_i \\ 1 \leq i \leq \alpha-1}} \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha-1} v_i}{v_\alpha} (\ell - 1 - \sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha} v_i} \cdot \\
& (t_{\alpha,1}(1 - r_\alpha))^{v_\alpha} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha-1} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j}{v_i}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left((-1)^{-1+\sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq k < j} v_k \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \alpha}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\quad (\ell - 1 - \sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha} v_i} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha - 1} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j}{v_i} \cdot \\
&\quad (1 - r_\alpha)^{v_\alpha} \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha - 1} v_i}{v_\alpha} \frac{1}{t_\alpha!} \sum_{0 \leq t_{\alpha,1} \leq t_\alpha} (-1)^{t_{\alpha,1}} \binom{t_\alpha}{t_{\alpha,1}} t_{\alpha,1}^{v_\alpha} \\
&\stackrel{\text{use (12)}}{=} \left((-1)^{-1+\sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq k < j} v_k \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \alpha}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\quad (\ell - 1 - \sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha} v_i} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha - 1} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j}{v_i} \cdot \\
&\quad (1 - r_\alpha)^{v_\alpha} \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha - 1} v_i}{v_\alpha} (-1)^{t_\alpha} \mathbf{S}(v_\alpha, t_\alpha) \\
&= \left((-1)^{-1+\sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}} \right) \left(\frac{\ell}{\prod_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!} \right) \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq k < j} v_k \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \alpha}} \mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0) \cdot \\
&\quad (\ell - 1 - \sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1))^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha} v_i} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \alpha} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j}{v_i}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that (*) is by the induction hypothesis of the Claim 2.6 for $\alpha - 1$. Hence part (b) of Claim 2.6 is true.

(c) Formula (14) comes from Formula (13) by taking $\alpha = \lambda$ and letting the empty sums $\sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}$ and $\sum_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}(r_i - 1)$ to be 0, and the empty product $\prod_{\alpha < i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1}! t_{i,2}!$ to be 1. The proof in part (b) still works when $\alpha = \lambda$. This completes the proof of Claim 2.6. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (i) (continued). From part (c) of Claim 2.6, we get that

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1 \\ \dots \\ 0 \leq t_{\lambda,1} \leq t_\lambda}} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \right)$$

(15)

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\ell \sum_{\substack{0 \leq v_0 \leq -1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \\ 0 \leq v_j \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq k < j} v_k \\ \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \lambda}} \left(\mathbf{s}(-1 + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i, v_0)(\ell - 1)^{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} v_i} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j}{v_i} \right) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds because each term in the sum of line (15) is 0. Indeed, in the factor $\prod_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} (-1)^{t_i} (1 - r_i)^{v_i} \mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) \binom{v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq j < i} v_j}{v_i}$, there exists $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$ such that $v_i < t_i$ and hence $\mathbf{S}(v_i, t_i) = 0$. We can show this by contradiction. If $v_i \geq t_i$ for each $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$, then $v_0 - \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lambda} v_i \leq v_0 - \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_i \leq -1$. But $v_\lambda \leq v_0 - \sum_{1 \leq i < \lambda} v_i$ and therefore $v_0 - \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \lambda} v_i \geq 0$. This is a contradiction.

Note that if $(t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}) = (t_1, \dots, t_\lambda)$, then

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i \\ t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \end{array} \right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i \\ 0, \dots, 0, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i \end{array} \right) = 1.$$

Hence,

$$d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_1, \dots, t_\lambda} = - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq t_{1,1} \leq t_1 \\ \dots \\ 0 \leq t_{\lambda,1} \leq t_\lambda \\ (t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}) \neq (t_1, \dots, t_\lambda)}} d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}} \left(\begin{array}{c} \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i \\ t_{1,2}, \dots, t_{\lambda,2}, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,1} r_i - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \lambda} t_{i,2} \end{array} \right).$$

Therefore, Equation (9) holds. This completes the proof of part (i) of Theorem 1.1.

From (9), we know that $d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_1, \dots, t_\lambda}$ can be represented in terms of $d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_{1,1}, \dots, t_{\lambda,1}}$ with $0 \leq t_{i,1} \leq t_i$, $0 \leq \sum r_i t_{i,1} < \sum r_i t_i$, and the binomial coefficients using product, summation, and negation. Because $d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{0, \dots, 0} = -1$ is an integer, we get that $d_{r_1, \dots, r_\lambda}^{t_1, \dots, t_\lambda}$ is an integer. This proves Theorem 1.1 (iii) when $0 < m < \ell$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (ii) We start with the following claim.

