

Algebraic proof of modular form inequalities for optimal sphere packings

Seewoo Lee

ABSTRACT. We give algebraic proofs of Viazovska and Cohn-Kumar-Miller-Radchenko-Viazovska's modular form inequalities for 8 and 24-dimensional optimal sphere packings.

1. Introduction

In their celebrated papers [20, 3], Viazovska and Cohn-Kumar-Miller-Radchenko-Viazovska proved the optimality of E_8 and Leech lattice sphere packings in dimensions 8 and 24, respectively. Their proof is based on the Cohn and Elkies' linear programming bound [2], which states that the existence of a function on \mathbb{R}^d satisfying certain inequalities implies an upper bound on the sphere packing densities. The conjectural *magic functions* in dimensions 8 and 24 are constructed by Viazovska and Cohn et al. as integral transforms of certain (quasi)modular forms. When the dimension is 8, the required inequalities for the function and its Fourier transform reduce to the following inequalities on modular forms.

Theorem 1.1 (Viazovska [20]). *Define*¹

$$\phi_0 = 1728 \frac{(E_2 E_4 - E_6)^2}{E_4^3 - E_6^2}, \quad (1)$$

$$\psi_S = -128 \left(\frac{\Theta_3^4 + \Theta_2^4}{\Theta_4^8} + \frac{\Theta_2^4 - \Theta_4^4}{\Theta_3^8} \right), \quad (2)$$

Then

$$\phi_0(it) - \frac{36}{\pi^2} \psi_S(it) > 0, \quad (3)$$

$$\phi_0(it) + \frac{36}{\pi^2} \psi_S(it) > 0, \quad (4)$$

for all $t > 0$.

¹Note that the original inequality is written in terms of $\psi_I(z) = z^2 \psi_S(-1/z)$, but we found that the above form is more convenient for us to work with.

(See Section 2 for the definitions of the terms appearing above.) Similarly, the case of dimension 24 reduces to the following three inequalities. Here we abuse notations so that two ψ_S in (2) and (6) are different.

Theorem 1.2 (Cohn et al. [3]). *Define*

$$\varphi = -\frac{49E_2^2E_4^3 - 25E_2^2E_6^2 - 48E_2E_4^2E_6 - 25E_4^4 + 49E_4E_6^2}{\Delta^2}, \quad (5)$$

$$\psi_S = -\frac{\Theta_2^{20}(2\Theta_2^8 + 7\Theta_2^4\Theta_4^4 + 7\Theta_4^8)}{\Delta^2}. \quad (6)$$

Then for all $t > 0$,

$$\varphi(it) + \frac{432}{\pi^2}\psi_S(it) < 0, \quad (7)$$

$$\varphi(it) - \frac{432}{\pi^2}\psi_S(it) > 0. \quad (8)$$

and for all $t \geq 1$,

$$t^{10} \left(\varphi\left(\frac{i}{t}\right) - \frac{432}{\pi^2}\psi_S\left(\frac{i}{t}\right) \right) \geq \frac{725760}{\pi} e^{2\pi t} \left(t - \frac{10}{3\pi} \right). \quad (9)$$

In dimension 8, the inequality (3) is easier to prove than (4) since we have $\phi_0(it) > 0$ and $-\psi_S(it) > 0$ separately. However, (4) is trickier and also looks unnatural in the sense that we need to compare two modular forms with different weights, and it also includes a bizarre constant $\frac{36}{\pi^2}$ (note that both ϕ_0 and ψ_S have rational Fourier coefficients). The third inequality (9) is much more complicated due to the non-modular terms (polynomial and exponential). The original proofs in [20, 3] use approximations of Fourier coefficients and numerical analysis, and it is natural to ask whether there's a more conceptual and simpler proof of the inequalities. Recently, Romik proposed an alternative proof of (3) and (4) [14], based on various identities among modular forms and special values of them at $z = i$ (which can be expressed in terms of π and $\Gamma(1/4)$).

In this article, we provide simple and *algebraic* proofs of theorems 1.1 and 1.2 which do not require any approximations or numerical analysis. For (4) and (8), the idea is simple: the *ratio* of two forms with the input $z = it$ is a *monotone function* in t , and the *limit* as $t \rightarrow 0^+$ equals the constants $\frac{36}{\pi^2}$ or $\frac{432}{\pi^2}$ appearing in Theorem (1.1) and Theorem (1.2) (see Proposition 5.2, 5.1, 6.5, and 6.4). Figure 1 shows this phenomenon for $d = 8$, where F and G are certain normalization of ϕ_0 and ψ_S respectively (see (55) and (56)). We can compute the limit easily using the modular transformation laws of F and G , and they coincide with the above constants. Also, the monotonicity of the quotient is equivalent to

$$F'(it)G(it) - F(it)G'(it) > 0,$$

(where the derivatives are defined as in (13)), which is now a *homogeneous* inequality. For (9), we first reduce it to a simpler inequality by replacing the exponential term with Δ




FIGURE 1. Graph of the quotient $F(it)/G(it)$ as a function in $t > 0$. Here $F = \Delta\phi_0$ and $G = -2\Delta\psi_5$.

(Lemma 6.7). After rewriting the inequality as (75), we observe that the resulting function is also monotone (Figure 3 and Proposition 6.8).

To prove these inequalities, we develop a general theory of quasimodular forms that are nonnegative on the imaginary axis or have nonnegative Fourier coefficients (Section 3). In particular, we study how the positivity behaves under (anti-)(Serre-)derivatives, which are simple but surprisingly useful. Combined with the differential equations that the modular forms satisfy ((64),(65), (71), and (72)), our theory gives short proofs of the inequalities, by considering their Serre derivatives of appropriate weight (Corollary 3.6, Proposition 5.2, Lemma 6.1, Proposition 6.5, and Proposition 6.8). Along the way, we found that the modular forms are closely connected to the *extremal quasimodular forms* defined by Kaneko and Koike [10]. The extremal forms are conjectured to have nonnegative Fourier coefficients, and can be defined recursively when the depth is less than 5 [10, 7]. As a byproduct, we prove their conjecture in the case of depth 1 (Corollary 4.3).

Our proofs are based on several nontrivial identities among modular forms. These can be checked directly with SageMath [19], since the rings of quasimodular forms are polynomial rings over certain generators, and we only need to check identities for the corresponding polynomials. Also, we can easily factor a given modular form or write it as a (nonnegative) linear combination of other modular forms using SageMath, for example (43), (45), (46), (64), (65), (71), and (72). Codes are available in the GitHub repository <https://github.com/seewoo5/posqmf>, checking all the identities appearing in the paper.

Acknowledgement. We thank YoungJu Choie, Henry Cohn, Dan Romik, and Sug Woo Shin for the valuable comments and discussions. Especially, Romik's talk on his work [14] at UC Berkeley RTG seminar motivated this project.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. Quasimodular forms. For any function $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined on the complex upper half plane $\mathbb{H} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \Im z > 0\}$ and integer k , we define the action of $\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ as

$$(f|_k\gamma)(z) := (cz + d)^{-k} f\left(\frac{az + b}{cz + d}\right), \quad \gamma = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}).$$

We denote $T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $S = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ that generate $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Let $q = e^{2\pi iz}$ for $z \in \mathbb{H}$. Define the Eisenstein series of weight 2, 4, 6 as

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &= 1 - 24 \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma_1(n) q^n, \\ E_4 &= 1 + 240 \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma_3(n) q^n, \\ E_6 &= 1 - 504 \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma_5(n) q^n, \end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma_a(n) := \sum_{d|n} d^a$. The last two Eisenstein series E_4, E_6 are genuine modular forms. However, E_2 is not a modular form - it is a *quasimodular* form of weight 2 and level 1. They obey the following transformation laws:

$$(E_2|_2S)(z) = z^{-2} E_2\left(-\frac{1}{z}\right) = E_2(z) - \frac{6i}{\pi z}, \quad (10)$$

$$(E_4|_4S)(z) = z^{-4} E_4\left(-\frac{1}{z}\right) = E_4(z), \quad (11)$$

$$(E_6|_6S)(z) = z^{-6} E_6\left(-\frac{1}{z}\right) = E_6(z). \quad (12)$$

The (graded) ring of quasimodular forms is isomorphic to a polynomial ring in 3 variables with generators E_2, E_4 , and E_6 [1, §5.1], and we define the *depth* of a quasimodular form as the highest degree of E_2 in its expression as a polynomial in E_2, E_4 , and E_6 . It is closed under the differentiation

$$F' = DF := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{dF}{dz} = q \frac{dF}{dq}, \quad \sum_n a_n q^n \mapsto \sum_n n a_n q^n \quad (13)$$

which increases depth by 1 and weight by 2. For the Eisenstein series, we have Ramanujan's identities [1, Proposition 15, p. 49]

$$E_2' = \frac{E_2^2 - E_4}{12}, \quad (14)$$

$$E_4' = \frac{E_2E_4 - E_6}{3}, \quad (15)$$

$$E_6' = \frac{E_2E_6 - E_4^2}{2}. \quad (16)$$

We write $\mathcal{QM}_w^s = \mathcal{QM}_w^s(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}))$ for the space of quasimodular forms of weight w and depth $\leq s$, and $\mathcal{M}_w := \mathcal{QM}_w^0$ for the space of genuine modular forms of weight w . We denote $\Delta := (E_4^3 - E_6^2)/1728$ for the discriminant form, which is the unique normalized cusp form of weight 12 and level $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. It can be expressed as an infinite product

$$\Delta(z) = q \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - q^n)^{24} = \eta(z)^{24}$$

where $\eta(z) := q^{1/24} \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - q^n)$ is the Dedekind eta function ($q^{1/24} = e^{\pi iz/12}$).

