

# DETERMINATION OF CERTAIN MOD $p$ GALOIS REPRESENTATIONS USING LOCAL CONSTANCY

ABHIK GANGULI\* AND SUNEEL KUMAR\*\*

ABSTRACT. Let  $p \geq 5$  be a prime. Let  $k = b + c(p - 1)$  be an integer in  $[2p + 2, p^2 - p + 3]$ , where  $b \in [2, p]$  and  $c \in [2, p - 1]$ . We prove local constancy in the weight space of the mod  $p$  reduction of certain two dimensional crystalline representations of  $\text{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ , where the slope  $\nu(a_p)$  is constrained to be in  $(1, c)$  and non-integral. We use the mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence for  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  to compute the mod  $p$  reductions explicitly, thereby also giving a lower bound on the radius of constancy around the weights  $k$  in the above range and under additional conditions on the slope. As an application of local constancy, we obtain explicit mod  $p$  reductions at many new values of  $k$  and  $a_p$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $p$  be an odd prime and  $\nu : \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^* \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  be the normalized  $p$ -adic valuation such that  $\nu(p) = 1$ . For an integer  $k \geq 2$  and  $0 \neq a_p \in \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  with slope  $\nu(a_p) > 0$ , let  $D_{k, a_p}$  be the weakly admissible filtered  $\phi$ -module given in [8] with the characteristic polynomial of semilinear Frobenius  $\phi$  given by  $X^2 - a_p X + p^{k-1}$  with jumps in the filtration at 0 and  $k - 1$ . By the theorem of Colmez-Fontaine (Theorem A in [18]) there exists a unique irreducible 2-dimensional crystalline representation  $V_{k, a_p}$  of  $\text{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$  with Hodge-Tate weights  $(0, k - 1)$  such that  $D_{\text{cris}}(V_{k, a_p}^*) \cong D_{k, a_p}$ . Here  $D_{\text{cris}}$  is Fontaine's functor defined in [19] and  $V_{k, a_p}^*$  is the dual representation of  $V_{k, a_p}$ . Let  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  be the reduction of a  $\text{Gal}(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ -stable lattice of  $V_{k, a_p}$  up to semisimplification. The problem of explicit computation of the mod  $p$  reduction  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  is quite intricate, and a substantial work has been done using local techniques that involve  $p$ -adic Hodge theory and more recently the mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence for  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  due to Breuil and Berger ([13], [14], [7], [5]).

We see that  $V_{k, a_p}$  is completely determined by  $a_p$  and the weight  $k$  and thus, so is  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$ . In this article, fixing  $a_p$  we study the question of local constancy of  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  as a function of  $k$  in the weight space. From Berger's local constancy theorem (Theorem B, [6]) we expect local constancy to hold

---

Email: \*aganguli@iisermohali.ac.in

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER) Mohali, Sector 81, SAS Nagar, Punjab-140306, India.

Email: \*\*suneelm145@gmail.com

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research (IISER) Tirupati, Srinivasapuram, Yerpedu Mandal, Tirupati Dist, Andhra Pradesh-517619, India.

Key words: Reduction of crystalline representations, mod  $p$  local Langlands, MSC: 11F80, 11F70, 11F33.

if  $k$  and  $k'$  are  $p$ -adically close enough and are in the same class modulo  $p-1$ . Let  $m(k, a_p)$  be the smallest integer  $m$  such that  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  for all  $k' \in k + p^{m-1}(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .

We write  $k$  as  $b + c(p-1) + 2$ , where we take  $b \in [2, p]$  and  $c \geq 0$ . The first result giving an explicit upper bound for Berger's constant  $m(k, a_p)$  is in Bhattacharya [9], and [22] extends the result significantly to cover more values of  $k$  and allowing higher slope. Thus, [9] & [22] give an explicit lower bound on the radius of local constancy. In both [9] & [22] the slope  $\nu(a_p) > c$ , and the precise reduction  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  is also given in the disk of constancy.

In this article, we consider the problem of local constancy in the situation when  $\nu(a_p) < c$  and also non-integral. The approach in [9], [22] and our results here is to compute explicitly  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  for all  $k'$  in the punctured disk  $k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  for  $t > t_0$ , where  $t_0$  is given explicitly and sufficiently large. In order to compute  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$ , we use the mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence for  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ . In [9] and [22], Theorem 1.1.1, [4] together with Berger's local constancy theorem (Theorem B, [6]) are applied to further determine the reduction  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  at the center to finally establish local constancy in the disc around the weight  $k$ . In our present situation, the condition for Berger's local constancy is already satisfied since  $\nu(a_p) < c$ , proving the existence of local constancy for these small slopes. We use Berger's theorem to infer that since the reduction  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  computed in a sufficiently small punctured disk is the same as  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  at the center, local constancy must hold in the disk  $k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  for  $t > t_0$  around the weight  $k$ .

In this small slope range the lower bound  $\nu(a_p) > \lfloor \frac{k-1}{p} \rfloor$  in Bergdall-Levin, [4] (and also the larger bound from Berger-Li-Zhu, [8]) is not satisfied. Therefore, unlike the generic situation in [9], [22], we are not able to compute in general the reduction at the center separately, making it difficult to predict the precise reduction in a punctured disk in the small slope regime. Furthermore, as an important application of local constancy in the small slope regime, we instead deduce the precise reduction  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  at the center in previously unknown cases of weights and slopes (see Corollary 1.3). Let  $\nu$  denote  $\lfloor \nu(a_p) \rfloor$ . Our first result is as follows (Theorem 7.2 (1)):

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $k = b + c(p-1) + 2$  with  $2 \leq c \leq p-1$ ,  $2 \leq b \leq p$  and  $p \geq 5$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral,  $1 < \nu(a_p) < c - \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon \in \{0, 1, 2\}$  as defined in (2.5), and let  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . If  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$  such that  $b \neq 2\nu + 1$  and  $(b, \nu) \neq (p, 1)$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \mathrm{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+\nu(p-1)} \right)$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Moreover, the Berger's constant  $m(k, a_p)$  exists and  $m(k, a_p) \leq \lceil \nu(a_p) \rceil + c + 1$ .*

We note that in Theorem 1.1 as well as in Theorem 1.2 below, we treat only the cases where  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  is necessarily irreducible. The omitted values of  $b$  in the theorems are precisely the possibly reducible cases that arise from the mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence (see Lemma 2.5). We remark that the above theorem can be proved for  $1 < \nu(a_p) < c + 1$  with different methods (see Theorem 1.0.6 [28]). We also observe that the above theorem shows that  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  also depends on  $\nu$  when  $\nu(a_p) < c - \epsilon$  unlike in the cases of  $\nu(a_p) > c$  known so far, where  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  depends only on the weight  $k$  (see Theorem 1.1 in [22]). In Theorem 1.1, although the condition  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$  is technical, it arises quite naturally from the broader constraints coming from our method (see §1.1 below).

We next address the question of local constancy in the case when  $b \leq c + \nu - 2$ , wherein we assume Conjecture 5.2. Our next result is as follows (Theorem 7.2 (2)-(4)):

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $k = b + c(p - 1) + 2$  with  $2 \leq c \leq p - 1$ ,  $2 \leq b \leq p$  and  $p \geq 5$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral,  $1 < \nu(a_p) < c - \epsilon$ , and let  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . Assume **Conjecture 5.2** is true.*

(1) *If  $c - 1 \leq b \leq 2c - 4$  and  $\nu = c - 2$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(b-c+1)(p-1)} \right)$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .*

(2) *Suppose  $2 \leq b \leq c - 2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$ . Also assume that  $b \neq 2\nu + 2 - p$  if  $b \leq 2c - 2 - p$ . Then for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(\nu+1)(p-1)} \right)$  if  $b \leq \nu$ , and  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right)$  if  $b = \nu + 1$ .*

(3) *If  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 5 - p$  and  $\nu \in \{p + b - c + 1, c - 3\}$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{k_0} \right)$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , where  $k_0 = b + 1 + (p + b - c + 2)(p - 1)$ .*

*In the above cases the Berger's constant  $m(k, a_p)$  exists and  $m(k, a_p) \leq \lceil \nu(a_p) \rceil + c + 1$ .*

In determining  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  in the theorems above, the critical component of our approach is to show certain monomials belong to the kernel of a map  $P$  obtained from the mod  $p$  local Langlands machinery (see §1.1). This involves computations with the Hecke operator  $T$  requiring a delicate choice of functions, and also some complicated binomial identities. Conjecture 5.2 is critical to showing that these monomials (the  $q(c)$  in §1.1) are essentially in the kernel of this map  $P$ . We make an important remark that Theorem 1.1 is unconditional on Conjecture 5.2. Theorem 8.1 proves a substantial portion of Conjecture 5.2. We refer to §1.1 for a discussion on this conjecture.

For slope  $0 < \nu(a_p) < 2$ , the mod  $p$  reduction  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  is completely known for all the weights (see [15],[16],[21],[11], [12],[25]). Our contribution in computing new cases of  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  is therefore when the slope  $\nu(a_p) > 2$ . Recall that  $b$  is the unique integer in  $[2, p]$  such that  $k - 2 \equiv b \pmod{p - 1}$  and  $c := \frac{k - 2 - b}{p - 1}$ . As a consequence of Theorems 1.1 & 1.2 we have the following corollary that gives the reduction  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  at new values of  $k$  and  $a_p$ . We note that the first reduction given in each of the three ranges of slopes below are coming from Theorem 1.1, and hence unconditional on Conjecture 5.2.

**Corollary 1.3.** *Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral and  $1 < \nu(a_p) < p - 1$ . Let  $p \geq 13$  and assume **Conjecture 5.2** is true. Suppose that  $k \notin \{2\nu + 3 + c(p - 1), 2\nu + 4 - p + c(p - 1)\}$ , where  $c$  is given below.*

(1) *If  $\nu = 2$ , then*

$$\bar{V}_{k, a_p} \cong \begin{cases} \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+\nu(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in \bigcup_{c=3+\epsilon}^{p-1} [c + 3 + c(p - 1), p + 2 + c(p - 1)] \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+p} \right) & \text{if } k = 4p + 2 \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right) & \text{if } \{5 + c(p - 1) \mid 4 \leq c \leq p - 1\} \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(\nu+1)(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in \{4 + c(p - 1) \mid 4 \leq c \leq p - 1\}. \end{cases}$$

(2) If  $\nu = 3$ , then

$$\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \cong \begin{cases} \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+\nu(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in \bigcup_{c=4+\epsilon}^{p-1} [c+4+c(p-1), p+2+c(p-1)] \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(b-c+1)(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in \{5p+2, 5p+3\} \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right) & \text{if } k \in \{6+c(p-1) \mid 5 \leq c \leq p-1\} \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(\nu+1)(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in \bigcup_{c=5}^{p-1} [4+c(p-1), 5+c(p-1)]. \end{cases}$$

(3) If  $4 \leq \nu \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$ , then

$$\bar{V}_{k,a_p} \cong \begin{cases} \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+\nu(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in \bigcup_{c=\nu+1+\epsilon}^{p+1-\nu} [c+\nu+1+c(p-1), p+2+c(p-1)] \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(b-c+1)(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in [2+(\nu+2)p, \nu+(\nu+2)p] \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right) & \text{if } k \in \{\nu+3+c(p-1) \mid \nu+2 \leq c \leq p-1\} \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(\nu+1)(p-1)} \right) & \text{if } k \in I, \end{cases}$$

$$\text{where } I = \bigcup_{c=\nu+2}^{p-\nu+2} [4+c(p-1), \nu+2+c(p-1)] \bigcup_{c=p-\nu+3}^{p-1} [c+\nu+1-p+c(p-1), \nu+2+c(p-1)].$$

For a given range of slope, the gaps in the intervals for the weight  $k$  in the above corollary are precisely the weights not covered in Theorems 1.1 & 1.2. Corollary 1.3 can be extended to slope  $\nu \leq p-3$  with  $k$  as given in Corollary 7.4. We have taken the prime  $p \geq 13$  in order to give a more uniform and simplified statement.