Claim 2.7. The coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2}$ in the q -expansion of the left-hand side of (4), i.e. $j(\ell z)^{\ell+1} + j(z)^{\ell+1} + \sum_{0 \leq r, s \leq \ell} a_{r,s} j(\ell z)^r j(z)^s$, is

(16)

$$a_{\ell,0} + a_{\ell-1,\ell} + a_{\ell,\ell} c_0 + (\ell + 1) c_0 +$$

$$\sum_{0 \leq n \leq \ell-1} a_{\ell, \ell-n} \left(\sum_{\substack{t_1 + t_2 + \dots + t_{\ell-n} = \ell-n \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{\ell-n}, \ell-n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-n} t_i} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{\ell-n-1}^{t_{\ell-n-1}} \right).$$

Assume that $0 \leq r \leq \ell$ and $0 \leq s \leq \ell + 1$ satisfy one of the following three conditions: (a) $r = 0$ and $s = \ell + 1$; (b) $0 \leq r \leq \ell - 2$ and $0 \leq s \leq \ell$; (c) $r = \ell - 1$ and $0 \leq s \leq \ell - 1$. Then the lowest degree in the q -expansion of $a_{r,s} j(\ell z)^r j(z)^s$ is greater than $-\ell^2$.

The coefficients of the term $q^{-\ell^2}$ in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)^\ell$ and $j(\ell z)^{\ell-1}j(z)^\ell$ are both 1. The coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2}$ in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)^{\ell+1}$ is $(\ell+1)c_0$. This is clear because $j(\ell z)^{\ell+1} = q^{-\ell(\ell+1)}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^{\ell i}\right)^{\ell+1}$.

Claim 2.8. Let $1 \leq n \leq \ell - n$ and let A_n be the coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2}$ in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)^\ell j(z)^{\ell-n}$. Then the following is true.

(a)

$$A_0 = \ell c_0 + \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_\ell=\ell \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell}{t_1, \dots, t_\ell, \ell - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} t_i} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{\ell-1}^{t_\ell}.$$

(b) If $1 \leq n \leq \ell - 1$, then

$$A_n = \sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_{\ell-n}(\ell-n)=\ell-n \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{\ell-n}, \ell-n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell-n} t_i} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{\ell-n-1}^{t_{\ell-n}}.$$

Recall that

$$j(\ell z)^\ell j(z)^\ell = q^{-\ell^2-\ell} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^{\ell i}\right)^\ell \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^i\right)^\ell.$$

In the q -expansion of $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^{\ell i}\right)^\ell$, the lowest degree term is 1, the second lowest degree term is $\ell c_0 q^\ell$, and the third lowest degree is 2ℓ . So A_0 is the sum of ℓc_0 and the coefficient of q^ℓ in the q -expansion of $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^i\right)^\ell$.

Assume that $1 \leq n \leq \ell - 1$. Then

$$j(\ell z)^\ell j(z)^{\ell-n} = q^{-\ell^2-\ell+n} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^{\ell i}\right)^\ell \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^i\right)^{\ell-n}.$$

In the q -expansion of $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^{\ell i}\right)^\ell$, the lowest degree term is 1, the second lowest degree is ℓ . So A_n is the coefficient of $q^{\ell-n}$ in the q -expansion of $\left(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_{i-1}q^i\right)^{\ell-n}$. By the Multinomial Theorem as used in the proof of Claim 2.5, we know that part (a) and (b) of Claim 2.8 hold.

It follows that the coefficient of the term $q^{-\ell^2}$ in the q -expansion of $j(\ell z)^{\ell+1} + j(z)^{\ell+1} + \sum_{0 \leq r, s \leq \ell} a_{r,s} j(\ell z)^r j(z)^s$ is (16). Therefore Claim 2.7 is true.

Since $\Phi_\ell(j(\ell z), j(z)) = 0$ in (4), we find that the expression (16) equals 0. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\ell,0} &= -a_{\ell-1,\ell} - a_{\ell,\ell} \ell c_0 - (\ell+1)c_0 - \\
&\sum_{0 \leq n \leq \ell-1} a_{\ell,\ell-n} \left(\sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_{\ell-n}=\ell-n \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{\ell-n}} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{\ell-n-1}^{t_{\ell-n}} \right) \\
&= -(\ell+1)c_0 - \\
&\sum_{0 \leq n \leq \ell-1} a_{\ell,\ell-n} \left(\sum_{\substack{t_1+t_2+\dots+t_{\ell-n}=\ell-n \\ t_i \geq 0}} \binom{\ell-n}{t_1, \dots, t_{\ell-n}} c_0^{t_1} \cdots c_{\ell-n-1}^{t_{\ell-n}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the facts that $a_{\ell,\ell} = -1$ and $a_{\ell-1,\ell} = a_{\ell,\ell-1} = \ell c_0$ proved in Theorem 1.1 (i).