2.2. Jacobi's thetanull functions. Jacobi's *thetanull* functions are defined as

$$\Theta_2(z) = \theta_{10}(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{\frac{1}{2}(n+\frac{1}{2})^2}$$

$$\Theta_3(z) = \theta_{00}(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^{\frac{n^2}{2}}$$

$$\Theta_4(z) = \theta_{01}(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^n q^{\frac{n^2}{2}}.$$

Here we choose $q^{1/2} = e^{\pi iz}$. These are weight 1/2 modular forms of level $\Gamma(2) = \{\gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : \gamma \equiv \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \pmod{2}\}$. Although the definition of half-integral weight modular forms is quite subtle (for example, see [18]), we can ignore such subtleties since we will only care about 4-th powers of these forms, which are modular forms of weight 2 and level $\Gamma(2)$. We will denote them as $H_2, H_3,$ and H_4 , which admit Fourier expansions

$$H_2(z) := \Theta_2^4(z) = 2 \sum_{n \geq 0} r_4(2n+1) q^{n+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (17)$$

$$H_3(z) := \Theta_3^4(z) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} r_4(n) q^{\frac{n}{2}}, \quad (18)$$

$$H_4(z) := \Theta_4^4(z) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} (-1)^n r_4(n) q^{\frac{n}{2}}, \quad (19)$$

where $r_4(k) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^4 : \|\mathbf{x}\|^2 = k\}$. They transform under $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ as:

$$(H_2|_2T)(z) = -H_2(z), \quad (H_3|_2T)(z) = H_4(z), \quad (H_4|_2T)(z) = H_3(z), \quad (20)$$

$$(H_2|_2S)(z) = -H_4(z), \quad (H_3|_2S)(z) = -H_3(z), \quad (H_4|_2S)(z) = -H_2(z). \quad (21)$$

Also, we have the Jacobi identity $H_3 = H_2 + H_4$. These functions are related to the Eisenstein series and the discriminant form as ([1, p. 29])

$$E_4 = \frac{1}{2}(H_2^2 + H_3^2 + H_4^2) = H_2^2 + H_2H_4 + H_4^2 \quad (22)$$

$$E_6 = \frac{1}{2}(H_2 + H_3)(H_3 + H_4)(H_4 - H_2) = \frac{1}{2}(H_2 + 2H_4)(2H_2 + H_4)(H_4 - H_2) \quad (23)$$

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{256}(H_2H_3H_4)^2. \quad (24)$$

We also have the following identities relating weight 2 Eisenstein series and theta functions (See Exercises of [15, Chapter 5]):

$$H_2(z) = \frac{1}{3} \left(E_2 \left(\frac{z+1}{2} \right) - E_2 \left(\frac{z}{2} \right) \right) \quad (25)$$

$$H_3(z) = \frac{1}{3} \left(4E_2(2z) - E_2 \left(\frac{z}{2} \right) \right) \quad (26)$$

$$H_4(z) = \frac{1}{3} \left(4E_2(2z) - E_2 \left(\frac{z+1}{2} \right) \right). \quad (27)$$

Note that E_2 also satisfies the following identity

$$E_2(z) = \frac{1}{6} \left(4E_2(2z) + E_2 \left(\frac{z}{2} \right) + E_2 \left(\frac{z+1}{2} \right) \right). \quad (28)$$

Combining (25), (27), and (28), we obtain

$$H_2(z) + 2H_4(z) = 4E_2(2z) - 2E_2(z). \quad (29)$$

2.3. Serre derivative. For a (positive) integer k and a quasimodular form F , the weight k Serre derivative $\partial_k F$ of F is given by

$$\partial_k F := F' - \frac{k}{12} E_2 F.$$

For $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s$, $\partial_k F$ is *a priori* quasimodular form of weight $w + 2$ and depth $s + 1$, but when $k = w - s$, Kaneko and Koike proved that it preserves depth of quasimodular forms, i.e. $\partial_k F \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+2}^s$ [10, Proposition 3.3]. Serre derivative is equivariant under the $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ -action in the sense that

$$\partial_k(F|_k \gamma) = (\partial_k F)|_{k+2} \gamma, \quad \forall \gamma \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}).$$

Here is a list of special Serre derivatives of Eisenstein series and Jacobi thetanull functions:

$$\partial_1 E_2 = -\frac{1}{12} E_4, \quad \partial_4 E_4 = -\frac{1}{3} E_6, \quad \partial_6 E_6 = -\frac{1}{2} E_4^2 \quad (30)$$

and

$$\partial_2(H_2) = \frac{1}{6}(H_2^2 + 2H_2H_4), \quad \partial_2(H_3) = \frac{1}{6}(H_2^2 - H_4^2), \quad \partial_2(H_4) = -\frac{1}{6}(2H_2H_4 + H_4^2). \quad (31)$$

Serre derivative satisfies the product rule

$$\partial_{w_1+w_2}(FG) = (\partial_{w_1}F)G + F(\partial_{w_2}G). \quad (32)$$

In particular, we have

$$\partial_w(E_2F) = E_2(\partial_{w-1}F) - \frac{1}{12}E_4F, \quad (33)$$

$$\partial_w(E_4F) = E_4(\partial_{w-4}F) - \frac{1}{3}E_6F, \quad (34)$$

$$\partial_w(E_6F) = E_6(\partial_{w-6}F) - \frac{1}{2}E_4^2F, \quad (35)$$

which are useful for the computations. Also, combining the product rule with the Serre derivatives of theta functions, we have the following formula: For $a, b \geq 0$, we have

$$\partial_{2a+2b}(H_2^a H_4^b) = \frac{1}{6}H_2^a H_4^b((a-2b)H_2 + (2a-b)H_4). \quad (36)$$

At last, we often denote the r -fold Serre derivatives as

$$\partial_k^r F := \partial_{k+2(r-1)}\partial_{k+2(r-2)} \cdots \partial_k F, \quad \partial_k^0 F := F.$$

2.4. Linear programming bounds for optimal sphere packings and modular form inequalities. Cohn–Elkies’ linear programming bound for sphere packings [5] reads as follows.

Theorem 2.1 (Cohn–Elkies [2, Theorem 3.2]). *Let $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an admissible function satisfying the following three conditions for some $r > 0$:*

- (1) $f(\mathbf{0}) = \widehat{f}(\mathbf{0}) > 0$;
- (2) $f(\mathbf{x}) \leq 0$ for $\|\mathbf{x}\| \geq r$;
- (3) $\widehat{f}(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Then the optimal density Δ_d of sphere packings in \mathbb{R}^d is bounded above by

$$\Delta_d \leq \left(\frac{r}{2}\right)^d \frac{\pi^{d/2}}{(d/2)!}.$$

Hence one can prove optimality of certain sphere packings by finding *magic functions* with the corresponding radius r . For example, when $d = 1$, the function

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{1-x^2} \left(\frac{\sin(\pi x)}{\pi x} \right)^2$$

satisfies all the conditions above for $r = 1$, and yields the (trivial) bound $\Delta_1 \leq 1$. Based on their numerical experiments, Cohn and Elkies conjectured the existence of magic functions in dimension 2, 8, and 24 giving the optimal bounds correspond to the best known packings. After few years, Viazovska [20] found an elegant construction of a magic function in dimension 8 that proves optimality of the E_8 lattice sphere packing, and it only took one more week for her and other colleagues to find a similar magic function in dimension 24 (for Leech lattice) [3]. Sphere packing problem can be also viewed as a special case of potential minimization problem, and more general question on the universal optimality of E_8 and Leech lattices is recently resolved by the same authors via similar methods [4]. Especially, they proved Fourier interpolation formula for these dimensions, which imply *uniqueness of magic functions* in dimensions 8 and 24 up to a constant (see Theorem 1.7 and Corollary 1.8 of [4]). Existence of a magic function in dimension 2 is still wide open.

Viazovska and Cohn et al.'s constructions are based on ingenious use of (quasi)modular forms. They first decompose it as a sum of (± 1) -Fourier eigenfunctions $f = f_+ + f_-$ (hence $\widehat{f}_+ = f_+$ and $\widehat{f}_- = -f_-$), and assume that they have a following form:

$$f_{\pm}(\mathbf{x}) = \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi\|\mathbf{x}\|^2}{2}\right) \int_0^{\infty} \varphi_{\pm}(it) e^{-\pi\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 t} dt$$

for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where φ_{\pm} is function defined on \mathbb{H} . Here we can assume that f is radial (by averaging over spheres centered at the origin), and the \sin^2 factor is added to enforce roots at the desired radii, i.e. the lengths of the vectors in E_8 or Leech lattices (if f is a magic function, then both f and \widehat{f} should have zeros at the nonzero lattices points, which follows from the proof of Theorem 2.1). Surprisingly, under this assumption, they proved that f_{\pm} is a (± 1) -Fourier eigenfunction if and only if φ_{\pm} behaves as "modular forms". For example, when $d = 8$, we have $\varphi_{\pm}(t) = t^2\psi_{\pm}(i/t)$ with²

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_+ &= -\phi_0 = -\frac{(E_2 E_4 - E_6)^2}{\Delta}, \\ \psi_- &= 2\psi_S = -\frac{18 \Theta_2^{12} (2\Theta_2^8 + 5\Theta_2^4 \Theta_4^4 + 5\Theta_4^8)}{\pi^2 \Delta}. \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding integrals only converge for $\|\mathbf{x}\| > \sqrt{2}$, and one needs to analytically continue to $0 \leq \|\mathbf{x}\| \leq \sqrt{2}$. Under this construction, the corresponding inequalities for f and \widehat{f} reduces to the inequalities between ψ_+ and ψ_- , which are essentially the inequalities (3) and (4). Viazovska proved the inequalities by approximating the functions and reducing it to the finite calculations, which can be checked by interval arithmetic with computer calculations. $d = 24$ case is similar but more involved, and requires more complicated and careful computer analysis.

²Here we normalized in a slightly different way. We have $f(0) = \widehat{f}(0) = \frac{5}{4\pi}$. This normalization will be also used in Section 5.