We discuss the overlap of our theorems above with known results computing  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ . Firstly, Theorems 1.1 & 1.2 have no overlap with the  $(k, a_p)$  covered in [14], [8] & [4]. Theorem 1.1 has a significant number of cases when the slope is in  $(1, 2)$ , and the  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$  from Theorem 1.1 above match with those from Theorem 1.1 in [11]. Theorem 1.2 has an overlap with Theorem 1.1 in [11] when  $b = 2$  (since  $\nu(a_p) \in (1, 2)$ ), and the reductions match in this case. Theorem 1.2 also overlaps with Corollary 1.12 in [26], precisely when  $b \in [2, c-2]$  and  $\nu(a_p) \in (b-1, b) \cup (b, b+1)$  or when  $b = c-1$  and  $\nu(a_p) = (b-1, b)$ . The reductions from Theorem 1.2 match with the ones coming from [26].

We next discuss results that apply local methods to compute  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$ . Breuil in [14] computes  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$  for weights up to  $2p+1$  and for all  $a_p$  (see Theorem 3.2.1 in [5]). Berger-Li-Zhu in [8] and Bergdall-Levin in [4] treat this problem for sufficiently large slopes  $\nu(a_p) > \lfloor \frac{k-2}{p-1} \rfloor$  and  $\nu(a_p) > \lfloor \frac{k-1}{p} \rfloor$  respectively. Buzzard-Gee in [15] and [16] determine  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$  for slope in  $(0, 1)$  and for all weights. For slope in  $(1, 2)$ , Ganguli-Ghate in [21] compute  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$  up to weights  $p^2-p$ , and Bhattacharya-Ghate in [11] give the reduction for all weights and slope in  $(1, 2)$  with an additional assumption at  $\nu(a_p) = \frac{3}{2}$ . Bhattacharya-Ghate-Rozensztajn in [12] treat the case  $\nu(a_p) = 1$  for all weights. We refer to the work of Ghate-Rai in [25] which treats the case of slope  $\nu(a_p) = \frac{3}{2}$ . Furthermore, Rozensztajn in [29] gives an algorithm to compute  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$  which is efficient for small slopes and weights. We also refer to the recent work of Arsovski [1] in connection to the slope conjecture of Breuil, Buzzard and Emerton. The zig-zag conjecture of Ghate in [23] (see also Conjecture 1.1 in [24]) gives an explicit

description of  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p}$  for all half-integral slopes  $1/2 \leq \nu(a_p) \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$  and  $k' \geq k$  (and  $k'$  sufficiently close to  $k$   $p$ -adically), where  $3 \leq k \leq p+1$  is such that  $k = 2\nu(a_p) + 2$ . This conjecture provides important counterexamples to local constancy in the weight space for certain  $a_p$  and  $k$  (see Theorem 2.2 in [23]). We remark that in fact  $k > 2\nu(a_p) + 2$  in our theorems above. We refer to the work of Chitrao-Ghate-Yasuda in [17] which explains to a large extent the reason behind these important counterexamples to local constancy.

For results with alternate approaches using global methods which assume the modularity of the Galois representations, we refer to the work of Deligne, Deligne-Serre and Fontaine-Edixhoven (see [Edi92] and also Theorem 1.2, [15]) for modular forms, and the work of Ganguli [20] and Bhattacharya-Ganguli [10] for certain Hilbert modular forms of small slope.

**1.1. Outline of the proof.** Breuil has constructed a locally algebraic representation  $\Pi_{k',a_p}$  of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  and a  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ -stable lattice  $\Theta_{k',a_p}$  in  $\Pi_{k',a_p}$  such that  $\Theta_{k',a_p}^{ss} \cong LL(\bar{V}_{k',a_p})$ , where  $LL$  is the mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence (see §2.1 for more details). Let  $r = k' - 2 \geq 0$  be a non-negative integer. Using the definition of  $\Theta_{k',a_p}$ , we get a canonical surjection  $P : \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_r) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}$  (see §2.3 for more details). For  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ , we denote  $V_r^{(m)} := \{f \in V_r \mid \theta^m \text{ divides } f \text{ in } \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p[x, y]\}$ , where  $\theta := x^p y - xy^p$ . From Remark 4.4 of Buzzard-Gee in [15], we deduce that

$$P : \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}$$

as  $\nu(a_p) < \nu + 1$ , where  $\nu = \lfloor \nu(a_p) \rfloor$ . We consider the following filtration

$$0 \subseteq \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(\nu)}}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}} \right) \subseteq \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(\nu-1)}}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}} \right) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}} \right).$$

For  $0 \leq m \leq \nu$ , observe that  $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(m)}}{V_r^{(m+1)}} \right)$  are the successive quotients in the above filtration. By Lemma 2.4 the successive quotients  $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(m)}}{V_r^{(m+1)}} \right)$  are generated by  $[g, F_m(x, y)]$ , where  $F_m(x, y) = x^{r-m}y^m - x^{r-(s-m)}y^{s-m}$  and  $s = k - 2$ . By a contributing factor, we mean the successive quotient  $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n)}}{V_r^{(n+1)}} \right)$  such that  $P : \mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n)}}{V_r^{(n+1)}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}$  (we prove that there is always only one contributing factor for Theorem 1.1 and 1.2).

To determine  $\bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}^{ss}$  when  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p}$  is irreducible, it is enough to determine the contributing factor (see Lemma 2.5). At first, Proposition 6.1 shows that the map  $P$  surjects via  $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n_1+1)}}{V_r^{(n_2)}} \right)$ , where  $n_1$  &  $n_2$  are as given in the proposition. Next in Theorem 6.3, we prove that  $\mathrm{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n_0)}}{V_r^{(n_0+1)}} \right)$  is the contributing factor, where  $n_0$  is defined in the same theorem. The hypotheses of Theorem 6.3 is such that  $n_1 = n_0 - 1$  and  $n_2 = n_0 + 1$ , thus giving that contributing factor comes from  $n_0$ . In particular, the condition  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$  in Theorem 1.1 arises naturally to give us that  $n_0 = \nu$ .

We next apply Lemma 2.5 together with Theorem 6.3 to get the reduction  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p}$  (in a puncture disk centered at  $k$ ) in Proposition 7.1. Finally we apply Theorem 2.3 in Theorem 7.2 to determine  $\bar{V}_{k,a_p}$  at the center, thereby giving us local constancy in the whole disk.

We now explain our strategy to prove Proposition 6.1. We do this by showing that  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(m)}}{V_r^{(m+1)}} \right)$  do not contribute to  $\bar{\Theta}_{k', a_p}$  for all  $m \in [0, n_1] \cup [n_2, \nu]$ . We apply Lemma 2.1 & 2.2 to the intervals  $[0, n_1]$  &  $[n_2, \nu]$  respectively, whenever they are non-empty. To apply Lemma 2.2, we are required to show that  $F_m(x, y) \in \text{Ker}(P)$  for all  $m \in [n_2, \nu]$ . To obtain this, it suffices to prove that  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $m \in [n_2, \nu]$ . This can be seen by reverse induction on  $m$  after observing that  $F_\nu(x, y) \in \text{Ker}(P)$  because  $F_\nu(x, y) \in (V_r^{(\nu+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  and  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_r^{(\nu+1)}) \subset \text{Ker}(P)$ .

Next to apply Lemma 2.1, we are required to construct  $W_m$  for all  $m \in [0, n_1]$  of this lemma. In fact, for  $m \geq 1$  it suffices to show  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  (for  $m = 0$  we construct  $W_0$  separately). This can be seen by observing that  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  implies that there exists  $v_{m+1} \in V_r^{(m+1)}$  such that  $F_m(x, y) - v_{m+1} \in \text{Ker}(P)$ . Let  $W_m$  be the submodule of  $V_r^{(m)}$  generated by  $F_m(x, y) - v_{m+1}$ . By using Lemma 2.4, and given that  $F_m(x, y) - v_{m+1} \in \text{Ker}(P)$ , we observe that  $W_m$  satisfies the required conditions of Lemma 2.1.

From the above discussion, we deduce that it is enough to prove  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $m \in [1, n_1] \cup [n_2, \nu]$ . Next, we explain the steps to prove  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $m \in [1, n_1] \cup [n_2, \nu]$ . By using Remark 4.4 in [15], observe that for each  $m \leq \nu$   $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  if and only if  $q(c) = x^{r-s+m}y^{s-m} \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  (as  $\nu < \nu(a_p)$ ; see §2.6 for the definition of  $q(i)$  in general).

Applying Proposition 4.3, we deduce that there exists  $a_{j,l} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$  such that  $\sum_j a_{j,l} q(j) \in \text{Ker}(P)$ , where  $0 \leq j \leq c-1$  &  $b-m+j(p-1) > 0$ . Further in Lemma 4.1, we prove that for all  $\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1$ ,  $q(j)$  are integral linear combinations of  $q(j)$  for  $c-m \leq j \leq c$ . Using this we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \frac{\alpha(i,l)}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}} q(c-m-1+i) \in \text{Ker}(P),$$

where  $\alpha(i,l)$  are as given in (3.2) and  $\sigma_1(l)$  in (3.5). This is done in Proposition 4.4. We note from the definition of  $\sigma_1(l)$  and  $\alpha(i,l)$  that  $\alpha(i,l)/p^{\sigma_1(l)}$  is integral for all  $i,l$ . Therefore, in order to prove that  $q(c) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $m \in [1, n_1] \cup [n_2, \nu]$ , we need to show that for each  $m$  there exists some  $l$  such that the following holds:

- (1) The sum  $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \frac{\alpha(i,l)}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}} q(c-m-1+i)$  vanishes modulo  $(V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$ .
- (2) The coefficient  $\frac{\alpha(m+1,l)}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}}$  of  $q(c)$  (i.e., the last term  $i = m+1$ ) in the above summation is non-zero mod  $p$ .