The rest of the proof of Theorem 1.1 (ii) is the same as the proof of Theorem 1.1 (i). We simply take $m = \ell$ after the line (7) in the proof of Theorem 1.1 (i). The case $m = \ell$ in Theorem 1.1 (iii) follows as in the case $0 < m < \ell$. The proof of Theorem 1.1 is now complete. \square

Example 2.9. For use later in Proposition 2.13, we list explicitly the first few coefficients $a_{\ell,\ell-m}$ with $m < \ell$ in Theorem 1.1: $a_{\ell,\ell-1} = \ell c_0$, $a_{\ell,\ell-2} = \ell c_1 - \binom{\ell}{2} c_0^2$, $a_{\ell,\ell-3} = \ell c_2 - \ell(\ell-2)c_0 c_1 + \binom{\ell}{3} c_0^3$,

$$a_{\ell,\ell-4} = \ell c_3 - \ell(\ell-3)\left(\frac{c_1^2}{2} + c_0 c_2\right) + \ell \binom{\ell-2}{2} c_0^2 c_1 - \binom{\ell}{4} c_0^4,$$

$$a_{\ell,\ell-5} = \ell c_4 - \ell(\ell-4)(c_0 c_3 + c_1 c_2) + \ell \binom{\ell-3}{2} (c_0^2 c_2 + c_0 c_1^2) - \ell \binom{\ell-2}{3} c_0^3 c_1 + \binom{\ell}{5} c_0^5,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\ell,\ell-6} &= \ell c_5 - \ell(\ell-5)(c_4 c_0 + c_3 c_1 + \frac{1}{2} c_2^2) + \ell \binom{\ell-4}{2} (c_3 c_0^2 + 2c_2 c_1 c_0 + \frac{1}{3} c_1^3) \\
&\quad - \ell \binom{\ell-3}{3} (c_2 c_0^3 + \frac{3}{2} c_1^2 c_0^2) + \ell \binom{\ell-2}{4} c_1 c_0^4 - \binom{\ell}{6} c_0^6,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\ell,\ell-7} &= \ell c_6 - \ell(\ell-6)(c_2 c_3 + c_0 c_5 + c_1 c_4) + \ell \binom{\ell-5}{2} (c_0^2 c_4 + 2c_0 c_1 c_3 + c_1^2 c_2 + c_0 c_2^2) \\
&\quad - \ell \binom{\ell-4}{3} (3c_0^2 c_1 c_2 + c_0^3 c_3 + c_0 c_1^3) + \ell \binom{\ell-3}{4} (c_0^4 c_2 + 2c_0^3 c_1^2) - \ell \binom{\ell-2}{5} c_0^5 c_1 + \binom{\ell}{7} c_0^7.
\end{aligned}$$

We now use Theorem 1.1 to provide some evidence supporting Conjecture 1.2. Recall that part (a) of Conjecture 1.2 implies that $a_{\ell,0}$ is divisible by 2^{15} . In our next proposition, we prove divisibilities by powers of 2 for more general coefficients $a_{\ell,\ell-m}$ with $m \leq \ell$.

Proposition 2.10. *Let ℓ be an odd prime and let $0 < m \leq \ell$ be an integer. Let $a_{\ell,\ell-m}$ be the coefficient of the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Then*

- (i) *If $m \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$, then $a_{\ell,\ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$.*
- (ii) *If $m \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, then $a_{\ell,\ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^2}$.*
- (iii) *If $m \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$, then $a_{\ell,\ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^3}$.*
- (iv) *If $m \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$, then $a_{\ell,\ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^4}$.*
- (v) *If $m \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $a_{\ell,\ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^5}$.*

Proof. First, we consider the case $m = \ell$ and prove the congruences for $a_{\ell,0}$ using Equation (3). Recall that $c_0 = 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 31$. So $(\ell + 1)c_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{2^4}$. Assume that $t_1 r_1 + \dots + t_\lambda r_\lambda = \ell$ for some $0 < r_1 < \dots < r_\lambda$ and $t_1, \dots, t_\lambda \geq 1$.

If $r_1 \geq 2$, then $r_i \geq 3$ is odd for some $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$. Hence $c_{r_i-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{11}}$ by Theorem 1 in [17]. If $r_1 = 1$ and $t_1 \geq 2$, then $c_{r_1-1}^{t_1} = c_0^{t_1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^6}$. If $r_1 = t_1 = 1$ and r_i is odd for some $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$. Then $c_{r_i-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{11}}$ by Theorem 1 in [17]. Assume that $r_1 = t_1 = 1$ and r_i is even for each $2 \leq i \leq \lambda$.