In [14], Romik proposed an alternative proof of (3) and (4). His proof of (4) uses explicit values of modular forms at $z = i$, such as

$$E_2(i) = \frac{3}{\pi}, \quad E_4(i) = \frac{3\Gamma(1/4)^8}{64\pi^6}, \quad E_6(i) = 0. \quad (37)$$

(Note that the first and third identity directly follows from (10) and (12), respectively.) He treated $0 < t < 1$ and $t \geq 1$ cases separately. Proofs for the both cases utilize monotonicity of certain modular forms on the imaginary axis and reducing the inequalities to comparisons of the values of the functions at $t = 1$. This gives a simpler proof of the inequality (4) that requires no interval arithmetic.

3. Positive quasimodular forms

In this section, we study properties of quasimodular forms that are positive on the imaginary axis or have nonnegative Fourier coefficients. We say that a quasimodular form $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s$ is *positive* if it takes nonnegative real values on the (positive) imaginary axis ($F(it) \geq 0$ for all $t > 0$). We denote as $\mathcal{QM}_w^{s,+} \subset \mathcal{QM}_w^s$ for the subset of positive quasimodular forms. We define *completely positive* quasimodular forms as those with nonnegative (real) Fourier coefficients, i.e. $F(z) = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n q^n$ with $a_n \geq 0$ for all $n \geq n_0$. We denote the set of such forms of weight w and depth s as $\mathcal{QM}_w^{s,++}$. Both $\mathcal{QM}_w^{s,+}$ and $\mathcal{QM}_w^{s,++}$ are *convex cones* in \mathcal{QM}_w^s : they are closed under nonnegative linear combinations. Clearly we have $\mathcal{QM}_w^{s,++} \subset \mathcal{QM}_w^{s,+}$, and the inclusion is strict in general (e.g. $\Delta(z) = q \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - q^n)^{24} \in \mathcal{QM}_{12}^{0,+}$ but $\Delta(z) = q - 24q^2 + 252q^3 - 1472q^4 + \dots \notin \mathcal{QM}_{12}^{0,++}$).

3.1. Derivative and positivity. Differentiation preserves complete positivity of quasimodular cusp forms, since it changes the n -th Fourier coefficient from a_n to na_n .

Proposition 3.1. *Let $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s$ and $F' \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+2}^{s+1}$. Assume F is a cusp form. Then $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^{s,++}$ if and only if $F' \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+2}^{s+1,++}$.*

Positivity (not necessarily complete) is not preserved under derivatives in general. For example, the discriminant form Δ is positive due to its product expansion, but its derivative $\Delta' = E_2\Delta$ has a unique simple zero on the imaginary axis ($\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E_2(it) = 1$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} E_2(it) = -\infty$). However, the positivity is preserved under *antiderivatives*.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $X \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s$ be a cusp form. If $X' \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+2}^{s+1,+}$, then $X \in \mathcal{QM}_w^{s,+}$.*

PROOF. Let $x(t) := X(it)$ for $t > 0$. If $X' \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+2}^{s+1,+}$, then $\frac{dx}{dt} = -2\pi X'(it) \leq 0$ and $x(t)$ is monotone decreasing for all t . Hence $x(t) \geq \lim_{u \rightarrow \infty} x(u) = 0$. \square

Complete positivity can be characterized as positivity of (higher) derivatives. To prove this, we need the following version of Bernstein's theorem.³

Theorem 3.3 (Bernstein). *Let $g : (0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth function. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $g(t)$ is a completely monotone function, i.e. $(-1)^n g^{(n)}(t) \geq 0$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $t > 0$.
- (2) There exists a unique nonnegative measure μ on $(0, \infty)$ such that

$$g(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-tu} d\mu(u)$$

where the integral converges absolutely.

A proof can be found in [16, Theorem 4.8, page 40]. Note that the original version of the Bernstein's theorem consider functions on $[0, \infty)$ and finite measures, and this is a slightly generalized version of it.

Proposition 3.4. $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s$ is completely positive if and only if its derivatives are all positive.

PROOF. This is a direct corollary of Theorem 3.3. Observe that $\frac{d^k}{dt^k} F(it) = (-2\pi)^k F^{(k)}(it)$, and the series $f(t) = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n e^{-2\pi n t}$ is the Laplace transform of the measure $\mu = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n \delta_{2\pi n}$. Although the measure μ is not finite, the integral

$$f(t) = \int_0^\infty e^{-tu} d\mu(u)$$

converges absolutely (by the polynomial growth of the coefficients [17, Theorem 5, page 94]) and we can apply Theorem 3.3. \square

3.2. Serre derivative and positivity. We can also prove that *anti-Serre* derivative preserves positivity, which is a simple but surprisingly powerful theorem.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s$ be a quasimodular form. Assume that there exists k and $t_0 > 0$ such that $(\partial_k F)(it) \geq 0$ for all $0 < t < t_0$ and $F(it_0) > 0$. Then $F(it) > 0$ for all $0 < t \leq t_0$.*

PROOF. By $\Delta' = E_2 \Delta$, we have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{F(it)}{\Delta(it)^{\frac{k}{12}}} \right) = (-2\pi) \frac{F'(it) \Delta(it)^{\frac{k}{12}} - F(it) \frac{k}{12} E_2(it) \Delta(it)^{\frac{k}{12}}}{\Delta(it)^{\frac{k}{6}}} = (-2\pi) \frac{(\partial_k F)(it)}{\Delta(it)^{\frac{k}{12}}} < 0,$$

hence $t \mapsto F(it) / \Delta(it)^{\frac{k}{12}}$ is monotone decreasing and the result follows. \square

Corollary 3.6. *Let $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s$ be a quasimodular form. If $\partial_k F \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+2}^{s+1,+}$ and $F(it) > 0$ for sufficiently large $t > 0$, then $F \in \mathcal{QM}_w^{s,+}$. Especially, the assumption holds if all the Fourier coefficients of F are real and the first nonzero Fourier coefficient of F is positive.*

³This theorem was the motivation for the naming of *complete* positivity.

PROOF. First assertion directly follows from Proposition 3.5. For the last assertion, when F has a Fourier expansion $F(z) = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n q^n$ with $a_{n_0} > 0$, then

$$e^{2\pi n_0 t} F(it) = a_{n_0} + e^{-2\pi t} \sum_{n \geq n_0+1} a_n e^{-2\pi(n-n_0-1)t}$$

and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} e^{2\pi n_0 t} F(it) = a_{n_0} > 0$, so $F(it) > 0$ for sufficiently large t . \square

Remark 3.7. It is also possible to solve the differential equation $\partial_k F = G$ and express $f(t) = F(it)$ in $g(t) = G(it)$ as

$$f(t) = \left(\frac{\eta(it)}{\eta(it_0)} \right)^{2k} f(t_0) + 2\pi \int_{t_0}^t \left(\frac{\eta(it)}{\eta(iu)} \right)^{2k} g(u) du. \quad (38)$$

Also, Proposition 3.5 holds for more general class of functions, e.g. differentiable on $(0, \infty)$ with

$$\partial_k := D - \frac{k}{12} E_2(it) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{d}{dt} - \frac{k}{12} E_2(it),$$

and this version will be used in the proof of the inequality (9) later.

In general, the Serre derivative does not preserve complete positivity, e.g. E_4 is completely positive but $\partial_4 E_4 = -\frac{E_6}{3} = -\frac{1}{3} + 168q + \dots$ is not. However, when the vanishing order at the cusp is sufficiently large, then it actually does.

Proposition 3.8. Let $F = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n q^n \in \mathcal{QM}_w^{s,++}$. For $k \geq 0$ and $n \geq k/12$, the n -th coefficient of $\partial_k F$ is nonnegative. Especially, if $n_0 \geq k/12 \geq 0$, $\partial_k F$ is also completely positive.

PROOF. One can directly check that the Fourier expansion of Serre derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_k F &= \partial_k \left(a_{n_0} q^{n_0} + a_{n_0+1} q^{n_0+1} + a_{n_0+2} q^{n_0+2} + \dots \right) \\ &= \left(n_0 a_{n_0} q^{n_0} + (n_0 + 1) a_{n_0+1} q^{n_0+1} + \dots \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{k}{12} (1 - 24q - 72q^2 - 96q^3 - \dots) \left(a_{n_0} q^{n_0} + a_{n_0+1} q^{n_0+1} + a_{n_0+2} q^{n_0+2} + \dots \right) \\ &= \left(n_0 - \frac{k}{12} \right) a_{n_0} q^{n_0} + \left(\left(n_0 + 1 - \frac{k}{12} \right) a_{n_0+1} + 2k a_{n_0} \right) q^{n_0+1} + \dots \\ &\quad + \left(\left(n_0 + m - \frac{k}{12} \right) a_{n_0+m} + 2k \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_1(m+1-j) a_{n_0+j-1} \right) q^{n_0+m} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $n_0 \geq k/12$ and $a_j \geq 0$ for all $j \geq n_0$, the Fourier coefficients of $\partial_k F$ are also all nonnegative. \square

3.3. Level and positivity. We also consider (completely) positive quasimodular forms of higher level. For completely positive forms, we will only consider the q -expansions at the cusp $i\infty$, although there are several cusps for a congruence subgroup $\Gamma \subset \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ in general. One easy way to construct (completely) positive quasimodular forms of level $\Gamma_0(N)$ is using *old forms*.