To prove the statement (1) above, we first check if  $\frac{\alpha(i,l)}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}}$  vanish modulo  $p$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , but we get a negative answer to this in general. Therefore, we ask whether the monomials  $q(c-m-1+i) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . To answer this question, we consider the matrix  $A = (\alpha(i,l))_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m+1 \\ 0 \leq l \leq m}}$  and check whether the linear systems  $AX = e_i \pmod{p}$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . We note that  $\alpha(i,l)$  has a complicated formula, and so proving that the linear system of equations  $AX = e_i \pmod{p}$  has a solution in general turns out to be quite hard. However, we make the conjecture that the above linear system of equations has a solution (see Conjecture 5.1).

We apply Proposition 4.4 to translate Conjecture 5.1 into Conjecture 5.2 which claims that the monomials  $q(c - m - 1 + i) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

Next, we consider the expression  $\frac{\alpha(m+1,l)}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}}$  occurring in the statement (2) above. One can indeed check that  $\frac{\alpha(m+1,l)}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}} = d_l$ , where  $d_l$  is as defined in (3.6). Crucially in Lemma 3.3, we prove that for each  $m$  given in the lemma, there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l$  is non-zero modulo  $p$ . We use this in Proposition 4.5 to recover the statement (2) above. Lemma 3.3 is not covering all the values of  $m$  in  $[1, \nu]$ . This is because for the remaining values of  $m$ , the coefficients  $d_l$  are zero modulo  $p$  for all  $l$ . This results in the gap between  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  as seen in the various subcases of Proposition 6.1, wherein  $n_2 > n_1 + 1$  in general. In our approach, the vanishing of  $d_l$  is the key reason for the restrictions appearing on  $b, c$  and  $\nu$  in Theorems 6.3 & 7.2, the other reason being to force  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  to be consecutive. The condition that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral appears first in Proposition 4.5, and is required so that one is able to apply Proposition 4.3 and Lemma 3.3.

We note importantly that Proposition 4.5 requires Conjecture 5.2 as a hypothesis, and thus Conjecture 5.2 is also needed crucially for Proposition 6.1. We also remark that Lemma 5.4 proves Conjecture 5.1 in the cases required to make Theorem 1.1 (i.e., Theorem 7.2 (1)) unconditional on Conjecture 5.2 (see Remark 7.3 for more details).

Finally, we discuss the evidence for Conjecture 5.1. In Theorem 8.1, we prove a substantial portion of Conjecture 5.1. In doing so the binomial identities in Lemmas 3.5 & 3.7 play an important role by simplifying the expression  $\alpha(i, l)$ . In the cases proved in Theorem 8.1, the matrix  $A$  turns out to be non-invertible. In the remaining cases not covered by Theorem 8.1, we verify the conjecture using SageMath code for all values of  $b, c, m$  and primes up to 97. Further, the SageMath computations reveal that the matrix  $A$  in the remaining cases are all invertible.

## 2. BACKGROUND

**2.1. The mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence.** We begin by recalling some notations and definitions. We fix an algebraic closure  $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  with the ring of integers  $\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p$  and the residue field  $\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$ . Let  $G_p$  and  $G_{p^2}$  be the absolute Galois groups of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  and  $\mathbb{Q}_{p^2}$  respectively where  $\mathbb{Q}_{p^2}$  is the unique unramified quadratic extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ . Let  $\omega_1 = \omega$  be the mod  $p$  cyclotomic character, and  $\omega_2$  be a fixed fundamental character of level 2. We view  $\omega_1$  as a character of  $\mathbb{Q}_p^*$  via local class field theory, identifying uniformizers with geometric Frobenii. For  $a \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$  such that  $(p+1) \nmid a$  let  $\text{ind}(\omega_2^a)$  denote the unique two dimensional irreducible representation of  $G_p$  with determinant  $\omega^a$  and whose restriction to inertia is isomorphic to  $\omega_2^a \oplus \omega_2^{ap}$ .

We denote the group  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$  by  $G$ , its maximal compact subgroup  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  by  $K$  and the center of  $G$  by  $Z \cong \mathbb{Q}_p^*$ . For  $r \geq 0$  let  $V_r := \text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^2)$  be the symmetric power representation of  $\text{GL}_2(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)$  of dimension  $r+1$ . We can also view  $V_r$  as representations of  $KZ$  by defining the action of  $K$  through the natural surjection  $K \twoheadrightarrow \text{GL}_2(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ , and by letting  $p$  act trivially. For  $0 \leq r \leq p-1$ ,  $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p$  and

a smooth character  $\eta : \mathbb{Q}_p^* \rightarrow \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^*$ , the representation

$$\pi(r, \lambda, \eta) := \frac{\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_r)}{T - \lambda} \otimes (\eta \circ \det)$$

is a smooth admissible representation of  $G$  where  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G$  denotes compact induction (see [13], [15]). The operator  $T$  (see §2.2) is the Hecke operator  $T_p$  generating the Hecke algebra  $\text{End}_G(\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_r)) = \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p[T_p]$ . The irreducible subquotients of these representations give all the irreducible smooth admissible representations of  $G$  ([2],[3],[13]). For  $\lambda \in \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^*$ , let  $\mu_\lambda$  be the unramified character of  $G_p$  that sends the geometric Frobenius to  $\lambda$ . Then Breuil's semisimple mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence  $LL$  (see [14]) is as follows:

- $\lambda = 0$  :  $\text{ind}(\omega_2^{r+1}) \otimes \eta \xleftrightarrow{LL} \pi(r, 0, \eta)$
- $\lambda \neq 0$  :  $(\mu_\lambda \omega^{r+1} \oplus \mu_{\lambda^{-1}}) \otimes \eta \xleftrightarrow{LL} \pi(r, \lambda, \eta)^{ss} \oplus \pi([p-3-r], \lambda^{-1}, \omega^{r+1}\eta)^{ss}$   
where  $\{0, 1, \dots, p-2\} \ni [p-3-r] \equiv p-3-r \pmod{p-1}$ .

For integers  $k \geq 2$  we define  $\Pi_{k, a_p} := \frac{\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2))}{T - a_p}$  as representations of  $G$  where  $r = k - 2$  and  $T$  is the Hecke operator from §2.2. We consider the  $G$ -stable lattice  $\Theta_{k, a_p}$  in the representation  $\Pi_{k, a_p}$  (see [14], [7]) given by

$$\Theta_{k, a_p} := \text{image} \left( \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2)) \rightarrow \Pi_{k, a_p} \right) \cong \frac{\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2))}{(T - a_p) \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2)) \cap \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2))}.$$

By the compatibility of the  $p$ -adic and mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondences ([14],[5], [7]) we have

$$\bar{\Theta}_{k, a_p}^{ss} \cong LL(\bar{V}_{k, a_p}) \quad \text{where} \quad \bar{\Theta}_{k, a_p} := \Theta_{k, a_p} \otimes \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p.$$

Since the mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence is injective, to determine  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  it is enough to compute  $\bar{\Theta}_{k, a_p}^{ss}$ .

**2.2. Hecke Operator  $T$ .** We give an explicit definition of the Hecke operator  $T = T_p$  below (see [14] for more details). For  $m = 0$ , set  $I_0 = \{0\}$  and for  $m > 0$ , let  $I_m = \{[\lambda_0] + p[\lambda_1] + \dots + p^m[\lambda_{m-1}] \mid \lambda_i \in \mathbb{F}_p\} \subset \mathbb{Z}_p$  where square brackets denote Teichmüller representatives. For  $m \geq 1$  there is a truncation map  $[\ ]_{m-1} : I_m \rightarrow I_{m-1}$  given by taking the first  $m-1$  terms in the  $p$ -adic expansion above. For  $m = 1$ ,  $[\ ]_{m-1}$  is the zero map. For  $m \geq 0$  and  $\lambda \in I_m$ , let

$$g_{m, \lambda}^0 = \begin{pmatrix} p^m & \lambda \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad g_{m, \lambda}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ p\lambda & p^{m+1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we have

$$G = \coprod_{\substack{m \geq 0, \lambda \in I_m \\ i \in \{0, 1\}}} KZ(g_{m, \lambda}^i)^{-1}.$$

Let  $R$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ -algebra and  $V = \text{Sym}^r R^2$  be the symmetric power representation of  $KZ$ , modelled on homogeneous polynomials of degree  $r$  in the variables  $x$  and  $y$  over  $R$ . For  $g \in G$ ,  $v \in V$ , let



$[g, v]$  be the function defined by:  $[g, v](g') = g'g \cdot v$  for all  $g' \in KZg^{-1}$  and zero otherwise. Since an element of  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V)$  is a  $V$ -valued function on  $G$  that has compact support modulo  $KZ$ , one can see that every element of  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V)$  can be written as a finite sum of  $[g, v]$  with  $g = g_{m\lambda}^0$  or  $g = g_{m,\lambda}^1$ , for some  $\lambda \in I_m$  and  $v \in V$ . Then the action of  $T$  on  $[g, v]$  can be given explicitly when  $g = g_{n,\mu}^0$  with  $n \geq 0$  and  $\mu \in I$ . Let  $v = \sum_{j=0}^r c_j x^{r-j} y^j$ , with  $c_j \in R$ . We write  $T = T^+ + T^-$  where

$$\begin{aligned} T^+([g_{n,\mu}^0, v]) &= \sum_{\lambda \in I_1} \left[ g_{n+1, \mu+p^n \lambda}^0, \sum_{j=0}^r p^j \left( \sum_{i=j}^r c_i \binom{i}{j} (-\lambda)^{i-j} \right) x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ T^-([g_{n,\mu}^0, v]) &= \left[ g_{n-1, [\mu]_{n-1}}^0, \sum_{j=0}^r \left( \sum_{i=j}^r p^{r-i} c_i \binom{i}{j} \left( \frac{\mu - [\mu]_{n-1}}{p^{n-1}} \right)^{i-j} \right) x^{r-j} y^j \right] \quad \text{for } n > 0 \\ T^-([g_{n,\mu}^0, v]) &= \left[ \alpha, \sum_{j=0}^r p^{r-j} c_j x^{r-j} y^j \right] \quad \text{for } n = 0, \text{ where } \alpha := g_{0,0}^1. \end{aligned}$$

**2.3. The filtration.** Let  $k' = k + p^t(p-1)d$  satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 1.1 & 1.2. Since  $t \geq [2\nu(a_p)] + \epsilon$ , we have  $r = k' - 2 \geq (\nu+1)(p+1)$ , where  $\nu = [\nu(a_p)]$ . From the definition of  $V_r$  and  $\bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}$  it follows that there is a natural surjection

$$P : \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_r) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}.$$