Assume that $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$. then $c_{r_1-1} = c_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{2^3}$. So each summand on the right-hand side of (3) is divisible by 2^3 and hence, 2^3 divides $a_{\ell,0}$.

Assume that $\ell \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$. If $r_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ for some $2 \leq i \leq \lambda$, then $c_{r_i-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ by relations (2),(3) and (4) in [14]. So 2^4 divides $c_{r_1-1}^{t_1} \dots c_{r_\lambda-1}^{t_\lambda}$. If $r_i \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ for each $2 \leq i \leq \lambda$, then $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$. This is a contradiction. So each summand on the right-hand side of (3) is divisible by 2^4 and hence, 2^4 divides $a_{\ell,0}$.

Assume that $\ell \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. If $r_i \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ for some $2 \leq i \leq \lambda$, then $c_{r_i-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^2}$ by the relations (2) and (4) in [14]. So 2^5 divides $c_{r_1-1}^{t_1} \dots c_{r_\lambda-1}^{t_\lambda}$. If $r_i \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ or $r_i \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$ for each $2 \leq i \leq \lambda$, then $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ or $\ell \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$. This is a contradiction. So each summand on the right-hand side of (3) is divisible by 2^5 and hence, 2^5 divides $a_{\ell,0}$.

The cases where $m < \ell$ are proved using the formula (2) for $a_{\ell,\ell-m}$ in Theorem 1.1. We leave the details to the reader. \square

Recall that part (b) of Conjecture 1.2 implies that $a_{\ell,0} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^3}$, and when $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, $a_{\ell,0} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^5}$. Using Theorem 1.1, we can show the following:

Proposition 2.11. *Let ℓ be a prime and let $0 < m \leq \ell$ be an integer. Let $a_{\ell,\ell-m}$ be the coefficient of the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Then*

- (i) *If $m \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then $a_{\ell,\ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$.*
- (ii) *If $m \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, then $a_{\ell,\ell-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^2}$.*

Proof. We first prove the congruence for $a_{\ell,0}$ using Equation (3). Recall that $c_0 = 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 31$. Assume that $t_1 r_1 + \dots + t_\lambda r_\lambda = \ell$ for some $0 < r_1 < \dots < r_\lambda$ and $t_1, \dots, t_\lambda \geq 1$.

Then $r_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq \lambda$. If $r_i = 1$, then $c_{r_i-1} = c_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$. Assume that $r_i > 1$. If $r_i \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, then $c_{r_i-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^5}$ by Theorem 1 in [17]. If $r_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, then $c_{r_i-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^3}$ by 1.13 in [15]. Assume that $r_1 = 1$ and $t_1 \geq 2$. Then $c_0^{t_1} \equiv 0 \pmod{3^2}$.

Assume that $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. Then $(\ell + 1)c_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$. So each summand on the right-hand side of (3) is divisible by 3 and hence, 3 divides $a_{\ell,0}$.

Assume that $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$. Then $(\ell + 1)c_0 \equiv 0 \pmod{3^2}$. If $r_1 = t_1 = 1$, then $r_2 t_2 + \dots + r_\lambda t_\lambda = \ell - 1$. If $r_i \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ for each $2 \leq i \leq \lambda$, then $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. This is a contradiction. So each summand on the right-hand side of (3) is divisible by 3^2 and hence, 3^2 divides $a_{\ell,0}$.

The cases when $m < \ell$ are proved using the formula (2) for $a_{\ell,\ell-m}$. We leave the details to the reader. \square

Recall that Conjecture 1.2 part (c) predicts certain congruences modulo 5 satisfied by $a_{m,n}$ with $\ell + 1 > m + n$. Our computations also suggest that the following 5-divisibilities hold in some cases where $\ell + 1 \leq m + n$.

Conjecture 2.12. *Let ℓ be a prime and let $0 < m < \ell$ be an integer. Let $a_{\ell,\ell-m}$ be the coefficient of the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Assume that one of the following three conditions is true:*

- (i) *$\ell \equiv 1$ or $3 \pmod{5}$ and $m \equiv 4 \pmod{5}$;*

- (ii) $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{5}$ and $m \equiv 3 \pmod{5}$;
- (iii) $\ell \equiv 4 \pmod{5}$ and $m \equiv 2 \pmod{5}$.

Then 5 divides $a_{\ell, \ell-m}$.

Recall that $c_0 = 744$, $c_1 = 196884$, $c_2 = 21493760$, $c_3 = 864299970$, $c_4 = 20245856256$, $c_5 = 333202640600$, and $c_6 = 4252023300096$ (see e.g. [24] p. 398).