Proposition 3.9. *Let $F(z) \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}))$ be a positive (resp. completely positive) quasimodular form of weight w , depth s , and level $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$. Then for any $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, the form $G(z) := F(Nz) \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s(\Gamma_0(N))$ is also a positive (resp. completely positive) quasimodular form.*

PROOF. If f has a q -expansion $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n q^n$, then $g(it) = f(iNt)$ and $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq n_0} a_n q^{Nn}$, and the proposition immediately follows. \square

4. Extremal quasimodular forms

4.1. Definitions and examples. In [10], Kaneko and Koike defined and studied *extremal quasimodular forms*, which are the quasimodular forms of given depth with maximum possible order of zeros at infinity. In other words, for given weight w and depth s , a quasimodular form $f \in \mathcal{QM}_w^s \setminus \mathcal{QM}_w^{s-1}$ is *extremal* if, for $m = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{QM}_w^s$, the first m Fourier coefficients of $f = \sum_{n \geq 0} a_n q^n$ are

$$a_0 = a_1 = \cdots = a_{m-2} = 0, a_{m-1} \neq 0.$$

The authors conjectured existence and uniqueness (up to a constant) of extremal forms for each (even) weight w and depth s (satisfying $0 \leq s \leq w/2, s \neq \frac{w}{2} - 1$), and give examples in case of depth 1 and 2 that are defined recursively and satisfying certain differential equations. Pellarin [13] established the conjecture for $s \leq 4$, and Grabner [7] extended Kaneko–Koike’s result and construct differential equations satisfied by depth ≤ 4 extremal quasimodular forms. For these depths, we will denote the normalized (i.e. the first nonzero Fourier coefficient is zero) extremal form of weight w and depth s as $X_{w,s}$. Kaneko and Koike also conjectured that the Fourier coefficients of extremal forms of depth ≤ 4 are all positive [10, Conjecture 2], and Grabner [8] proved the conjecture *for all but finitely many coefficients*. The proof uses Jenkins and Rouse’s explicit version of Deligne’s bound [9].

We can check complete positivity of certain low-weight extremal forms from Ramanujan’s identities:

Lemma 4.1. *The following modular forms are extremal and completely positive:*

$$\begin{aligned} X_{4,2} &= \frac{1}{288}(E_4 - E_2^2) \in \mathcal{QM}_4^{2,++}, \\ X_{6,1} &= \frac{1}{720}(E_2E_4 - E_6) \in \mathcal{QM}_6^{1,++}, \\ X_{8,1} &= \frac{1}{1008}(E_4^2 - E_2E_6) \in \mathcal{QM}_8^{1,++}. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Extremality are mentioned in [10]. Complete positiveness directly follows from Ramanujan's identities,

$$\begin{aligned} X_{4,2} &= \frac{1}{288}(E_4 - E_2^2) = -\frac{1}{24}E_2' = \sum_{n \geq 1} n\sigma_1(n)q^n, \\ X_{6,1} &= \frac{1}{720}(E_2E_4 - E_6) = \frac{1}{240}E_4' = \sum_{n \geq 1} n\sigma_3(n)q^n, \\ X_{8,1} &= \frac{1}{1008}(E_4^2 - E_2E_6) = -\frac{1}{504}E_6' = \sum_{n \geq 1} n\sigma_5(n)q^n. \end{aligned}$$

□

More examples can be found in Appendix B, Table 1.

4.2. Kaneko–Koike's conjecture for depth 1. In this subsection, we prove the conjecture of Kaneko and Koike [10, Conjecture 2] in the case of depth 1.

For even $w \geq 6$, let $X_w = X_{w,1}$ be the unique normalized extremal quasimodular form of weight w and depth 1. We have $X_6 = (E_2E_4 - E_6)/720$ and X_w 's satisfy the following recursive formula for $w \geq 6$ with $6|w$ [10, 7]:

$$X_{w+2} = \frac{12}{w+1} \partial_{w-1} X_w \tag{39}$$

$$X_{w+4} = E_4 X_w \tag{40}$$

$$\begin{aligned} X_{w+6} &= \frac{w+6}{72(w+1)(w+5)} \left(E_4 \partial_{w-1} X_w - \frac{w+1}{12} E_6 X_w \right) \\ &= \frac{w+6}{864(w+5)} (E_4 X_{w+2} - E_6 X_w). \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

The vanishing order of X_w at the cusp is $\lfloor \frac{w}{6} \rfloor$. Also, X_w is a solution of the following differential equation (for $6|w$)

$$X_w'' - \frac{w}{6} E_2 X_w' + \frac{w(w-1)}{144} (E_2^2 - E_4) X_w = 0 \tag{42}$$

Following new recurrence relation (43) can be easily shown from the above identities, which immediately implies the complete positivity of X_w 's.

Theorem 4.2. Let $X_w = X_{w,1}$ be the unique normalized extremal quasimodular form of weight w and depth 1. For $6|w$ and $w \geq 12$, we have

$$X'_w = \frac{5w}{72}X_6X_{w-4} + \frac{7w}{72}X_8X_{w-6}. \quad (43)$$

PROOF. $(39)_{w-4}$ is equivalent to

$$X'_{w-4} = \frac{w-5}{12}E_2X_{w-4} + \frac{w-7}{12}E_4X_{w-6} \quad (44)$$

and differentiating $(41)_{w-6}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} X'_w &= \frac{w}{864(w-1)}(E'_4X_{w-4} + E_4X'_{w-4} - E'_6X_{w-6} - E_6X'_{w-6}) && \cdots (41)_{w-6} \\ &= \frac{w}{864(w-1)} \left(\frac{E_2E_4 - E_6}{3}X_{w-4} + \frac{w-5}{12}E_2E_4X_{w-4} + \frac{w-7}{12}E_4^2X_{w-6} \right. && \cdots (44)_w \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{E_2E_6 - E_4^2}{2}X_{w-6} - E_6 \left(\frac{w-5}{12}X_{w-4} + \frac{w-7}{12}E_2X_{w-6} \right) \right) && \cdots (39)_{w-6} \\ &= \frac{w}{864(w-1)} \left(\frac{w-1}{12}(E_2E_4 - E_6)X_{w-4} + \frac{w-1}{12}(E_4^2 - E_2E_6)X_{w-6} \right) \\ &= \frac{5w}{72}X_6X_{w-4} + \frac{7w}{72}X_8X_{w-6}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 4.3. The Kaneko–Koike’s conjecture is true for depth 1 extremal forms.

PROOF. The conjecture holds for X_6 and X_8 by Lemma 4.1, and $X_{10} = E_4X_6$ shows that X_{10} is also completely positive. Now, assume that X_k is completely positive for $k \leq w-2$. Then $(43)_w$ implies that X_w is also completely positive. Combining it with Proposition 3.8 (recall that the vanishing order of X_w at the cusp is $\frac{w}{6} > \frac{w-1}{12}$) shows $X_{w+2} \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+2}^{1,++}$, and we also get $X_{w+4} \in \mathcal{QM}_{w+4}^{1,++}$ from (40), since E_4 has nonnegative Fourier coefficients.

□

Remark 4.4. We also have the following relations (for $6|w$):

$$X'_{w+2} = \frac{5w}{72}X_6X_{w-2} + \frac{7w}{12}X_8X_{w-4}, \quad (45)$$

$$X'_{w+4} = 240X_6X_w + \frac{7w}{72}X_8X_{w-2} + \frac{5w}{72}X_{10}X_{w-4} \quad (46)$$

which can be proven similarly and also provide an alternative proof of Corollary 4.3.

4.3. Extremal forms of depth 2. For even $w \geq 4$ and $w \neq 6$, the depth 2 (normalized) extremal forms $X_{w,2}$ satisfy the following recurrence relations [7]⁴: $X_{4,2} = \frac{E_4 - E_2^2}{288}$ and

$$X_{w+4,2} = \frac{3(w+4)^2}{16(w+1)(w+2)^2(w+3)} \left(\frac{w(w+1)}{36} E_4 X_{w,2} - \partial_{w-2}^2 X_{w,2} \right) \quad (47)$$

$$X_{w+2,2} = \frac{6}{w+1} \partial_{w-2} X_{w,2}. \quad (48)$$

$$= \frac{3w^2}{16(w^2-1)(w-6)^2} \left(\frac{(w-4)(w-5)}{36} E_4 X_{w-2,2} - \partial_{w-4}^2 X_{w-2,2} \right) \quad (49)$$

The vanishing order of $X_{w,2}$ at the cusp is $\lfloor \frac{w}{4} \rfloor$. Also, X_w (for $4|w$) is a solution of the differential equation

$$X_{w,2}''' - \frac{w}{4} E_2 X_{w,2}'' + \frac{w(w-1)}{4} E_2' X_{w,2}' - \frac{w(w-1)(w-2)}{24} E_6 X_{w,2} = 0. \quad (50)$$

We found the following (exceptional) identities that verify the conjecture for depth 2 and weight ≤ 14 that can be checked directly, although we could not find a similar recurrence relations as (43) in the case of depth 2 that may prove the conjecture completely.

Proposition 4.5. *We have the following identities:*

$$X_{8,2}' = 2X_{4,2}X_{6,1}, \quad (51)$$

$$X_{10,2}' = \frac{8}{9}X_{4,2}X_{8,1} + \frac{10}{9}X_{6,1}^2, \quad (52)$$

$$X_{12,2}' = 3X_{6,1}X_{8,2}, \quad (53)$$

$$X_{14,2}' = 3X_{4,2}X_{12,1}. \quad (54)$$

Epecially, $X_{w,2}$ is completely positive for $w \leq 14$.

PROOF. Complete positivity follows from the identities and Proposition 3.1. □

5. 8-dimensional inequalities

Now we are ready to give a new proof of Theorem 1.1. Define

$$F(z) = (E_2(z)E_4(z) - E_6(z))^2 \quad (55)$$

$$G(z) = H_2(z)^3(2H_2(z)^2 + 5H_2(z)H_4(z) + 5H_4(z)^2). \quad (56)$$

Then we can check $F(z) = \Delta(z)\phi_0(z)$ and $G(z) = -2\Delta(z)\psi_S(z)$, where the second identity on $G(z)$ follows from the Jacobi identity and (24). Since $\Delta(it) > 0$, the inequalities (3) and

⁴There's a minor error in [6]. We need to replace w^2 with $(w+4)^2$ on the numerator to make sure that $X_{w+4,2}$ is normalized, i.e. its leading coefficient is 1. We fix this in (47).

(4) are equivalent to

$$F(it) + \frac{18}{\pi^2}G(it) > 0, \quad (57)$$

$$F(it) - \frac{18}{\pi^2}G(it) < 0. \quad (58)$$

As already mentioned in [14], $F(it) = 9E_4'(it)^2 = 9(240 \sum_{n \geq 1} n \sigma_3(n) e^{-2\pi n t})^2 > 0$, and $G(it) > 0$ follows from $\Theta_2(it) > 0$ and $\Theta_4(it) > 0$. Note that F can be also written as $F = 720^2 X_{6,1}^2$.