Now, let us consider the Dickson polynomial  $\theta := x^p y - xy^p \in V_{p+1}$ . Here we note that  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$  acts on  $\theta$  by the determinant character. For  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let us denote

$$V_r^{(m)} = \{f \in V_r \mid \theta^m \text{ divides } f \text{ in } \bar{\mathbb{F}}_p[x, y]\}$$

which is a subrepresentation of  $V_r$ . By using Remark 4.4 of [15], one can see that the map  $P$  factors through  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G\left(\frac{V_r}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}}\right)$ , where  $\nu := [\nu(a_p)]$ . So let us consider the following chain of submodules

$$0 \subseteq \text{ind}_{KZ}^G\left(\frac{V_r^{(\nu)}}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}}\right) \subseteq \text{ind}_{KZ}^G\left(\frac{V_r^{(\nu-1)}}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}}\right) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \text{ind}_{KZ}^G\left(\frac{V_r}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}}\right). \quad (2.1)$$

For  $0 \leq m \leq \nu$ , observe that  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G\left(\frac{V_r^{(m)}}{V_r^{(m+1)}}\right)$  are the successive quotients in the above filtration. In the following two lemmas we make precise the notion of a successive quotient not contributing to  $\bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}$  via the map  $P$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $1 \leq n \leq \nu$  and assume for all  $0 \leq m \leq n-1$  that there exists  $W_m \subset V_r^{(m)}$  such that  $P\left(\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(W_m)\right) = 0$  and  $W_m \twoheadrightarrow \frac{V_r^{(m)}}{V_r^{(m+1)}}$  induced by the inclusion  $W_m \subset V_r^{(m)}$ . Then the map  $P$  restricted to  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G\left(\frac{V_r^{(n)}}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}}\right)$  is a surjection.*

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $1 \leq n \leq \nu$  and suppose for all  $n \leq m \leq \nu$  that there exists  $G_m(x, y) \in V_r$  such that  $P([g, G_m(x, y)]) = 0$ . If  $G_m(x, y)$  generates  $\frac{V_r^{(m)}}{V_r^{(m+1)}}$  then the map  $P$  factors through  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G\left(\frac{V_r}{V_r^{(n)}}\right)$ .*

**2.4. JH factors of  $V_r^{(n)}/V_r^{(n+1)}$ .** In this subsection, we assume simply that  $r, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $r \geq (n+2)(p+1) - 3$  so that we can apply Theorems (4.1) and (4.2) of [27] below. Next, we determine the Jordan-Holder factors of the successive quotients  $\frac{V_r^{(n)}}{V_r^{(n+1)}}$ . Let  $D$  denote the determinant character of  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . Let us write  $r - n(p+1) = r' + d'(p-1)$  such that  $p \leq r' \leq 2p-2$  and for some  $d' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . By Theorems (4.1) and (4.2) of [27] together with Lemma 5.1.3 of [14] gives:

(i) if  $r' = p$  then

$$0 \longrightarrow V_1 \otimes D^n \longrightarrow \frac{V_r^{(n)}}{V_r^{(n+1)}} \longrightarrow V_{p-2} \otimes D^{n+1} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (2.2)$$

The first map sends  $(x, y)$  to  $(\theta^n x^{r-n(p+1)}, \theta^n y^{r-n(p+1)})$  and the second map sends  $\theta^n x^{r-n(p+1)-1} y$  to  $x^{p-2}$ .

(ii) if  $r' \neq p$  then

$$0 \longrightarrow V_{r'-(p-1)} \otimes D^n \longrightarrow \frac{V_r^{(n)}}{V_r^{(n+1)}} \longrightarrow V_{2(p-1)-r'} \otimes D^{n+r'-(p-1)} \longrightarrow 0. \quad (2.3)$$

The first map sends  $(x^{r'-(p-1)}, y^{r'-(p-1)})$  to  $(\theta^n x^{r-n(p+1)}, \theta^n y^{r-n(p+1)})$  because  $\binom{r'}{p-1} \equiv 0 \pmod p$  as  $1 \leq r' - p \leq p - 2$ . For  $r' - (p-1) \leq i \leq p-1$ , the second map sends  $\theta^n x^{r-n(p+1)-i} y^i$  to  $\alpha_i x^{p-1-i} y^{p-1-r'+i}$  where  $\alpha_i := (-1)^{r'-i} \binom{2(p-1)-r'}{p-1-r'+i} \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$  because  $0 \leq 2(p-1) - r' \leq p-3$  and  $0 \leq p-1-r'+i \leq 2(p-1)-r'$ .

**2.5. Some crucial results.** In this section, we state Berger's local constancy theorem and some crucial lemmas required later.

**Theorem 2.3.** [Berger [6]] *Suppose  $a_p \neq 0$  with  $\nu(a_p) > 0$  and  $k > {}^13\nu(a_p) + \frac{(k-1)p}{(p-1)^2} + 1$ , then there exists  $m = m(k, a_p)$  such that  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \bar{V}_{k, a_p}$ , if  $k' - k \in p^{m-1}(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .*

For integers  $0 \leq m \leq s$  let us define polynomials  $F_m$  in  $V_r$  as follows

$$F_m(x, y) := x^m y^{r-m} - x^{r-s+m} y^{s-m}$$

where  $r > s$  and  $r \equiv s \pmod{p-1}$ .

**Lemma 2.4** (Bhattacharya, Lemma 3.2, [9]). *Let  $r \equiv s \pmod{p-1}$ , and  $t = \nu(r-s) \geq 1$  and  $1 \leq m \leq p-1$ .*

- (1) *For  $s \geq 2m$ , the polynomial  $F_m$  is divisible by  $\theta^m$  but not by  $\theta^{m+1}$ .*
- (2) *For  $s > 2m$ , the image of  $F_m$  generates the subquotient  $\frac{V_r^{(m)}}{V_r^{(m+1)}}$  as a  $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_p)$ -module.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Theorem B in [6] is actually stronger, wherein the lower bound on  $k$  is  $3\nu(a_p) + \alpha(k-1) + 1$ . Here  $\alpha(k-1) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \lfloor (k-1)/(p^{n-1}(p-1)) \rfloor$ . We note that although  $\frac{(k-1)p}{(p-1)^2} \geq \alpha(k-1)$ , it is easier to use this bigger bound for calculations.

**Lemma 2.5** (Lemma 6.1, [22]). *Let  $p \geq 5$  and  $r, n$  be integers such that  $0 \leq n \leq p - 1$  and  $r \geq (n + 2)(p + 1) - 3$ . Let  $b \equiv r \pmod{p - 1}$  such that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ . Suppose the map*

$$P : \text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n)}}{V_r^{(n+1)}} \right) \rightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{r+2, a_p} \quad (2.4)$$

*is a surjection. Further if  $(b, n) \notin \{(p-2, 0), (p, 0), (p, 1)\}$  and also  $b \notin \{2n \pm 1, 2(n+1) - p, 2n - p\}$  then*

$$\bar{V}_{r+2, a_p} \cong \begin{cases} \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+n(p-1)+1} \right) & \text{if } 2n + 1 \leq b \leq p \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+(n+1)(p-1)+1} \right) & \text{if } 2n + 1 - (p - 1) \leq b \leq 2n \\ \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+(n+2)(p-1)+1} \right) & \text{if } 2(n + 1) - 2(p - 1) \leq b \leq 2n - (p - 1). \end{cases}$$

**2.6. Notations and Conventions.** We fix the following conventions in the rest of this article unless stated otherwise:

- (1) The integer  $p$  always denotes a prime number greater than or equal to 5. The integers  $b$  and  $c$  are from  $\{2, 3, \dots, p\}$  and  $\{0, 1, \dots, p - 2\}$  respectively.
- (2) We define  $\epsilon$  as follows

$$\epsilon = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 2c - 1 \leq b \leq p \\ 1 & \text{if } 2(c - 1) - p \leq b \leq 2(c - 1) \\ 2 & \text{if } 2 \leq b \leq 2(c - 1) - (p + 1). \end{cases} \quad (2.5)$$

- (3) We define  $\epsilon_1$  as follows

$$\epsilon_1 = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 2m + 1 \leq b \leq p \\ 1 & \text{if } 2m + 1 - (p - 1) \leq b \leq 2m \\ 2 & \text{if } 2 \leq b \leq 2m - (p - 1). \end{cases} \quad (2.6)$$

- (4) We write  $s = b + c(p - 1)$  and  $r = s + p^t(p - 1)d$  with  $p \nmid d$ , and  $t, d \in \mathbb{N}$  and so  $s < r$ .
- (5) For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define  $\binom{n}{k} = 0$  if  $k > n$  or  $k < 0$  and the usual binomial coefficient otherwise.
- (6) For  $A \equiv B$ , where  $A, B \in M_n(\mathbb{Z}_p)$  we mean that  $A \equiv B \pmod{p}$ .
- (7) Unless stated otherwise, for  $A, B \in \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2))$ , by  $A \equiv B$  or  $A \equiv B \pmod{p}$  we mean that  $A - B$  is in  $\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p} \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Z}}_p^2))$ .
- (8) By the vectors  $\{e_j\}$  we mean the standard basis of a free module over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .
- (9) For  $v \in \text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{F}}_p^2)$ , by  $v \in \text{Ker}(P)$  or  $v \in V_r^{m+1} + \text{Ker}(P)$  we mean that  $[1, v] \in \text{Ker}(P)$  or  $[1, v] \in \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_r^{m+1}) + \text{Ker}(P)$  respectively.
- (10) We define  $q(i) = x^{r-b+m-i(p-1)}y^{b-m+i(p-1)}$  for all  $n_0 \leq i \leq c$  &  $1 \leq m \leq p - 1$ , where  $n_0 = 0$  if  $b \geq m$  and 1 otherwise.

## 3. BINOMIAL IDENTITIES

In this section, we prove some technical lemmas, which we use later.

**Lemma 3.1.** For  $0 \neq a, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$ , let

$$\beta(a, i) := \begin{cases} \binom{m+1}{i} & \text{if } a = 1 \\ \sum_{1 \leq l \leq a-1} (-1)^{l+1} \binom{m+1}{l} \beta(a-l, i) + (-1)^{a-1} \binom{m+1}{i+a-1} & \text{if } a \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

then  $\beta(a, i) = \binom{i+a-2}{a-1} \binom{m+a}{i+a-1}$ .