Proposition 2.13. *Conjecture 2.12 is true for $m \leq 7$.*

Proof. We reduce the expressions in 2.9 modulo 5 and find: If $\ell \equiv 4 \pmod{5}$, then

$$a_{\ell, \ell-2} \equiv \ell c_1 - \frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2} c_0^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{5},$$

and

$$a_{\ell, \ell-7} \equiv \ell c_6 - \ell(\ell-6)c_1 c_4 + \ell \binom{\ell-5}{2} c_0^2 c_4 - \ell \binom{\ell-2}{5} c_0^5 c_1 + \binom{\ell}{7} c_0^7 \equiv 0 \pmod{5}.$$

If $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{5}$, then

$$a_{\ell, \ell-3} \equiv -\ell(\ell-2)c_0 c_1 + \binom{\ell}{3} c_0^3 \equiv 0 \pmod{5}.$$

If $\ell \equiv 1$ or $3 \pmod{5}$, then

$$a_{\ell, \ell-4} \equiv -\frac{\ell(\ell-3)}{2} c_1^2 + \ell \binom{\ell-2}{2} c_1 c_0^2 - \binom{\ell}{4} c_0^4 \equiv 0 \pmod{5}.$$

□

Let ℓ be an odd prime such that $\left(\frac{-3}{\ell}\right) = 1$. The following theorem of Ito shows that Conjecture 1.2 is true for both $a_{0,0}$ and $a_{1,0}$ of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$ for such ℓ .

Theorem 2.14. [Ito [12], see Theorem 1] *Let $\ell \geq 5$ be a prime and let $a_{0,0}$ and $a_{1,0}$ be the coefficients of the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Then $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ if and only if $a_{0,0} = a_{1,0} = 0$.*

For a general prime ℓ , we prove the following results on the divisibilities of $a_{0,0}$ of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$.

Proposition 2.15. *Let K be an imaginary quadratic field with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K and Hilbert class field H . Let j be the j -invariant of an elliptic curve E/H with geometric endomorphism ring \mathcal{O}_K . Assume that a prime $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ splits completely in H . Let $a_{0,0}$ be the coefficient of the ℓ -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Then $|\text{Norm}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathbb{Q}(j)} j|$ divides $a_{0,0}$.*

Proof. Because ℓ splits completely in H , we have that ℓ splits completely as $\mathfrak{p}_1 \mathfrak{p}_2$ in K where \mathfrak{p}_1 and \mathfrak{p}_2 are principal ideals. Assume that $\mathfrak{p}_1 = (\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathcal{O}_K$. Then $|\text{Norm}_{\mathbb{Q}}^K \alpha| = \ell$. Let $[\alpha] : E \rightarrow E$ be the endomorphism as defined in Proposition II 1.1 of [20]. Then $[\alpha]$ has degree ℓ by Corollary II 1.5 in [20]. It follows that $\Phi_\ell(j, j) = 0$ and hence j is a root of the polynomial $P(X) := \Phi_\ell(X, X)$. Note that $P(X)$ has leading term $-X^{2\ell}$. In particular, $P(X)$ is primitive.

Let $f(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be a primitive minimal polynomial of j over \mathbb{Q} . Then $P(X) = f(X)g(X)$ for some $g(X) \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$. By Gauss's Lemma, $g(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$. Therefore the constant term $\text{Norm}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathbb{Q}(j)} j$ of $f(X)$ divides $a_{0,0}$. □

For the norms of some CM j -invariants, see [9] Table 1, and [2].

Proposition 2.16. *Let $\ell > 5$ be a prime and let $a_{0,0}$ be the coefficient of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$. Then the following is true.*

(i) $a_{0,0} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{15}3^35^3}$.

(ii) *If Conjecture 1.2 is true for all $a_{m,n}$ with $(m, n) \neq (0, 0)$ such that $\ell + 1 > m + n$, then Conjecture 1.2 is true for $a_{0,0}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 2.1, we can assume that $\ell > 400$. Fix a prime $\ell > 400$.