As we mentioned before, our proof of the ‘‘hard’’ inequality (58) is based on the following observations (Figure 1).

Proposition 5.1.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{F(it)}{G(it)} = \frac{18}{\pi^2}. \quad (59)$$

Proposition 5.2. *The function $t \mapsto \frac{F(it)}{G(it)}$ is strictly decreasing on $t > 0$.*

It is clear that the inequality (58) follows from Proposition 5.1 and 5.2.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.1. We have

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{F(it)}{G(it)} = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(i/t)}{G(i/t)}.$$

By using the transformation laws of Eisenstein series and the thetanull functions (10)-(12) and (21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} F\left(\frac{i}{t}\right) &= t^{12}F(it) - \frac{12t^{11}}{\pi}(E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it))E_4(it) + \frac{36t^{10}}{\pi^2}E_4(it)^2, \\ G\left(\frac{i}{t}\right) &= t^{10}H_4(it)^3(2H_4(it)^2 + 5H_4(it)H_2(it) + 5H_2(it)^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since F , $E_2E_4 - E_6$ and H_2 are cusp forms, we have $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t^k A(it) = 0$ when $A(z)$ is one of these forms and $k \geq 0$. From $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} E_4(it) = 1 = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} H_4(it)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(i/t)}{G(i/t)} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t^{12}F(it) - \frac{12t^{11}}{\pi}(E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it))E_4(it) + \frac{36t^{10}}{\pi^2}E_4(it)^2}{t^{10}H_4(it)^3(2H_4(it)^2 + 5H_4(it)H_2(it) + 5H_2(it)^2)} \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t^2F(it) - \frac{12t}{\pi}(E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it))E_4(it) + \frac{36}{\pi^2}E_4(it)^2}{H_4(it)^3(2H_4(it)^2 + 5H_4(it)H_2(it) + 5H_2(it)^2)} \\ &= \frac{18}{\pi^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5.2. It is enough to show that the derivative

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{F(it)}{G(it)} \right) = -2\pi \frac{F'(it)G(it) - F(it)G'(it)}{F(it)G(it)}$$

is negative, which is equivalent to the positivity of (recall that $F(it) > 0$ and $G(it) > 0$)

$$F'G - FG' = (\partial_{10}F)G - F(\partial_{10}G) =: \mathcal{L}_{1,0} \quad (60)$$

that has weight 24, level $\Gamma(2)$, and depth 2. Here we give two different proofs of $\mathcal{L}_{1,0} > 0$.

First proof. Using (33)-(35) and (36), one can check that the inequality (60) nicely factors as

$$(H_2 + H_4)^2 H_4^2 (E_2 E_4 - E_6) \left(E_4 - \frac{1}{2} E_2 (H_2 + 2H_4) \right) > 0 \quad (61)$$

for $z = it$ with $t > 0$. Since the first three factors are all positive, it is enough to prove that the last factor is positive, i.e.

$$E_4(it) - \frac{1}{2} E_2(it) (H_2(it) + 2H_4(it)) > 0. \quad (62)$$

Using (29), we can rewrite the inequality (62) as

$$E_4(it) - E_2(it) (2E_2(2it) - E_2(it)) > 0,$$

and the left hand side can be written as

$$(E_4(it) - E_4(2it)) + (E_4(2it) - E_2(2it)^2) + (E_2(it) - E_2(2it))^2 \quad (63)$$

where each term is positive ($E_4(it)$ is monotone decreasing in t , $E_4 - E_2^2 = 3E_4'$, and the square is nonnegative).

Second proof. We can directly check that F and G satisfy the following differential equations:

$$\partial_{10}^2 F = \frac{5}{6} E_4 F + a \Delta X_{4,2}, \quad (64)$$

$$\partial_{10}^2 G = \frac{5}{6} E_4 G - b \Delta H_2, \quad (65)$$

where $a = 172800$ and $b = 640$. Combining these with (32), we get

$$\partial_{22} \mathcal{L}_{1,0} = (\partial_{10}^2 F)G - F(\partial_{10}^2 G) = \Delta(aX_{4,2}G + bH_2F) > 0. \quad (66)$$

Since $\mathcal{L}_{1,0}$ has a Fourier expansion

$$\mathcal{L}_{1,0} = 5308416000q^{\frac{7}{2}} + 50960793600q^{\frac{9}{2}} - 528718233600q^{\frac{11}{2}} + O(q^{\frac{13}{2}})$$

and the first nonzero coefficient is positive, the positivity follows from Corollary 3.6. \square

Remark 5.3. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $L_{2,k} := \partial_k^2 - \frac{k(k+2)}{144} E_4$ be the type $(k, k+4)$ modular linear differential operator defined in [12] that is originated from [11]. Then the identities (64) and (65) show $L_{2,10}F > 0$ and $L_{2,10}G < 0$.

6. 24-dimensional inequalities

We give a similar proof of Theorem 1.2. The *easy* inequality (7) is not easy as (3), but it almost directly follows from Corollary 3.6. The idea for the proof of the inequality (8) is the same as that of (4), and (9) is more involved. We will abuse notation and write $F = -\Delta^2\varphi$ and $G = -\Delta^2\psi_S$ for the numerators of (5) and (6). Then the inequalities (7), (8) and (9) are equivalent to

$$F(it) + \frac{432}{\pi^2}G(it) > 0, \tag{67}$$

$$F(it) - \frac{432}{\pi^2}G(it) < 0, \tag{68}$$

$$t^{10} \left(-\frac{F(i/t)}{\Delta(i/t)^2} + \frac{432}{\pi^2} \frac{G(i/t)}{\Delta(i/t)^2} \right) \geq \frac{725760}{\pi} e^{2\pi t} \left(t - \frac{10}{3\pi} \right). \tag{69}$$

6.1. “Easy” inequality (67). As in the $d = 8$ case, we can prove (67) by proving the *easy* inequalities $F(it) > 0$ and $G(it) > 0$ separately. Especially, the second inequality directly follows from its expression (which is already mentioned in [3, p. 1028]). However, the other inequality $F(it) > 0$ is less trivial, although it follows from Corollary 3.6 and the following surprising identity.

Lemma 6.1. *We have*

$$\partial_{14}F = 6706022400 \cdot X_{6,1}X_{12,1} \in \mathcal{QM}_{18}^{2,++}.$$

PROOF. The identity follows from direct calculations. (Complete) positivity follows from Theorem 4.2. □

Corollary 6.2. $F(it) > 0$ for all $t > 0$.

PROOF. This follows from Lemma 6.1 and Corollary 3.6. Note that F has a Fourier expansion

$$F = 3657830400q^3 + 138997555200q^4 + 2567796940800q^5 + O(q^6)$$

and its first nonzero Fourier coefficient is positive. □

Remark 6.3. F is a constant multiple of f_{16} that appears in the family of Feigenbaum–Grabner–Hardin [6, Proposition 5.1]. The authors already proved that the functions f_w are *completely* positive for $w \leq 94$ [6, Remark 6.3], and they conjectured that all the forms in the family are completely positive [6, Conjecture 1]. However, their proof uses approximations based on Jenkins and Rouse’s explicit bound on Fourier coefficients [9].




FIGURE 2. Graph of the quotient $F(it)/G(it)$ as a function in $t > 0$.

6.2. “Hard” inequality (68). The previous approach we used in the proof of (58) also works for (68), as we can expect from Figure 2. It follows from the following two propositions.

Proposition 6.4.

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{F(it)}{G(it)} = \frac{432}{\pi^2}. \quad (70)$$

Proposition 6.5. *The function $t \mapsto \frac{F(it)}{G(it)}$ is strictly decreasing on $t > 0$.*

The computation of the limit in Proposition (6.4) follows the same lines as the proof of Proposition 5.1, and we omit the details.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 6.5. The idea is similar to that of 5.2 (second proof). It is enough to show that

$$F'G - FG' = (\partial_{14}F)G - F(\partial_{14}G) =: \mathcal{L}_{1,0}$$

is positive, which has weight 32, level $\Gamma(2)$, and depth 2. F and G satisfy the following differential equations similar to (64) and (65):

$$\partial_{14}^2 F = \frac{14}{9} E_4 F + c \Delta X_{8,2} \quad (71)$$

$$\partial_{14}^2 G = \frac{14}{9} E_4 G \quad (72)$$

where $c = 5486745600$. If we take the Serre derivative ∂_{30} , by (32), (71), and (72), we have

$$\partial_{30} \mathcal{L}_{1,0} = \mathcal{L}_{2,0} := (\partial_{14}^2 F)G - F(\partial_{14}^2 G) = c \Delta X_{8,2} G > 0 \quad (73)$$

and $\mathcal{L}_{1,0}$ has a Fourier expansion

$$\mathcal{L}_{1,0} = 13424296093286400q^{\frac{11}{2}} + 494781198866841600q^{\frac{13}{2}} + O(q^{\frac{15}{2}})$$

where the first nonzero Fourier coefficient is positive. Hence Corollary 3.6 applies and we get the positivity of $\mathcal{L}_{1,0}$. \square

Remark 6.6. As in $d = 8$ case, (71) and (72) are about the action of the operator $L_{2,14}$ of type (14, 18) in [11, 12] on F and G . Especially, G is a solution of the linear differential equation $L_{2,14}G = 0$.

6.3. “Harder” inequality (69). The last inequality (69) is more involved than the previous inequalities because of the presence of the non-modular terms t^{10} and $e^{2\pi t}$. We first replace the exponential term $e^{2\pi t}$ with $1/\Delta$ using the following inequality.