*Proof.* We prove the above result by induction on  $a$ . Observe that it is trivially true for  $a = 1$  and for all  $i$ . By induction, assume the above result is true for all  $1 \leq a \leq k-1$  and we prove it for  $a = k \geq 2$ . Therefore, we need to prove

$$\binom{i+k-2}{k-1} \binom{m+k}{i+k-1} = \sum_{1 \leq l \leq k-1} (-1)^{l+1} \binom{m+1}{l} \beta(k-l, i) + (-1)^{k-1} \binom{m+1}{i+k-1}.$$

Using induction, we get

$$\sum_{0 \leq l \leq k-1} (-1)^l \binom{m+1}{l} \binom{i+k-l-2}{i-1} \binom{m+k-l}{m+1-i} = (-1)^{k-1} \binom{m+1}{i+k-1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Hence, we need to prove the above equation to prove our lemma. Now,

$$(x-1)^{m+1} = \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m+1} (-1)^l \binom{m+1}{l} x^{m+1-l}.$$

Multiply the above equation by  $x^{k-1}$  ( $k \geq 2$ ), we get

$$(x-1)^{m+1} x^{k-1} = \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m+1} (-1)^l \binom{m+1}{l} x^{m+k-l}.$$

By differentiating the above equation with respect to  $x$ ,  $(m+1-i)$  times and multiplying by  $\frac{x^{-1}}{(m+1-i)!}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m+1-i} \binom{m+1}{m+1-i-j} \binom{k-1}{j} (x-1)^{i+j} x^{k-2-j} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m+1} (-1)^l \binom{m+1}{l} \binom{m+k-l}{m+1-i} x^{i+k-l-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the first sum,  $j$  can be taken over the range  $0 \leq j \leq n_1$  where  $n_1 := \min\{m+1-i, k-1\}$ . The last sum can be taken over the range  $0 \leq l \leq i+k-1$ , since  $\binom{m+k-l}{m+1-i} = 0$  if  $i+k-1 < l \leq m+1$

and  $\binom{m+1}{l} = 0$  if  $m+1 < l \leq i+k-1$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n_1} \binom{m+1}{m+1-i-j} \binom{k-1}{j} (x-1)^{i+j} x^{k-2-j} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq l \leq i+k-1} (-1)^l \binom{m+1}{l} \binom{m+k-l}{m+1-i} x^{i+k-l-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Again, by differentiating the above equation with respect to  $x$ ,  $(i-1)$  times and dividing by  $(i-1)!$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n_1} \binom{m+1}{i+j} \binom{k-1}{j} \left( \sum_{0 \leq j' \leq i-1} \binom{i+j}{i-1-j'} (x-1)^{j+j'+1} \frac{1}{j'!} d^{j'}(x^{k-2-j}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq l \leq i+k-2} (-1)^l \binom{m+1}{l} \binom{m+k-l}{m+1-i} \binom{i+k-l-2}{i-1} x^{k-l-1} + (-1)^k \binom{m+1}{i+k-1} x^{-i}. \end{aligned}$$

By putting  $x = 1$  in the above equation, we get

$$\sum_{0 \leq l \leq i+k-2} (-1)^l \binom{m+1}{l} \binom{m+k-l}{m+1-i} \binom{i+k-l-2}{i-1} + (-1)^k \binom{m+1}{i+k-1} = 0$$

as  $(x-1)^{j+j'+1} = 0$  at  $x = 1$  (since  $j, j' \geq 0$ ). Observe that the above summation can be taken over the range  $0 \leq l \leq k-1$  as  $\binom{i+k-l-2}{i-1} = 0$  if  $k-1 < l \leq i+k-2$ . Thus, we obtained the required equation (3.1).  $\square$

For  $0 \leq l \leq p-1$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$ , we define  $\alpha(i, l)$  as follows

$$\alpha(i, l) := \begin{cases} \alpha_1(i, l) + \binom{r-l}{b-m+(i+c-m-1)(p-1)} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq m \\ \alpha_1(i, l) & \text{if } i = m+1 \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\alpha_1(i, l) = (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{1 \leq a \leq c-m-\epsilon_1} \binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-a)(p-1)} \beta(a, i) \quad (3.3)$$

and  $\beta(a, i)$  is defined as in Lemma 3.1. For  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$ , we define  $\alpha'(i, l)$  as follows

$$\alpha'(i, l) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq b-c \\ (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{c_0 \leq a \leq c_1} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-c+a} \binom{c-1}{c-m-a} \beta(a, i) & \text{if } c_2 \leq l \leq p+b-c \\ (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{1 \leq a \leq c_1} \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+a} \binom{c-2}{c-m-1-a} \beta(a, i) & \text{if } p+c_2 \leq l \leq m \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

where  $c_0 = \max\{c-b, 1\}$ ,  $c_1 = c-m-\epsilon_1$ ,  $c_2 = b-c+1$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $r = s + p^t(p-1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p-1)$  and  $t \geq 2$ . Assume that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $0 \leq c \leq p-1$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq c-1$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$  and  $0 \leq l \leq m$ . Let*

$$X(i, l) = \binom{r-l}{b-m+(i+c-m-1)(p-1)}.$$

Then  $\alpha_1(i, l) \equiv \alpha'(i, l)$  and

$$X(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{b-c-l}{b-c+1-i} \binom{c}{c-m-1+i} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq b-c, 1 \leq i \leq b-c+1 \\ \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-1+i} & \text{if } b-c+1 \leq l \leq p+b-c, 1 \leq i \leq b-c+1 \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq b-c, b-c+2 \leq i \leq p+b-c+1 \\ \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } b-c+1 \leq l \leq p+b-c, b-c+2 \leq i \leq p+b-c+1 \\ \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-2}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq p-1, b-c+2 \leq i \leq p+b-c+1 \\ 0 & \text{if } b-c+1 \leq l \leq p+b-c, p+b-c+2 \leq i \leq p-1 \\ \binom{2p+b-c-l}{2p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-2}{c-m-3+i} & \text{if } p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq p-1, p+b-c+2 \leq i \leq p-1. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* First, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} r-l &= b-c-l+cp+p^t(p-1)d \\ b-m+(c-m-a)(p-1) &= b-c+a+(c-m-a)p \\ b-m+(c-m-1+i)(p-1) &= b-c+1-i+(c-m-1+i)p \end{aligned}$$

If  $0 \leq l \leq b-c$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$ , then by Lucas Theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(-1)^{i+1} \sum_{1 \leq a \leq c-m} \binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-a)(p-1)} \beta(a, i) \\ &\equiv (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{1 \leq a \leq c-m} \binom{b-c-l}{b-c+a} \binom{c}{c-m-a} \binom{i+a-2}{a-1} \binom{m+a}{i+a-1} \\ &\equiv 0 \pmod{p}. \end{aligned}$$

The last congruence follows since  $\binom{b-c-l}{b-c+a} = 0$  as  $b-c-l < b-c+a$ . Thus, we obtain the result in this case by using the above calculation together with

$$\binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-a+i)(p-1)} \equiv \binom{b-c-l}{b-c+1-i} \binom{c}{c-m-1+i}.$$

By a similar computation, one obtains results in all other cases also.  $\square$

Let  $S = \{j \mid 0 \leq j \leq c-1 \text{ \& } b-m+j(p-1) > 0\}$ . For  $0 \leq l \leq p-1$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} y(j, l) &= \binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)} \quad \forall j \in S \\ \& \sigma_1(l) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y(j, l) \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \quad \forall j \in S \\ 0 & \text{if } y(j, l) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \text{ for at least one } j \in S. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

For any  $1 \leq \nu \leq p-1$  and  $0 \leq l \leq \nu - \sigma_1(l)$ , we define  $d_l$  as follows

$$d_l := \frac{(-1)^m}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}} \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{c-1-j}{m} \binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)}. \quad (3.6)$$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $s = b + c(p-1)$  with  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq c \leq p-1$  and  $r = s + p^t(p-1)d$ , with  $t \geq 2$ ,  $p \nmid d$ . Fix a  $\nu$  in  $[1, c-1-\epsilon]$ . Assume that  $1 \leq m \leq \nu$  and  $l \in [0, \nu - \sigma_1(l)]$ .*

- (1) *If  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$ , and  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{\nu-1, b-c\}$ , then for each  $m$  there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .*
- (2) *If  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$ , and  $b-\nu \leq m \leq \nu$ , then for each such  $m$  there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .*
- (3) *If  $2c-2-p \leq b \leq c-2$ , and  $1 \leq \nu \leq c-2$ , then for each  $m \in ([b-\nu, \nu] \cap [1, b-1]) \cup [b, \nu-1]$ , there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .*
- (4) *If  $2 \leq b \leq 2(c-1)-p-1$ , and  $1 \leq \nu \leq p+b-c$ , then for each  $m \in ([b-\nu, \nu] \cap [1, b-1]) \cup [b, \nu-1]$ , there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .*
- (5) *If  $2 \leq b \leq 2(c-1)-p-1$  and  $p+b-c+1 \leq \nu \leq c-3$ , then for each  $m \in [1, p+b-c] \cup [p+b-\nu-1, \nu]$ , there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .*

*Remark 3.4.* The range of  $l$  is  $[0, \nu - \sigma_1(l)]$  in Lemma 3.3 since it is applied in Proposition 4.5 wherein  $l$  is in  $[0, \nu]$  (or  $[0, \nu-1]$ ). Further, in almost all cases of above lemma, the  $l$  for which  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  is given in terms of  $m$ . As will be clear in the proof below, the range of  $m$  in the cases below is given primarily so that the desired  $l$  (such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ ) lies in  $[0, \nu - \sigma_1(l)]$ .