The 2-divisibilities. The prime ℓ satisfies exactly one of the conditions (a),(b),(c) below.
(a) $\ell \equiv 3$ (resp. 7) mod 8. Let $x := 4$ (resp. 2). (b) $\ell \equiv 5$ (resp. 13, 21, 29) mod 32. Let $x := 5$ (resp. 1, 3, 7). (c)

$$\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{9, 17, 25, 33, 41, 49, 57, 65, 73, 81, 89, 97, 105, 113, 121} \pmod{128}.$$

Let

$$x := 9 \pmod{27, 15, 19, 25, 11, 1, 3, 23, 5, 17, 13, 7, 21, 31, 29}.$$

Assume that $\ell - x^2 > 0$. Write $\ell - x^2$ in the form ny^2 where $n, y \in \mathbb{N}$ and n is square-free. Our choice of x makes $n \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$ in all cases. Indeed, in case (a), this is clear. In case (b), we have that $ny^2 \equiv 12 \pmod{32}$. The possible residues of y^2 modulo 32 are the following: 0, 1, 4, 9, 16, 17, 25. If $y^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{32}$, then $0 \equiv 12 \pmod{32}$, a contradiction. If $y^2 \equiv 16 \pmod{32}$, then $4n \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$ and hence $0 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, a contradiction. If the residue of y^2 modulo 32 is one of the following: 1, 9, 17, 25, then 4 divides n . This contradicts the assumption that n is squarefree. Hence $y^2 \equiv 4 \pmod{32}$ and $n \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$. In case (c), we have that $ny^2 \equiv 48 \pmod{128}$. The possible residues of y^2 modulo 128 are the following: 0, 1, 4, 9, 16, 17, 25, 33, 36, 41, 49, 57, 64, 65, 68, 73, 81, 89, 97, 100, 105, 113, 121. By an argument similar to case (b), we can derive that $y^2 \equiv 16$ and thus $n \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$. So $n \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$ in each case.

(i) Let $K := \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-n})$ with ring of integers \mathcal{O}_K . By Theorem 9.4 in [7], ℓ splits completely in the Hilbert class field H of K . Let E/H be an elliptic curve with geometric endomorphism ring \mathcal{O}_K (see [20] p. 99 and p. 105). Let $j := j(E)$. Then $|\text{Norm}_{\mathbb{Q}(j)}^{\mathbb{Q}} j|$ divides $a_{0,0}$ by Proposition 2.15. Moreover, let d be the discriminant of K . Then $d = -n \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$. Corollary 2.5, 2) in [9] shows that $j = 2^{15}a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(j)}$. Recall that $[\mathbb{Q}(j) : \mathbb{Q}] = h(K)$, where $h(K)$ is the class number of K . Hence $2^{15h(K)}$ divides $|\text{Norm}_{\mathbb{Q}(j)}^{\mathbb{Q}} j|$. Therefore $2^{15h(K)}$ divides $a_{0,0}$.

(ii) Keep the notation in the proof of part (i). Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal in H above the ideal (2) in \mathbb{Q} and let v be the valuation on H associated to \mathfrak{p} . Since ℓ splits completely in H , we know that $\Phi_\ell(j, j) = 0$ (see the proof of Proposition 2.15). It follows that

$$v(a_{0,0}) = v(-2j^{\ell+1} - \sum_{\substack{0 \leq m, n \leq \ell \\ (m, n) \neq (0, 0)}} a_{m,n} j^{m+n}).$$

Assume that Conjecture 1.2 is true for all $a_{m,n}$ with $(m, n) \neq (0, 0)$ such that $\ell + 1 > m + n$. Because $j = 2^{15}a$ with $a \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(j)}$, we have that $v(a_{m,n} j^{m+n}) \geq 15(\ell + 1 - m - n)v(2) + 15(m + n)v(2) = 15(\ell + 1)v(2)$ for all m, n such that $0 \leq m, n \leq \ell$ and $(m, n) \neq (0, 0)$. We also have that $v(-2j^{\ell+1}) \geq 15(\ell + 1)v(2) + v(2)$. Hence $v(a_{0,0}) \geq 15(\ell + 1)v(2)$ and Conjecture 1.2 is true for $a_{0,0}$.

Assume that $\ell - x^2 \leq 0$ with $\ell > 400$. Then it is easy to check that ℓ is one of the following: 449, 521, 761, 881. Let $\ell = 449$ (resp. 521, 761, 881). Then the proof of Corollary 3.20 in [26] shows that $\Phi_\ell(j, j) = 0$ for $j = -2^{15}$ (resp. $-2^{15}, -2^{15}3^3, -2^{15}$) since $\left(\frac{-11}{449}\right) = 1$ (resp.

$\left(\frac{-11}{521}\right) = 1$, $\left(\frac{-19}{761}\right) = 1$, $\left(\frac{-11}{881}\right) = 1$). It is now clear that the 2-divisibilities in (i) and (ii) hold for ℓ .

Next, we prove the divisibilities by 3 and 5. We keep the notation in the proof of 2-divisibilities in the case $\ell - x^2 > 0$. Since the idea is similar, we only point out of the required adjustments.