Lemma 6.7. *For $t > 0$, we have*

$$\Delta(it) < e^{-2\pi t}. \quad (74)$$

PROOF. This directly follows from the product formula of Δ ,

$$\Delta(it) = e^{-2\pi t} \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - e^{-2\pi nt})^{24} < e^{-2\pi t}.$$

\square

The inequality (69) is true for $1 \leq t \leq \frac{10}{3\pi}$, since the left hand side (resp. the right hand side) is nonnegative (resp. nonpositive) on this range (by (68)). Hence it is enough to show for $t > \frac{10}{3\pi}$. On this range, we can bound the right hand side of (69) with (74)

$$\frac{725760}{\pi} e^{2\pi t} \left(t - \frac{10}{3\pi} \right) < \frac{725760}{\pi} \frac{1}{\Delta(it)} \left(t - \frac{10}{3\pi} \right) = \frac{725760}{\pi} \frac{t^{12}}{\Delta(i/t)} \left(t - \frac{10}{3\pi} \right)$$

and the inequality reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} t^{10} \left(-\frac{F(i/t)}{\Delta(i/t)^2} + \frac{432}{\pi^2} \frac{G(i/t)}{\Delta(i/t)^2} \right) &> \frac{725760}{\pi} \frac{t^{12}}{\Delta(i/t)} \left(t - \frac{10}{3\pi} \right) \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{t^2} \left(-\frac{F(i/t)}{\Delta(i/t)} + \frac{432}{\pi^2} \frac{G(i/t)}{\Delta(i/t)} \right) &> \frac{725760}{\pi} \left(t - \frac{10}{3\pi} \right) \end{aligned}$$

for $t > \frac{10}{3\pi}$. If we replace t by $1/t$, the last inequality becomes

$$\begin{aligned} t^3 \left(-\frac{F(it)}{\Delta(it)} + \frac{432}{\pi^2} \frac{G(it)}{\Delta(it)} \right) &> \frac{725760}{\pi} \left(1 - \frac{10t}{3\pi} \right) \\ \Leftrightarrow \frac{432}{\pi^2} - \frac{F(it)}{G(it)} &> \frac{725760\Delta(it)}{G(it)} \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

for $0 < t < \frac{3\pi}{10}$. From Proposition 6.5, we know that the left hand side of (75) is monotone increasing in t . Our main observation is that the difference between two sides of (75) is also monotone increasing (Figure 3).




FIGURE 3. Graph of $LHS(t)$, $RHS(t)$, and $g(t) = LHS(t) - RHS(t)$ of (75).

Proposition 6.8. *The function*

$$g(t) := \frac{432}{\pi^2} - \frac{F(it)}{G(it)} - \frac{725760\Delta(it)}{G(it)} \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right)$$

is monotone increasing in t for $0 < t < \frac{3\pi}{10}$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} g(t) = 0$. Especially, we have $g(t) > 0$ for all $0 < t < \frac{3\pi}{10}$.

PROOF. After writing the limit as $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} g(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(1/t)$, we can compute limit from Proposition 6.4 and the fact that $\Delta|_{12}S = \Delta$ is a cusp form but $G|_{14}S = -H_4^5(7H_2^2 + 7H_2H_4 + 2H_4^2)$ is not, so the third term in $g(t)$ vanishes as $t \rightarrow 0^+$. We will omit the details and focus on the monotonicity part. We have

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{F(it)}{G(it)} \right) = -2\pi \frac{\mathcal{L}_{1,0}(it)}{G(it)^2}$$

and by $\Delta' = E_2\Delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt} \left[\frac{\Delta(it)}{G(it)} \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) \right] \\ &= (-2\pi) \frac{\Delta(it)(E_2(it)G(it) - G'(it))}{G(it)^2} \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) + \frac{\Delta(it)}{G(it)} \left(-\frac{3}{\pi t^4} + \frac{20}{3\pi^2 t^3} \right) \\ &= (2\pi) \frac{\Delta(it)}{G(it)^2} \left[(\partial_{12}G)(it) \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) - G(it) \left(\frac{3}{2\pi^2 t^4} - \frac{10}{3\pi^3 t^3} \right) \right], \end{aligned}$$

so $dg/dt > 0$ if and only if (after factoring out $1/G^2$)

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(it) := \mathcal{L}_{1,0}(it) - 725760\Delta(it) \left[(\partial_{12}G)(it) \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) - G(it) \left(\frac{3}{2\pi^2 t^4} - \frac{10}{3\pi^3 t^3} \right) \right] > 0.$$

We have $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(\frac{3\pi i}{10}) > 0$, since Proposition 6.5 gives $\mathcal{L}_{1,0}(\frac{3\pi i}{10}) > 0$ and when $t = \frac{3\pi}{10}$,

$$(\partial_{12}G)(it) \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) - G(it) \left(\frac{3}{2\pi^2 t^4} - \frac{10}{3\pi^3 t^3} \right) = -G \left(\frac{3\pi i}{10} \right) \cdot \left(\frac{5000}{81\pi^6} \right) < 0.$$

From Proposition 3.5 (see also Remark 3.7), it is enough to show that its Serre derivative

$$\partial_{30}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(it) = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{1,0}(it) - \frac{5}{2}E_2(it)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(it) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{d\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(it)}{dt} - \frac{5}{2}E_2(it)\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(it)$$

is positive (i.e. $t \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(it)/\eta(it)^{60}$ is a monotone decreasing function in t) on $0 < t < \frac{3\pi}{10}$. Recall $\partial_{30}\mathcal{L}_{1,0} = c\Delta X_{8,2}G$ (73). Using (32), $\partial_{12}\Delta = 0$, and (72), one can check that the Serre derivative of the second term of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}$ is 725760Δ times

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial_{18} \left[(\partial_{12}G)(it) \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) - G(it) \left(\frac{3}{2\pi^2 t^4} - \frac{10}{3\pi^3 t^3} \right) \right] \\ &= \left[\frac{37E_4(it) - E_2(it)^2}{24} \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) + E_2(it) \left(\frac{3}{4\pi^2 t^4} - \frac{5}{3\pi^3 t^3} \right) - \left(\frac{3}{\pi^3 t^5} - \frac{5}{\pi^4 t^4} \right) \right] G(it), \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

so ΔG factors out from $\partial_{30}\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{1,0}(it) > 0$ and it reduces to the positivity of

$$7560X_{8,2}(it) - \frac{37E_4(it) - E_2(it)^2}{24} \left(\frac{1}{\pi t^3} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) - E_2(it) \left(\frac{3}{4\pi^2 t^4} - \frac{5}{3\pi^3 t^3} \right) + \left(\frac{3}{\pi^3 t^5} - \frac{5}{\pi^4 t^4} \right). \quad (77)$$

Let $h(t)$ be the above function in (77). Then

$$\begin{aligned} & t^{-8}h \left(\frac{1}{t} \right) \\ &= 7560 \left(X_{8,2}(it) + \frac{7E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it)}{30240\pi t} - \frac{E_4(it)}{1440\pi^2 t^2} \right) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{24} \left(37E_4(it) - E_2(it)^2 + \frac{12E_2(it)}{\pi t} - \frac{36}{\pi^2 t^2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\pi t} - \frac{10}{3\pi^2 t^2} \right) \\ & \quad - \left(-E_2(it) + \frac{6}{\pi t} \right) \left(\frac{3}{4\pi^2 t^2} - \frac{5}{3\pi^3 t^3} \right) + \left(\frac{3}{\pi^3 t^3} - \frac{5}{\pi^4 t^4} \right) \\ &= 7560X_{8,2}(it) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\pi t} \left(\frac{7E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it)}{4} - \frac{37E_4(it) - E_2(it)^2}{24} \right) + \frac{1}{\pi^2 t^2} \left(-\frac{4E_4(it) + 5E_2(it)^2}{36} + \frac{E_2(it)}{4} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

and since $X_{8,2}$ is (completely) positive, it is enough to show that (78) is positive, i.e. show the following *nonhomogeneous* inequality (after factoring out $1/\pi t$)

$$\frac{7E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it)}{4} - \frac{37E_4(it) - E_2(it)^2}{24} - \frac{1}{\pi t} \left(\frac{5E_2(it)^2 + 4E_4(it)}{36} - \frac{1}{4}E_2(it) \right) > 0 \quad (79)$$

for $t \geq \frac{10}{3\pi}$. We can further reduce it to an inequality with only quasimodular terms (i.e. no rational terms) with the following lemma.

Lemma 6.9. *The following (nonhomogeneous) quasimodular forms are completely positive:*

$$J_1 = \frac{5}{36}E_2^2 + \frac{1}{9}E_4 - \frac{1}{4}E_2, \quad (80)$$

$$J_2 = E_2 - E_6. \quad (81)$$

PROOF. By using the Fourier expansions of E_2 , E_4 , E_6 , and (14), we can compute the Fourier expansions of the above forms explicitly as

$$J_1 = \frac{5}{3}E_2' - \frac{1}{4}E_2 + \frac{1}{4}E_4 = \sum_{n \geq 1} (60\sigma_3(n) - 40n\sigma_1(n) + 6\sigma_1(n))q^n,$$

$$J_2 = \sum_{n \geq 1} (504\sigma_5(n) - 24\sigma_1(n))q^n.$$

The complete positivity of J_1 follows from the trivial estimates $\sigma_3(n) > n^3$ and $\sigma_1(n) \leq 1 + 2 + \dots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \leq n^2$, and that of J_2 follows from $504\sigma_5(n) - 24\sigma_1(n) = \sum_{d|n} (504d^5 - 24d) > 0$. \square