*Proof.* For each  $b, c, m$  as in the statement, in the following cases, we prove that there exists at least one  $l \in [0, \nu - \sigma_1(l)]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . For the above range of  $0 \leq l \leq \nu - \sigma_1(l)$  and  $\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1$ , we define

$$a_{j,l} = \frac{\binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)}}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}}.$$

**Case (1)**  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$  and  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{\nu-1, b-c\}$

Note that actually  $b \geq c$  in this case. We prove that there exists at least one  $l \in [m, \min\{\nu-1, b-c\}]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . By Lemma 3.4 in [22], we have

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)} &\equiv \binom{b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c}{j} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq b-c \text{ \& } 0 \leq j \leq c-1 \text{ (as } c \leq b-m) \\ &\equiv 0 \quad \text{if } m \leq l \leq b-c \text{ \& } 0 \leq j \leq c-1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\sigma_1(l) = 1$  for all  $m \leq l \leq \min\{\nu-1, b-c\}$ . Using Lemma 3.5 in [22], we get

$$\frac{\binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)}}{p} \equiv \frac{(-1)^{l-m} \binom{b-m}{j} \binom{p-1+m-l}{c-1-j}}{\binom{b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{b-m}{c}} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq c-1 \text{ \& } m \leq l \leq \min\{\nu-1, b-c\}.$$

Next, observe that  $\epsilon_1 = 0$  as  $b \geq m+c \geq 2m+1+\epsilon$ . Hence, for  $m \leq l \leq \min\{\nu-1, b-c\}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_l &\equiv (-1)^l \sum_{0 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \frac{\binom{b-m}{j} \binom{p-1+m-l}{c-1-j} \binom{c-1-j}{m}}{\binom{b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{b-m}{c}} \\ &\equiv \frac{(-1)^l \binom{p-1+l-m}{m}}{\binom{b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{b-m}{c}} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{b-m}{j} \binom{p-1-l}{c-m-1-j}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the last congruence follows as

$$\binom{p-1+m-l}{c-1-j} \binom{c-1-j}{m} = \binom{p-1+m-l}{m} \binom{p-1-l}{c-m-1-j}. \quad (3.7)$$

Using Vandermonde's identity, we get

$$d_l \equiv \frac{(-1)^l \binom{p-1+m-l}{m} \binom{p+b-(m+1+l)}{c-m-1}}{\binom{b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{b-m}{c}}.$$

By taking  $l = m$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_m &\equiv \frac{(-1)^m \binom{p-1}{m} \binom{p+b-(2m+1)}{c-m-1}}{\binom{b-m}{c}} \\ &\equiv \frac{(-1)^m \binom{p-1}{m} \binom{b-(2m+1)}{c-m-1}}{\binom{b-m}{c}} \quad (\text{as } b \geq 2m+1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we get  $d_m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  as  $b-2m-1-(c-m-1) = b-c-m \geq 0$  and  $b-2m+1 \leq p-1$ .

**Case (2)**  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$  and  $b-\nu \leq m \leq \nu$  (so  $\max\{1, b-c+1\} \leq m$ )

Observe that  $b \leq 2c-3$  as for  $b \geq 2c-2$  the range of  $m$  is empty. In this case, we claim that there exists at least one  $l \in [b-c+1, \nu] \subset [0, \nu]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  as  $\sigma_1(l) = 0$  for all  $l \in [b-c+1, \nu]$ .

We take  $j = b-m$  to show that  $\sigma_1(l) = 0$  (also using that  $b-c+1 \leq m \leq c-1-\epsilon$ ) in (3.5). Next, by Lemma 3.4 in [22] we have

$$a_{j,l} \equiv \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j} \quad \text{if } b-c+1 \leq l \leq \nu \leq p+b-c \text{ \& } \epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1.$$

Hence, we have

$$d_l \equiv (-1)^m \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j} \binom{c-1-j}{m}.$$

Since

$$\binom{c-1}{j} \binom{c-1-j}{m} = \binom{c-1}{m} \binom{c-m-1}{j} \quad (3.8)$$

so, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_l &\equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-m-1}{j} \\ &\equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq b-m} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-m-1}{j}. \end{aligned}$$

The last congruence follows as  $c-m-1 \leq b-m$  and  $\binom{c-m-1}{j} = 0$  for all  $c-m-1 < j \leq b-m$ .

Using Vandermonde's identity, we get

$$d_l \equiv \begin{cases} (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \binom{p+b-m-1-l}{b-m} & \text{if } b \geq 2m+1 \\ (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \left( \binom{p+b-m-1-l}{b-m} - \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m} \right) & \text{if } b \leq 2m. \end{cases}$$



If  $b \geq 2m + 1$ , then

$$d_l \equiv \begin{cases} (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \binom{b-m-1-l}{b-m} & \text{if } b-c+1 \leq l \leq b-m-1 \\ (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \binom{p-1}{b-m} & \text{if } l = b-m \end{cases}$$

$$\implies d_l \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } b-c+1 \leq l \leq b-m-1 \\ (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \binom{p-1}{b-m} & \text{if } l = b-m. \end{cases}$$

If  $b \leq 2m$  and  $0 \leq l = b - m - 1$ , then

$$d_l \equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \left( \binom{p}{b-m} - \binom{p-(c-m-1)}{b-m} \right)$$

$$\equiv (-1)^{m+1} \binom{c-1}{m} \binom{p-(c-m-1)}{b-m} \not\equiv 0.$$

From the above calculation, we get  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for  $l = b - m - 1$  if  $b \leq 2m$  and  $l = b - m$  if  $b \geq 2m + 1$ . When  $m \geq b - \nu$ , we note that  $l = b - m - 1$  and  $l = b - m$  lie in the required range  $[0, \nu]$ . Hence, for each  $m \in [b - \nu, \nu]$  there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .

**Case (3)**  $2c - 2 - p \leq b \leq c - 2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq c - 2$

Note that in this case  $\epsilon_1 \in \{0, 1\}$  as  $b \geq 2(c - 2) + 1 - (p - 1) \geq 2m + 1 - (p - 1)$  for all  $m \leq c - 2$ .

**Subcase (I)**  $m \in [b - \nu, \nu] \cap [1, b - 1]$

For  $1 \leq m \leq b - 1$ , we observe that  $\sigma_1(l) = 0$  for all  $l \in [0, \nu]$  (take  $j = b - m$  as before). By Lemma 3.4 in [22], for all  $0 \leq l \leq \nu$  ( $\leq p + b - c$ ) we have

$$a_{j,l} \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j} & \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq b-m \\ \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j-1} & \text{if } b-m+1 \leq j \leq c-m-1 \end{cases}$$

$$\equiv \begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j} & \text{if } 0 \leq j \leq b-m \\ 0 & \text{if } b-m+1 \leq j \leq c-m-1. \end{cases}$$

For each  $m \in [b - \nu, \nu] \cap [1, b - 1]$ , a similar calculation to Case (2) shows that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for  $l = b - m$  if  $b \geq 2m + 1$  and for  $l = b - m - 1$  if  $b \leq 2m$ .

**Subcase (II)**  $b \leq m \leq \nu - 1$

In this case, we observe that  $\sigma_1(l) = 1$  for all  $m \leq l \leq \nu - 1$  as  $\nu - 1 \leq p + b - c - 1$ . We claim that there exists at least one  $l \in [m, \nu - 1]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Note that  $\epsilon_1 = 1$  as  $b \leq 2m$ , so  $1 \leq j \leq c - m - 1$ . By Lemma 3.5 in [22], we have

$$a_{j,l} \equiv (-1)^{l-m} \frac{\binom{p+b-m-1}{j-1} \binom{p-1+m-l}{c-1-j}}{\binom{p+b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{p+b-m-1}{c-1}}.$$

Using (3.7), we have

$$d_l \equiv \frac{(-1)^l \binom{p-1+m-l}{m}}{\binom{p+b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{p+b-m-1}{c-1}} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{p+b-m-1}{j-1} \binom{p-1-l}{c-m-1-j}.$$

Replace  $j - 1$  by  $j$  in the above summation and by using Vandermonde's identity, we get

$$d_l \equiv \frac{(-1)^l \binom{p-1+m-l}{m} \binom{2p+b-m-2-l}{c-m-2}}{\binom{p+b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{p+b-m-1}{c-1}}.$$

Now, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{2p+b-2m-2}{c-m-2} &= \frac{\prod_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-3} (2p+b-2m-2-k)}{(c-m-2)!} \\ &\equiv \frac{(-1)^{c-m} \prod_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-3} (2m+2-b+k)}{(c-m-2)!} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

because  $0 < 2m+2-b+k \leq 2m+2-b+c-m-3 \leq c+m-b-1 \leq p-1$  (the last inequality follows as  $2c-2-p \leq b$  &  $m \leq c-2$ ). Hence, we get  $d_m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Thus, for each  $m \in [b, \nu-1]$  there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .

**Case (4)**  $2 \leq b \leq 2(c-1) - p - 1$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq p + b - c$

Note that  $\epsilon_1 \in \{0, 1\}$  as  $b \geq 2(p+b-c) + 1 - (p-1) \geq 2m+1 - (p-1)$ .

**Subcase (I)**  $m \in [b-\nu, \nu] \cap [1, b-1]$

Observe that  $\sigma_1(l) = 0$  for all  $l \in [0, \nu]$  (again taking  $j = b - m$ ). We claim that there exists at least one  $l \in [0, \nu]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . For each  $m \in [b-\nu, \nu] \cap [1, b-1]$ , using Lemma 3.4 in [22], we arrive at the same formula for  $d_l$  as in Case (2). Thus,  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for  $l = b - m$  if  $b \geq 2m + 1$  and for  $l = b - m - 1$  if  $b \leq 2m$ .

**Subcase (II)**  $b \leq m \leq \nu - 1$

We observe that  $\sigma_1(l) = 1$  for all  $m \leq l \leq \nu - 1$  as  $\nu - 1 \leq p + b - c - 1$ . For each  $m \in [b, \nu - 1]$ , using Lemma 3.4 in [22], we have the same formula for  $d_l$  as in Subcase (II) of Case (3), thus giving us that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for  $l = m$ .

**Case (5)**  $2 \leq b \leq 2(c-1) - p - 1$  and  $p + b - c + 1 \leq \nu \leq c - 3$

By Lemma 3.4 in [22], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)} \\ \equiv &\begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq p+b-c, 0 \leq j \leq b-m \\ \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j-1} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq p+b-c, b-m+1 \leq j \leq c-m-1 \\ \binom{2p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-2}{j} & \text{if } p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq \nu, 0 \leq j \leq b-m \\ \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-j} \binom{c-2}{j-1} & \text{if } p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq \nu, b-m+1 \leq j \leq c-m-1. \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

**Subcase (I)**  $1 \leq m \leq b - 1$

In this subcase, we observe that  $\sigma_1(l) = 0$  for all  $l \in [0, p + b - c]$  (take  $j = b - m$ ). We claim that there exists at least one  $l \in [0, p + b - c] \subset [0, \nu]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . From (3.9) note that  $a_{j,l} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  if  $b - m + 1 \leq j \leq c - m - 1$  and  $0 \leq l \leq p + b - c$ . Therefore, for  $l \leq p + b - c$  we

have using (3.8)

$$\begin{aligned} d_l &\equiv (-1)^m \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq b-m} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-1}{j} \binom{c-1-j}{m} \\ &\equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq b-m} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m-j} \binom{c-m-1}{j}. \end{aligned}$$

By using Vandermonde's identity we get

$$d_l \equiv \begin{cases} (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \binom{p+b-m-1-l}{b-m} & \text{if } b \geq 2m+1 \\ (-1)^m \binom{c-1}{m} \left( \binom{p+b-m-1-l}{b-m} - \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-m} \right) & \text{if } b \leq 2m. \end{cases}$$

Hence, if  $b \geq 2m+1$ , then for  $l = b-m \leq \nu$  (as  $\nu > p+b-c$ ) we have  $d_l \equiv \binom{p-1}{b-m} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . If  $b \leq 2m$  then for  $l = 0$  we have  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  as  $\binom{p+b-m-1}{b-m} \equiv \binom{b-m-1}{b-m} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and  $\binom{p+b-c}{b-m} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  (since  $b-c < 0$  and  $p+b-c \geq b-m$ ). Thus, in both cases there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .

**Subcase (II)**  $b \leq m \leq p+b-c$

In this case, we observe that  $\sigma_1(l) = 1$  for all  $m \leq l \leq p+b-c$  and  $\sigma_1(l) = 0$  for  $l = p+b-c+1$  (take  $j = 1$ ). We claim that there exists at least one  $l \in [m, p+b-c+1]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . For  $m \leq l \leq p+b-c$ , Lemma 3.5 in [22] gives

$$a_{j,l} \equiv \frac{(-1)^{l-m} \binom{p+b-m-1}{j-1} \binom{p-1+m-l}{c-1-j}}{\binom{p+b-m-c}{l-m} \binom{p+b-m-1}{c-1}} \pmod{p}.$$

Using above and (3.9) for  $a_{j,l}$  at  $l = p+b-c+1$ , we get

$$d_l \equiv \begin{cases} \beta(l) \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{p+b-m-1}{j-1} \binom{p-1-l}{c-m-1-j} & \text{if } m \leq l \leq p+b-c \\ \beta(l) \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-j} \binom{c-m-2}{j-1} & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1 \end{cases}$$

where (using (3.7) and a variation of (3.8))

$$\beta(l) = \begin{cases} \frac{(-1)^l \binom{p-1+m-l}{m}}{\binom{p+b-m-1}{c-1} \binom{p+b-m-c}{l-m}} & \text{if } m \leq l \leq p+b-c \\ (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1. \end{cases}$$

By replacing  $j-1$  by  $j$  we get

$$d_l \equiv \begin{cases} \beta(l) \sum_{\epsilon_1-1 \leq j \leq c-m-2} \binom{p+b-m-1}{j} \binom{p-1-l}{c-m-2-j} & \text{if } m \leq l \leq p+b-c \\ \beta(l) \sum_{\epsilon_1-1 \leq j \leq c-m-2} \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-1-j} \binom{c-m-2}{j} & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1. \end{cases}$$

By using Vandermonde's identity we get

$$d_l \equiv \begin{cases} \beta(l) \binom{2p+b-m-2-l}{c-m-2} & \text{if } m \leq l \leq p+b-c \text{ \& } b \geq 2m+1-(p-1) \\ \beta(l) \left( \binom{2p+b-m-2-l}{c-m-2} - \binom{p-1-l}{c-m-2} \right) & \text{if } m \leq l \leq p+b-c \text{ \& } b \leq 2m-(p-1) \\ \beta(l) \binom{2p+b-m-2-l}{p+b-m-1} & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1 \text{ \& } b \geq 2m+1-(p-1) \\ \beta(l) \left( \binom{2p+b-m-2-l}{p+b-m-1} - \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-1} \right) & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1 \text{ \& } b \leq 2m-(p-1). \end{cases}$$

Hence, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_l &\equiv \begin{cases} \beta(l) \binom{p+c-m-2}{c-m-2} & \text{if } l = p+b-c \text{ \& } b \geq 2m+1-(p-1) \\ \beta(l) \left( \binom{p+c-m-3}{p+b-m-1} - \binom{p-1}{p+b-m-1} \right) & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1 \text{ \& } b \leq 2m-(p-1). \end{cases} \\ &\equiv \begin{cases} \beta(l) \binom{c-m-2}{c-m-2} & \text{if } l = p+b-c \text{ \& } b \geq 2m+1-(p-1) \\ -\beta(l) \binom{p-1}{p+b-m-1} & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1 \text{ \& } b \leq 2m-(p-1). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

as  $\binom{p+c-m-3}{p+b-m-1} \equiv \binom{c-m-3}{p+b-m-1} = 0$  (note that  $m \leq c-3$ ). From the above calculation, we observe that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$  for  $l = p+b-c$  if  $b \geq 2m+1-(p-1)$  and for  $l = p+b-c+1$  if  $b \leq 2m-(p-1)$ . Note that if  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$  for  $l = p+b-c+1 \leq \nu$ , then  $l \in [0, \nu - \sigma_1(l)]$  because  $\sigma_1(p+b-c+1) = 0$ . Hence, in this case also there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$ .

**Subcase (III)**  $p+b-\nu-1 \leq m \leq \nu$

Using  $p+b-c+1 \leq m \leq \nu$ , we observe that  $\sigma_1(l) = 0$  for all  $p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq \nu$  (take  $j = p+b-m$ ). We claim that there exists at least one  $l \in [p+b-c+1, \nu]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod p$ . For  $p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq \nu$  and  $1 \leq \epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1$ , using (3.9) we get  $a_{j,l} \equiv \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-j} \binom{c-2}{j-1}$ . Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_l &\equiv (-1)^m \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-j} \binom{c-2}{j-1} \binom{c-1-j}{m} \\ &\equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-j} \binom{c-m-2}{j-1} \end{aligned}$$

as  $\binom{c-2}{j-1} \binom{c-1-j}{m} = \binom{c-2}{m} \binom{c-m-2}{j-1}$ . By replacing  $j-1$  by  $j$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_l &\equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \sum_{\epsilon_1-1 \leq j \leq c-m-2} \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-1-j} \binom{c-m-2}{j} \\ &\equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \sum_{\epsilon_1-1 \leq j \leq p+b-m-1} \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-1-j} \binom{c-m-2}{j}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter congruence follows as  $\binom{c-m-2}{j} = 0$  for all  $c-m-1 \leq j \leq p+b-m-1$ . By Vandermonde's identity, we get

$$d_l \equiv \begin{cases} (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \binom{2p+b-m-2-l}{p+b-m-1} & \text{if } b \geq 2m+1-(p-1) \\ (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \left( \binom{2p+b-m-2-l}{p+b-m-1} - \binom{2p+b-c-l}{p+b-m-1} \right) & \text{if } b \leq 2m-(p-1). \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_l &\equiv \begin{cases} (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \binom{p-1}{p+b-m-1} & \text{if } l = p+b-m-1 \text{ \& } b \geq 2m+1-(p-1) \\ (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \left( \binom{p+c-m-3}{p+b-m-1} - \binom{p-1}{p+b-m-1} \right) & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1 \text{ \& } b \leq 2m-(p-1) \end{cases} \\ &\equiv \begin{cases} (-1)^m \binom{c-2}{m} \binom{p-1}{p+b-m-1} & \text{if } l = p+b-m-1 \text{ \& } b \geq 2m+1-(p-1) \\ (-1)^{m+1} \binom{c-2}{m} \binom{p-1}{p+b-m-1} & \text{if } l = p+b-c+1 \text{ \& } b \leq 2m-(p-1). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The latter congruence follows as  $\binom{p+c-m-3}{p+b-m-1} \equiv \binom{c-m-3}{p+b-m-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  (note that  $m \leq c-3$  and  $c-m-3 < p+b-m-1$ ), and  $\binom{p-1}{p+b-m-1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  as  $b < m$ . Hence, we have  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for  $l = p+b-c+1$  if  $b \leq 2m-(p-1)$  and for  $l = p+b-m-1$  if  $b \geq 2m+1-(p-1)$ . Note that  $l = p+b-m-1 \leq \nu$  if  $p+b-1-\nu \leq m$ . Hence, for all  $m \in [p+b-1-\nu, \nu]$  there exists at least one  $l$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .  $\square$

The following identities will only be required in §8, where we prove more cases of Conjecture 5.1.

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $b, i \in \mathbb{N}$  and suppose  $c, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $l \geq b-c+1$  and  $i \geq b-c+2$ . Also assume that  $1 \leq m \leq c-1$  and  $b \geq m$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-1} (-1)^k (c-k) \binom{c-m-1+i}{k} \binom{c-m-2+i-k}{i-(b-c+2)} \binom{l+c-m-1-k}{l} \\ &= \begin{cases} C_1 + C_2 & \text{if } i \leq l \\ C_1 + C_2 + (-1)^{b-m+l} (m+1-i) \binom{i-1}{l} & \text{if } l \leq i-1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_1 = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} (-1)^j c \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(b-c+2+j)} \binom{l-(b-c+2+j)}{l-(b-m+1+j)}$$

$$C_2 = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_2} (-1)^j (b-m+1+j) \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(b-c+2+j)} \binom{l-(b-c+2+j)}{l-(b-m+j)}$$

where  $m_1 = \min\{i-(b-c+2), l-(b-m+1)\}$  and  $m_2 = \min\{i-(b-c+2), l-(b-m)\}$ . Further,  $C_1 = 0$  if  $l \leq b-m$  and  $C_2 = 0$  if  $l \leq b-m-1$ .

*Proof.* We obtain the lemma from Lemma A.3, where we put  $n = b-c+1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** If  $b \geq 2m+1$  and  $l \leq m$ , then the above lemma gives  $C_1 = 0 = C_2$ .

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $b, i \in \mathbb{N}$  and suppose  $c, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $l \geq p+b-c+1$  and  $i \geq p+b-c+2$ . Also, assume that  $1 \leq m \leq c-2$  and  $p+b-m-1 \geq 0$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-2} (-1)^k (c-1-k) \binom{c-m-2+i}{k} \binom{i+c-m-3-k}{i-(p+b-c+2)} \binom{l+c-m-2-k}{l} \\ &= \begin{cases} C_1 + C_2 & \text{if } l \geq i \\ C_1 + C_2 + (-1)^{p+b-m+1+l} (m+1-i) \binom{i-1}{l} & \text{if } l \leq i-1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_1 = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} (-1)^j (p+b-m+j) \binom{c-m-2+i}{i-(p+b-c+2+j)} \binom{l-(p+b-c+2+j)}{l-(p+b-m-1+j)},$$

$$C_2 = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_2} (-1)^j (c-1) \binom{c-m-2+i}{i-(p+b-c+2+j)} \binom{l-(p+b-c+2+j)}{l-(p+b-m+j)}$$

and  $m_1 = \min\{i-(p+b-c+2), l-(p+b-m-1)\}$  and  $m_2 = \min\{i-(p+b-c+2), l-(p+b-m)\}$ . Further,  $C_1 = 0$  if  $l \leq p+b-m-2$  and  $C_2 = 0$  if  $l \leq p+b-m-1$ .

*Proof.* The lemma follows from Lemma A.3, where we first replace  $c$  with  $c-1$  and then put  $n = p+b-c+1$  (in this order). Next, we observe that  $C_1$  &  $C_2$  of Lemma A.3 are  $C_2$  &  $C_1$  respectively of the lemma above.  $\square$

*Remark 3.8.* If  $b \geq 2(m+1) - p$  and  $l \leq m$  then above lemma gives  $C_1 = 0 = C_2$ .