The 3-divisibilities. Note that we can assume that $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ since $a_{0,0} = 0$ otherwise by Theorem 2.14. Let $\ell \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ and let $x := 1$. Then $n \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and $d \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$. Corollary 2.5, 2) in [9] shows that $j = 1728 + 3^6 a = 3^3(2^6 + a)$ for some $a \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(j)}$. The 3-divisibilities in (i) and (ii) follow.

The 5-divisibilities. If $\ell \equiv 1$ (resp. 2, 3, 4) $\pmod{5}$, let $x := 2$ (resp. 2, 1, 1). Then $n \equiv 2$ or 3 $\pmod{5}$ and $d \equiv 2$ or 3 $\pmod{5}$. We know that $j = 5^3 a$ for some $a \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(j)}$ by Corollary 2.5, 2) in [9]. The 5-divisibilities in (i) and (ii) follow. \square

Our initial interest in Conjecture 1.2 was motivated by some considerations about isogenous elliptic curves ([25], Section 3). In particular, let us mention the following conjecture, which is implied by Conjecture 1.2.

Conjecture 2.17. *Let \mathcal{O}_K be a discrete valuation domain with field of fractions K and residue field k . Let v be the normalized valuation of K . Let E_1/K and E_2/K be elliptic curves and assume that there exists an isogeny of degree d from E_1/K to E_2/K where d is coprime to $\text{char}(k)$. Then the following is true.*

- (a) *Assume that $\text{char}(k) = 2$. If $0 < v(j(E_1)) < 15v(2)$, then $v(j(E_1)) = v(j(E_2))$.*
- (b) *Assume that $\text{char}(k) = 3$. If $0 < v(j(E_1)) < 3v(3)$, then $v(j(E_1)) = v(j(E_2))$. Moreover, if $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ and $0 < v(j(E_1)) < \frac{9}{2}v(3)$, then $v(j(E_1)) = v(j(E_2))$.*
- (c) *Assume that $\text{char}(k) = 5$. If $0 < v(j(E_1)) < 3v(5)$, then $v(j(E_1)) = v(j(E_2))$.*

Proposition 2.18. *Conjecture 1.2 (a) (resp. (b), (c)) implies Conjecture 2.17 (a) (resp. (b), (c)).*

Proof. We only prove that Conjecture 1.2 (a) implies Conjecture 2.17 (a). The other statements can be proved similarly. Let $j_1 := j(E_1)$ and $j_2 := j(E_2)$. By possibly relabeling and considering the dual isogeny, assume that $v(j_1) \leq v(j_2)$. By Proposition 4.12 and Corollary 4.11 in [21], every isogeny of degree greater than 1 decomposes as the composition of isogenies of prime degrees. So it is enough to consider the case where d is prime. Assume that d is a prime. We first work with mixed characteristic 2. Since there exists an isogeny of degree d from E_1/K to E_2/K , we know that $\Phi_d(j_1, j_2) = 0$ (see Theorem 5 in Ch. 5 of [16]).

Assume that part (a) of Conjecture 1.2 is true so that $15v(2)(d+1-m-n) \leq v(a_{m,n})$ when $d+1 \geq m+n$. Assume for the sake of contradiction that $v(j_1) < v(j_2)$. Since $v(j_1) < 15v(2)$, we claim that

$$v(j_1^{d+1}) < v(a_{m,n} j_1^m j_2^n)$$

for each $0 \leq m, n \leq d+1$ such that $(m, n) \neq (d+1, 0)$. Indeed, if $m+n < d+1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (d+1)v(j_1) &= (d+1-m-n)v(j_1) + (m+n)v(j_1) \\ &< (d+1-m-n)15v(2) + mv(j_1) + nv(j_2) \leq v(a_{m,n}) + mv(j_1) + nv(j_2). \end{aligned}$$

If $m+n > d+1$, then

$$(d+1)v(j_1) < (m+n)v(j_1) \leq v(a_{m,n}) + mv(j_1) + nv(j_2).$$

If $m+n = d+1$ and $n \neq 0$, then

$$(d+1)v(j_1) = (m+n)v(j_1) < v(a_{m,n}) + mv(j_1) + nv(j_2).$$

Hence the claim is true. It follows that $v(j_1^{d+1}) = v(\sum_{0 \leq m, n \leq d+1} a_{m,n} j_1^m j_2^n) = v(\Phi_d(j_1, j_2))$ where $\Phi_d(j_1, j_2) = 0$. However $v(j_1) < 15v(2)$ by the assumption in Conjecture 2.17 (a). This is a contradiction. So $v(j_1) = v(j_2)$.