By Lemma 6.9, for $t \geq \frac{10}{3\pi}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{7E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it)}{4} - \frac{37E_4(it) - E_2(it)^2}{24} - \frac{1}{\pi t} \left(\frac{5E_2(it)^2 + 4E_4(it)}{36} - \frac{E_2(it)}{4} \right) \\ & > \frac{7E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it)}{4} - \frac{37E_4(it) - E_2(it)^2}{24} - \frac{3}{10} \left(\frac{5E_2(it)^2 + 4E_4(it)}{36} - \frac{E_2(it)}{4} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \frac{7E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it)}{4} - \frac{63}{40}E_4(it) + \frac{3}{40}E_2(it) \\ & > \frac{7E_2(it)E_4(it) - E_6(it)}{4} - \frac{63}{40}E_4(it) + \frac{3}{40}E_6(it) \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

$$= \frac{7}{4} \left(E_2(it)E_4(it) - \frac{1}{10}E_6(it) - \frac{9}{10}E_4(it) \right) =: \frac{7}{4}J_3 \quad (84)$$

where the positivity of J_1 and J_2 are used in (82) and (83), respectively. Now, we can prove the positivity of (84) (i.e. J_3) as follows. As in Lemma 6.9, we can compute the Fourier expansion of J_3 as

$$\begin{aligned} J_3 & = E_2E_4 - \frac{1}{10}E_6 - \frac{9}{10}E_4 \\ & = 3E_4' + \frac{9}{10}E_6 - \frac{9}{10}E_4 \\ & = \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(720n\sigma_3(n) - \frac{2268}{5}\sigma_5(n) - 216\sigma_3(n) \right) q^n \\ & =: \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n q^n. \end{aligned}$$

We have $a_1 = \frac{252}{5} > 0$. For $n \geq 2$,

$$n\sigma_3(n) \leq n(1^3 + 2^3 + \dots + n^3) = \frac{n^3(n+1)^2}{4} \leq \frac{9}{16}n^5 < \frac{9}{16}\sigma_5(n) < \frac{2268}{720 \cdot 5}\sigma_5(n)$$

and we get $a_n < 0$. From this observation, the function

$$t \mapsto e^{2\pi t} J_3(it) = a_1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n e^{-2\pi(n-1)t}$$

is monotone increasing, so

$$e^{2\pi t} J_3(it) \geq e^{2\pi} J_3(i) = e^{2\pi} \left(\frac{3}{\pi} - \frac{9}{10} \right) E_4(i) > 0 \Rightarrow J_3(it) > 0$$

for $t \geq 1$, hence for $t > \frac{10}{3\pi}$. □

Remark 6.10. The estimate $\pi < \frac{10}{3}$ is used in the proof (e.g. (82)), and this can be verified *geometrically* (without calculators) by considering the area of a regular octagon circumscribed to a unit circle:

$$\pi < 8 \tan\left(\frac{\pi}{8}\right) = 8(\sqrt{2} - 1) < \frac{10}{3}.$$

Remark 6.11. The inequalities (75) and (77) are “homogeneous” if one regard $\frac{1}{t} = \frac{i}{z}$ and $\frac{1}{\pi}$ as “weight 1” objects, which makes sense if we consider the transformation law of E_2 (10). However, we had to flip it under $t \leftrightarrow \frac{1}{t}$ and prove the nonhomogeneous inequalities (79)-(84) instead. It would be interesting if one can prove the inequality (69) in a purely homogeneous way.

References

- [1] Jan Hendrik Bruinier, Gerard van der Geer, Günter Harder, and Don Zagier. Elliptic modular forms and their applications. *The 1-2-3 of modular forms: Lectures at a summer school in Nordfjordeid, Norway*, pages 1–103, 2008.
- [2] Henry Cohn and Noam Elkies. New upper bounds on sphere packings I. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 689–714, 2003.
- [3] Henry Cohn, Abhinav Kumar, Stephen Miller, Danylo Radchenko, and Maryna Viazovska. The sphere packing problem in dimension 24. *Annals of Mathematics*, 185(3):1017–1033, 2017.
- [4] Henry Cohn, Abhinav Kumar, Stephen Miller, Danylo Radchenko, and Maryna Viazovska. Universal optimality of the E_8 and leech lattices and interpolation formulas. *Annals of Mathematics*, 196(3):983–1082, 2022.
- [5] Henry Cohn and Yufei Zhao. Sphere packing bounds via spherical codes. *Duke Math J.*, 163(10):1965–2002, 2014.
- [6] Ahram S Feigenbaum, Peter J Grabner, and Douglas P Hardin. Eigenfunctions of the Fourier Transform with specified zeros. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 171, pages 329–367. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [7] Peter J Grabner. Quasimodular forms as solutions of modular differential equations. *International Journal of Number Theory*, 16(10):2233–2274, 2020.
- [8] Peter J Grabner. Asymptotic expansions for the coefficients of extremal quasimodular forms and a conjecture of Kaneko and Koike. *The Ramanujan Journal*, 57(3):1021–1041, 2022.
- [9] Paul Jenkins and Jeremy Rouse. Bounds for coefficients of cusp forms and extremal lattices. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 43(5):927–938, 2011.
- [10] Masanobu Kaneko and Masao Koike. On extremal quasimodular forms. *Kyushu Journal of Mathematics*, 60(2):457–470, 2006.
- [11] Masanobu Kaneko and Don Zagier. Supersingular j -invariants, hypergeometric series, and Atkin’s orthogonal polynomials. *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*, 7:97–126, 1998.
- [12] Kiyokazu Nagatomo, Yuichi Sakai, and Don Zagier. Modular linear differential operators and generalized rankin-cohen brackets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.10686*, 2022.
- [13] F Pellarin and G Nebe. On extremal quasi-modular forms after Kaneko and Koike. *KYUSHU JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS*, 74(2):401–413, 2020.
- [14] Dan Romik. On Viazovska’s modular form inequalities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 120(43):e2304891120, 2023.
- [15] Dan Romik. *Topics in Complex Analysis*. De Gruyter, 2023.
- [16] René L Schilling, Renming Song, and Zoran Vondraček. *Bernstein functions: theory and applications*. Walter de Gruyter, 2009.
- [17] Jean-Pierre Serre. *A course in arithmetic*, volume 7. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [18] Goro Shimura. Modular forms of half integral weight. In *Modular Functions of One Variable I: Proceedings International Summer School University of Antwerp, RUCA July 17–August 3, 1972*, pages 57–74. Springer, 1973.
- [19] The Sage Developers. *SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 9.8)*, 2023. <https://www.sagemath.org>.
- [20] Maryna Viazovska. The sphere packing problem in dimension 8. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 991–1015, 2017.

Appendix

A. Implementation details

All the codes are available in the GitHub repository <https://github.com/seewoo5/posqmf>. Our SageMath codes are heavily based on the current implementation of quasimodular forms, thanks to David Ayotte. In SageMath, the ring of quasimodular forms of level $\Gamma_0(N)$ or $\Gamma_1(N)$ are essentially implemented as polynomial rings of one variable (E_2) with the ring of (genuine) modular forms as a coefficient ring, based on [11]. The implementation of extremal quasimodular forms simply follow the recurrence relations (43)-(46) and (47)-(49).

For the quasimodular forms of level $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$, we can simply define the ring as $QM = \text{QuasiModularForms}(1)$. However, for the ring of quasimodular forms of level $\Gamma(2)$, we had to implement it ourselves since the current implementation of the modular forms does not support the level. The ring of quasimodular forms of level $\Gamma(2)$ is isomorphic to a polynomial ring with three generators, namely $H_2 = \Theta_2^4$, $H_4 = \Theta_4^4$, and E_2 . So we simply define it as a polynomial ring $QM2.<H2,H4,E2.> = \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{Q}['H2,H4,E2']$, and implement functions that compute the q -series, (Serre) derivatives, and plotting a graph of a given form in t for $z = it$. We use (31) to implement (Serre) derivatives as follows.

```
def qm2_weight(qm):
    w = None
    for (a, b, e) in qm.dict().keys():
        if w is None:
            w = 2 * a + 2 * b + 2 * e
        else:
            assert w == 2 * a + 2 * b + 2 * e, "Not homogeneous"
    return w

def qm2_depth(qm):
    dp = 0
    for (_, _, e) in qm.dict().keys():
        dp = max(e, dp)
    return dp

def qm2_derivative(qm):
    r = QM2(0)
    for (a, b, e), coeff in qm.dict().items():
        r += (coeff/6) * H2^a * H4^b * ((a-2*b)*H2 + (2*a-b)*H4 + (a+b)*E2_) * E2_^e
        if e >= 1:
            r += coeff * H2^a * H4^b * e * E2_^(e-1) * (E2_^2 - E4_) / 12
    return r
```

```

def qm2_serre_derivative(qm, k=None):
    s = qm2_depth(qm)
    if k is None:
        # Serre derivative that preserves depth
        k = qm2_weight(qm) - qm2_depth(qm)
    return qm2_derivative(qm) - (k / 12) * E2_ * qm

```

For q -series, we expressed them in $qh = q^{1/2}$ instead of $q = q$, since the power series ring does not support non-integer powers. We also need a function that embeds the ring $\mathcal{QM}(\mathcal{QM}(\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})))$ into the ring $\mathcal{QM}_2(\mathcal{QM}(\Gamma(2)))$, using (22) and (23) (l1_to_l2).

```

E4_ = H2^2 + H2 * H4 + H4^2
E6_ = (H2 + 2 * H4) * (2 * H2 + H4) * (H4 - H2) / 2

```

```

def l1_to_l2(qm):
    r = QM2(0)
    for (d2, d4, d6), coeff in qm.polynomial.dict().items():
        r += coeff * E2_^d2 * E4_^d4 * E6_^d6
    return r

```

Now, we can check various quasimodular form identities using `assert` as follows. Note that the ring \mathcal{QM} is implemented as a polynomial ring in three variables (namely E_2 , E_4 , and E_6), and SageMath simply checks whether given two polynomials are equal or not.

```

>>> X_4_2 = extremal_qm(4, 2)
>>> X_6_1 = extremal_qm(6, 1)
>>> X_8_2 = extremal_qm(8, 2)
>>> assert X_8_2.derivative() == 2 * X_4_2 * X_6_1 # Check (51)
>>> Disc = (E4^3 - E6^2) / 1728
>>> F_8d = (E2 * E4 - E6)^2
>>> assert qm_serre_derivative_fold(F_8d, 2, 10) == (5/6) * E4 * F_8d + 172800 * Disc *
↪ X_4_2 # Check (64)
>>> G_24d = H2^5 * (2 * H2^2 + 7 * H2 * H4 + 7 * H4^2)
>>> assert qm2_serre_derivative_fold(G_24d, 2, 14) == (14/9) * E4_ * G_24d # Check (72)

```

For the computations in the proof of “harder” inequality (9), we define auxiliary rings \mathcal{RQM} and \mathcal{RQM}_2 corresponds to

$$\mathcal{RQM}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{QM}(\Gamma) \left[\frac{1}{\pi}, \frac{i}{z} \right]$$

for $\Gamma = \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\Gamma(2)$, by adding two formal variables ip and ioz correspond to $1/\pi$ and $i/z = 1/t$, respectively. As we mentioned before, we regard these new elements as “weight 1” objects. Then we extend the derivative D on these rings using

$$D\left(\frac{1}{\pi}\right) = 0, \quad D\left(\frac{i}{z}\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{d}{dz} \left(\frac{i}{z}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\pi} \left(\frac{i}{z}\right)^2$$

and the product rule.

```

# Level SL_2(Z)
RQM.<ip, ioz> = QM['ip','ioz'] # `ip` = 1 / pi, `ioz` = i / z = 1 / t

# Weight
def rqm_weight(rqm):
    w = 0
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        w = max(w, qm.weight() + dip + dioz)
    return w

def is_rqm_homogeneous(rqm):
    w = None
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        w_ = qm.weight() + dip + dioz
        if w is None:
            w = w_
        else:
            if w != w_:
                return False
    return True

# Depth
def rqm_depth(rqm):
    dp = 0
    for qm in rqm.dict().values():
        dp = max(dp, qm_depth(qm))
    return dp

def rqm_derivative(rqm):
    r = 0
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        r += qm.derivative() * ip^dip * ioz^dioz
        if dioz >= 1:
            r += qm * ip^dip * dioz * ioz^(dioz - 1) * ((1/2) * ip * ioz^2)
    return r

```

```

# Level \Gamma(2)
RQM2.<ip_, ioz_> = QM2['ip', 'ioz'] # `ip` = 1 / pi, `ioz` = i / z

# Weight
def rqm2_weight(rqm):
    w = 0
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        w = max(w, qm2_weight(qm) + dip + dioz)
    return w

def is_rqm2_homogeneous(rqm):
    w = None
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        w_ = qm2_weight(qm) + dip + dioz
        if w is None:
            w = w_
        else:
            if w != w_:
                return False
    return True

# Depth
def rqm2_depth(rqm):
    dp = 0
    for qm in rqm.dict().values():
        dp = max(dp, qm2_depth(qm))
    return dp

def rqm2_derivative(rqm):
    r = 0
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        r += qm2_derivative(qm) * ip_^dip * ioz_^dioz
        if dioz >= 1:
            r += qm * ip_^dip * dioz * ioz_^(dioz - 1) * ((1/2) * ip_ * ioz_^2)
    return r

```

We can also define S -actions on these rings, using the transformation laws of Eisenstein series and thetannull functions. Note that, if input is a quasimodular form without any rational terms, then the output is homogeneous. Otherwise, the output may not be homogeneous in general. Also, we always assume that the input is homogeneous. On each monomial, the action $|_w S$ on $F \cdot (1/\pi)^a \cdot (i/z)^b$ where $F \in \mathcal{QM}_{w-a-b}(\Gamma)$ equals

$$(F|_{w-a-b} S) \cdot (1/\pi)^a \cdot (i/(-1/z))^b \cdot z^{-a-b} = (-1)^{(a+b)/2} \cdot (F|_{w-a-b} S) \cdot (1/\pi)^a \cdot (i/z)^a$$

(we only deal with inputs of even weights, so $a + b$ is always even). We can extract homogeneous components using `rqm_homogeneous_comps` and `rqm2_homogeneous_comps`.

```

# For homogeneous inputs with rational terms
def rqm_S_action(rqm):
    r = 0
    assert is_rqm_homogeneous(rqm), "Input is not homogeneous."
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        r += (-1)^((dip + dioz)/2) * qm_S_action(qm) * ip^dip * ioz^dioz
    return r

# For homogeneous inputs with rational terms
def rqm2_S_action(rqm):
    r = 0
    assert is_rqm2_homogeneous(rqm), "Input is not homogeneous."
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        r += (-1)^((dip + dioz)/2) * qm2_S_action(qm) * ip^dip * ioz^dioz
    return r

# Extract each of homogeneous components
def rqm_homogeneous_comps(rqm):
    r = dict()
    for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
        qm_comps = qm.homogeneous_components()
        for w_, qm_ in qm_comps.items():
            w = w_ + dip + dioz
            if w not in r:
                r[w] = qm_ * ip^dip * ioz^dioz
            else:
                r[w] += qm_ * ip^dip * ioz^dioz
    return r

def qm2_homogeneous_comps(qm):
    r = dict()
    for (dh2, dh4, de2), coeff in qm.dict().items():
        w = 2 * (dh2 + dh4 + de2)
        if w not in r:
            r[w] = coeff * H2^dh2 * H4^dh4 * E2^de2
        else:
            r[w] += coeff * H2^dh2 * H4^dh4 * E2^de2
    return r

def rqm2_homogeneous_comps(rqm):
    r = dict()

```

```

for (dip, dioz), qm in rqm.dict().items():
    qm_comps = qm2_homogeneous_comps(qm)
    for w_, qm_ in qm_comps.items():
        w = w_ + dip + dioz
        if w not in r:
            r[w] = qm_ * ip_dip * ioz_dioz
        else:
            r[w] += qm_ * ip_dip * ioz_dioz
return r

```

Note that these functions also help us for the limit computations such as (59), (70), and the one in Proposition 6.8, since we essentially use S -action to change the limits from $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+}$ to $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}$. For example, the following code recovers the proof of Proposition 5.1, computing $F|_{12}S$ and $G|_{10}S$ and extract their modular form components.

```

>>> F_8dS = qm_S_action(F_8d)
>>> G_8dS = qm2_S_action(G_8d)
>>> print_rqmf(F_8dS, "F_8d|S")
F_8d|S
polynomial (E22*E42 - 2*E2*E4*E6 + E62) + (-12*E2*E42 + 12*E4*E6)*(1/π)*(i/z) +
↪ (36*E42)*(1/π)2*(i/z)2
weight 12
depth 2
>>> print_rqmf2(G_8dS, "G_8d|S")
G_8d|S
polynomial (-5*H22*H43 - 5*H2*H44 - 2*H45)
weight 10
depth 0
>>> print("F_8dS, ip0 * ioz0:", F_8dS.coefficient([0, 0]))
F_8dS, ip0 * ioz0: 518400*q2 + 18662400*q3 + 255052800*q4 + 1870387200*q5 + 0(q6)
>>> print("F_8dS, ip1 * ioz1:", F_8dS.coefficient([1, 1]))
F_8dS, ip1 * ioz1: -8640*q - 2229120*q2 - 56712960*q3 - 570689280*q4 -
↪ 3375043200*q5 + 0(q6)
>>> print("F_8dS, ip2 * ioz2:", F_8dS.coefficient([2, 2]))
F_8dS, ip2 * ioz2: 36 + 17280*q + 2229120*q2 + 37808640*q3 + 285344640*q4 +
↪ 1350017280*q5 + 0(q6)
>>> print("G_8dS, ip0 * ioz0:", qm2_q_series(QM2(G_8dS.coefficient([0, 0])), 10))
G_8dS, ip0 * ioz0: (-2) + (-240)*qh2 + 10240*qh3 + (-134640)*qh4 + 1007616*qh5 +
↪ (-5215680)*qh6 + 20828160*qh7 + (-69131760)*qh8 + 199966720*qh9 + Order(qh10)

```

B. Table of extremal forms

Table 1 gives first few extremal quasimodular forms of Kaneko and Koike [10].

s	w	$X_{w,s}$
1	6	$\frac{E_2E_4 - E_6}{720} = q + 18q^2 + 84q^3 + 292q^4 + 630q^5 + \dots$
	8	$\frac{-E_2E_6 + E_4^2}{1008} = q + 66q^2 + 732q^3 + 4228q^4 + 15630q^5 + \dots$
	10	$\frac{E_2E_4^2 - E_4E_6}{720} = q + 258q^2 + 6564q^3 + 66052q^4 + 390630q^5 + \dots$
	12	$\frac{-12E_2E_4E_6 + 5E_4^3 + 7E_6^2}{3991680} = q^2 + 56q^3 + 1002q^4 + 9296q^5 + 57708q^6 + \dots$
	14	$\frac{7E_2E_4^3 + 5E_2E_6^2 - 12E_4^2E_6}{4717440} = q^2 + 128q^3 + 4050q^4 + 58880q^5 + 525300q^6 + \dots$
2	4	$\frac{-E_2^2 + E_4}{288} = q + 6q^2 + 12q^3 + 28q^4 + 30q^5 + \dots$
	8	$\frac{-7E_2^2E_4 + 2E_2E_6 + 5E_4^2}{362880} = q^2 + 16q^3 + 102q^4 + 416q^5 + 1308q^6 + \dots$
	10	$\frac{5E_2^2E_6 + 2E_2E_4^2 - 7E_4E_6}{1088640} = q^2 + \frac{104}{3}q^3 + 390q^4 + 2480q^5 + 11140q^6 + \dots$
	12	$\frac{-77E_2^2E_4^2 + 34E_2E_4E_6 + 50E_4^3 - 7E_6^2}{798336000} = q^3 + \frac{51}{2}q^4 + \frac{1422}{5}q^5 + 1944q^6 + 9714q^7 + \dots$
	14	$\frac{13E_2^2E_4E_6 + E_2E_4^3 - 3E_2E_6^2 - 11E_4^2E_6}{415134720} = q^3 + \frac{93}{2}q^4 + 810q^5 + 8004q^6 + 54474q^7 + \dots$

TABLE 1. Extremal forms of depth ≤ 2 and weight ≤ 14 .