Now we consider the equicharacteristic 2 case. Let $\tilde{\Phi}_d(X, Y) \in \mathbb{F}_2[X, Y]$ denote the d -th classical modular polynomial $\Phi_d(X, Y) \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ modulo 2. Since there exists an isogeny of degree d from E_1/K to E_2/K , we know that $\tilde{\Phi}_d(j_1, j_2) = 0$ (see [18] p. 202). By the same arguments as in the mixed characteristic 2 case, the conclusions follow. \square

Proposition 2.19. *Conjecture 2.17 is true for $d \leq 400$.*

Proof. This follows from Propositions 2.1 and 2.18. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] W. E. H. Berwick. An invariant modular equation of the fifth Order. *Quart. J.*, 47:94–103, 1916. 3
- [2] W. E. H. Berwick. Modular Invariants Expressible in Terms of Quadratic and Cubic Irrationalities. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 28(1):53–69, 1928. 16
- [3] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust. The Magma algebra system. I. The user language. volume 24, pages 235–265. 1997. Computational algebra and number theory (London, 1993). 3
- [4] R. Bröker, K. Lauter, and A. V. Sutherland. Modular polynomials via isogeny volcanoes. *Math. Comp.*, 81(278):1201–1231, 2012. 2, 3
- [5] J. Bruinier, K. Ono, and A. V. Sutherland. Class polynomials for nonholomorphic modular functions. *J. Number Theory*, 161:204–229, 2016. 3
- [6] D. Charles and K. Lauter. Computing modular polynomials. *LMS J. Comput. Math.*, 8:195–204, 2005. 2
- [7] D. A. Cox. *Primes of the form $x^2 + ny^2$ —Fermat, class field theory, and complex multiplication*. AMS Chelsea Publishing, Providence, RI, [2022] ©2022. Third edition [of 1028322] with solutions, With contributions by Roger Lipsett. 17
- [8] R. Fricke. *Die elliptischen Funktionen und ihre Anwendungen. Zweiter Teil. Die algebraischen Ausführungen*. Leipzig und Berlin Verlag Und Druck Von B. G. Teubner, 1922. 3
- [9] B. H. Gross and D. B. Zagier. On singular moduli. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 355:191–220, 1985. 16, 17, 18
- [10] O. Herrmann. Über die Berechnung der Fourierkoeffizienten der Funktion $j(\tau)$. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 274(275):187–195, 1975. 3
- [11] H. Ito. Computation of the modular equation. *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci.*, 71(3):48–50, 1995. 2
- [12] H. Ito. Two remarks on the modular polynomial of $j(z)$. *Mem. Fac. Educ. Hum. Stud. Akita Univ. Nat. Sci.*, (56):35–42, 2001. 16
- [13] E. Kaltofen and N. Yui. On the modular equation of order 11. *Proceedings of the 1984 MACSYMA User’s Conference*, pages 472–485, 1984. 3
- [14] O. Kolberg. Congruences for the coefficients of the modular invariant $j(\tau)$ modulo powers of 2. *Univ. Bergen Årbok Naturvit. Rekke*, 16:1–9, 1961. 15
- [15] O. Kolberg. Congruences for the coefficients of the modular invariant $j(\tau)$. *Math. Scand.*, 10:173–181, 1962. 15
- [16] S. Lang. *Elliptic functions*, volume 112 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 1987. With an appendix by J. Tate. 1, 18
- [17] J. Lehner. Further congruence properties of the Fourier coefficients of the modular invariant $j(\tau)$. *Amer. J. Math.*, 71:373–386, 1949. 15
- [18] C. Moreno. *Algebraic curves over finite fields*, volume 97 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991. 19
- [19] J. Riordan. *An introduction to combinatorial analysis*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1980. Reprint of the 1958 edition. 7
- [20] J. H. Silverman. *Advanced topics in the arithmetic of elliptic curves*, volume 151 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994. 1, 16, 17
- [21] J. H. Silverman. *The arithmetic of elliptic curves*, volume 106 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, Dordrecht, second edition, 2009. 18

- [22] H. J. S. Smith. Note on a Modular Equation for the Transformation of the Third Order. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 10:87–91, 1878/79. 3
- [23] A. V. Sutherland. Modular polynomials. <https://math.mit.edu/~drew/ClassicalModPolys.html>. 2, 3
- [24] A. van Wijngaarden. On the coefficients of the modular invariant $J(\tau)$. *Indag. Math.*, 15:389–400, 1953. *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc. Ser. A* **56**. 16
- [25] H. Wang. On the Kodaira types of elliptic curves with potentially good supersingular reduction. Preprint, 2024. 18
- [26] H. Wang. *Three topics in number theory*. 2024. Thesis (Ph.D.)–University of Georgia. 17
- [27] N. Yui. Explicit form of the modular equation. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 299(300):185–200, 1978. 2