#### 4. DETERMINATION OF MONOMIALS IN $\text{Ker}(P)$

**Lemma 4.1.** Let  $r, b, c, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $2 \leq b \leq p$  and  $r \equiv b \pmod{p-1}$ . Assume that  $r \geq b + c(p-1) + 1$ . If  $0 \leq m \leq \min\{c-1 - \epsilon_1, p-1\}$ , then for all  $1 \leq a \leq c-m-\epsilon_1$ ,

$$q(c-m-a) \equiv \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+1} \beta(a, i) q(c-m-1+i) \pmod{V_r^{(m+1)}}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $P_j = x^{r-(b+1)-(c-j+1)(p-1)} y^{b-2m-1+(c-m-j)(p-1)}$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq c-m-\epsilon_1$ , and recall  $q(i) = x^{r-b+m-i(p-1)} y^{b-m+i(p-1)}$  for all  $n_0 \leq i \leq c$ , where  $n_0 = 0$  if  $b \geq m$  and 1 otherwise. Indeed  $P_j \in V_{r-(m+1)(p+1)}$  as  $b-2m-1+(c-m-j)(p-1) \geq b-(2m+1)+\epsilon_1(p-1) \geq 0$ . Observe that

$$\theta^{m+1} P_j = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^i \binom{m+1}{i} q(c-m-j+i). \quad (4.1)$$

We will prove the result by induction on  $a$ . Observe that for  $a = 1$ , the result is true, and can be seen by putting  $j = 1$  in (4.1) as follows

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^i \binom{m+1}{i} q(c-m-1+i) \equiv 0 \pmod{V_r^{(m+1)}}$$

$$\implies q(c-m-1) \equiv \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+1} \binom{m+1}{i} q(c-m-1+i) \pmod{V_r^{(m+1)}}.$$

By induction step, assume the result is true for  $1 \leq a \leq k-1$ , and we prove it for  $a = k \leq c-m-\epsilon_1$ . By putting  $j = k$  in (4.1) we have

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^i \binom{m+1}{i} q(c-m-k+i) \equiv 0 \pmod{V_r^{(m+1)}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \implies q(c-m-k) &\equiv \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k-1} (-1)^{i+1} \binom{m+1}{i} q(c-m-k+i) \\ &\quad + \sum_{k \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+1} \binom{m+1}{i} q(c-m-k+i). \end{aligned}$$

We note that if  $k > m+1$ , then the second sum above is zero and in the first sum  $i$  runs from 1 to  $m+1$  as  $\binom{m+1}{i} = 0$  for all  $m+1 < i \leq k-1$ . We rename  $i$  by  $l$  in the first sum and replace  $i - (k-1)$  by  $i$  in the second sum. Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned} q(c-m-k) &\equiv \sum_{1 \leq l \leq k-1} (-1)^{l+1} \binom{m+1}{l} q(c-m-k+l) \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1-(k-1)} (-1)^{i+k} \binom{m+1}{i+k-1} q(c-m-1+i). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the second sum can be taken over  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$  as  $\binom{m+1}{i+k-1} = 0$  for all  $i > m+1-(k-1)$ . By induction, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(c-m-k) &\equiv \sum_{1 \leq l \leq k-1} (-1)^{l+1} \binom{m+1}{l} \left( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+1} \beta(k-l, i) q(c-m-1+i) \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+k} \binom{m+1}{i+k-1} q(c-m-1+i) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we interchange the sums in the first sum and then combine them with the last sum, we get

$$q(c-m-a) \equiv \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+1} \beta(k, i) q(c-m-1+i)$$

where  $\beta(k, i)$  is defined in Lemma 3.1. □

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $r, b, c, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  such that  $2 \leq b \leq p$  and  $r \equiv b \pmod{p-1}$ . Assume that  $r \geq b + c(p-1) + 1$ . Suppose  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{c-1-\epsilon_1, p-1\}$ , and  $q(j) \in V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P)$  for all  $c-m \leq j \leq c-1$ . Then for all  $\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1$ ,*

$$q(j) \equiv (-1)^m \binom{c-1-j}{m} q(c) \pmod{\text{Ker}(P) + V_r^{(m+1)}}.$$

**Proposition 4.3.** *Let  $r = s + p^t(p-1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p-1)$  and suppose also that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq c \leq p-1$ . Fix non zero slope  $\nu(a_p)$  such that  $0 \leq m \leq \nu(a_p) < p-1$ ,  $(m, \nu) \neq (\nu, \nu(a_p))$ , and also  $s > 2\nu(a_p)$ . Further we assume  $t > \nu(a_p) + c-1$  if  $(b, c, m) \neq (p, 1, 0)$  and  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$  if  $(b, c, m) = (p, 1, 0)$ . Then for all  $g \in G$  and for  $0 \leq l \leq \nu$  with  $(l, \nu) \neq (\nu, \nu(a_p))$ , there exists  $f^l \in \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\mathbb{Q}_p^2))$  such that*

$$(T - a_p)f^l \equiv \left[ g, \sum_{\substack{0 < j < s-m \\ j \equiv (s-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right]. \quad (4.2)$$

Further assume  $(b, c, m) \neq (p, 1, 0)$ ,  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$  and  $0 \leq l, m \leq \nu - 1$ . If  $m = 0$ , then assume  $l$  further satisfies  $\nu\left(\binom{r-l}{p-1-l}\right) \geq 1$ . If  $l = \nu - 1$  or  $m = \nu - 1$ , then assume  $\nu < \nu(a_p)$ . For all  $g \in G$  and the above values of  $l, m$  there exists  $f^l \in \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2))$  such that

$$(T - a_p)\left(\frac{f^l}{p}\right) \equiv \left[ g, \sum_{\substack{0 < j < s-m \\ j \equiv (s-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{\binom{r-l}{j}}{p} x^{r-j} y^j \right]. \quad (4.3)$$

*Proof.* We begin by observing that the coefficients  $\frac{\binom{r-l}{j}}{p}$  in (4.3) are integral if  $0 \leq m \leq l \leq b - c$  or  $b \leq m \leq l \leq b - c + p$ , and not integral in general. Consider the following functions

$$\begin{aligned} f_{3,l} &= \sum_{\lambda \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{2,p\lambda}^0, \frac{F_l(x, y)}{\lambda^{m-l} p^l (p-1)} \right] \\ f_{2,l} &= \left[ g_{2,0}^0, \binom{r-l}{r-m} \frac{F_m(x, y)}{p^m} \right] \\ f_{1,l} &= \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \frac{1}{a_p} \sum_{\substack{s-m \leq j < r-m \\ j \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ f_0 &= \begin{cases} [1, F_s(x, y)] & \text{if } r \equiv m \pmod{p-1} \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} & T^+ \left( \left[ g_{2,p\lambda}^0, \frac{F_l(x, y)}{\lambda^{m-l} p^l (p-1)} \right] \right) \\ &= \sum_{\mu \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{3,p\lambda+p^2\mu}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq s-l} \frac{p^{j-l} (-\mu)^{s-l-j}}{\lambda^{m-l} (p-1)} \left( \binom{r-l}{j} - \binom{s-l}{j} \right) x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ & \quad + \sum_{\mu \in I_1} \left[ g_{3,p\lambda+p^2\mu}^0, \sum_{s-l+1 \leq j \leq r-l} \frac{p^{j-l} (-\mu)^{r-l-j}}{\lambda^{m-l} (p-1)} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ & \quad - \left[ g_{3,p\lambda}^0, \frac{p^{s-2l}}{\lambda^{m-l} (p-1)} x^{r-s+l} y^{s-l} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we will estimate the valuation of the coefficients in the three sums (I), (II) and (III) above. In (I), for  $j \geq 1$ ,  $\nu\left(\binom{r-l}{j} - \binom{s-l}{j}\right) \geq t - \nu(j!) \implies j - l + t - \nu(j!) \geq t - \nu + 1 > c \geq 1$ . For (III),  $s - 2l \geq s - 2\nu > 0$ . For (II) the same computation as in (III) shows that  $j - l > 0$ . Therefore we have  $T^+(f_{3,l}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Note that  $l \leq \nu - 1$  in (4.3); therefore, the same calculation gives the valuation of the coefficients to be positive as  $s - 2l - 1 \geq s - 2\nu + 1 > 1$  and for  $j \geq 1$ ,



$j - l - 1 + t - \nu(j!) \geq t - (\nu - 1) > c > 0$ . Hence we have  $T^+ \left( \frac{f_{3,l}}{p} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Now,

$$T^- \left( \left[ g_{2,p\lambda}^0, \frac{F_l(x,y)}{\lambda^{m-l} p^l (p-1)} \right] \right) = - \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq s-l} \frac{p^{r-s} \lambda^{s-m-j}}{(p-1)} \binom{s-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ + \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq r-l} \frac{\lambda^{r-m-j}}{(p-1)} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right].$$

In the first sum, the valuation of the coefficients is at least  $r - s \gg 0$ , and therefore we have

$$T^- \left( \frac{f_{3,l}}{p} \right) \equiv \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq r-m \\ j \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{\binom{r-l}{j}}{p} x^{r-j} y^j \right].$$

$$T^+(f_{2,l}) = \sum_{\mu \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{3,p^2\mu}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq s-m} p^{j-m} (-\mu)^{s-m-j} \binom{r-l}{r-m} \left( \binom{r-m}{j} - \binom{s-m}{j} \right) x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ + \sum_{\mu \in I_1} \left[ g_{3,p^2\mu}^0, \sum_{s-m+1 \leq j \leq r-m} \frac{p^j (-\mu)^{r-m-j}}{p^m} \binom{r-l}{r-m} \binom{r-m}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ - \left[ g_{3,0}^0, p^{s-2m} \binom{r-l}{r-m} x^{r-s+m} y^{s-m} \right].$$

In (I) sum, for  $j \geq 1$ ,  $j - m + t - \nu(j!) \geq t - \nu + 1 > c \geq 1$ . For (III),  $s - 2m \geq s - 2\nu > 0$ . For (II), the same computation as in (III) shows that  $j - m > 0$ . Therefore we have  $T^+(f_{2,l}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Note that  $m \leq \nu - 1$  in (4.3); therefore, the same calculation gives the valuation of the coefficients to be positive as  $s - 2m - 1 \geq s - 2\nu + 1 > 1$  and for  $j \geq 1$ ,  $j - m - 1 + t - \nu(j!) \geq t - (\nu - 1) > c > 0$ . Hence we have  $T^+ \left( \frac{f_{2,l}}{p} \right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Now,

$$T^-(f_{2,l}) = - \left[ g_{1,0}^0, p^{r-s} \binom{r-l}{r-m} x^{r-s+m} y^{s-m} \right] + \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \binom{r-l}{r-m} x^m y^{r-m} \right] \\ \implies T^-(f_{2,l}) \equiv \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \binom{r-l}{r-m} x^m y^{r-m} \right] \quad (\text{as } r - s \gg 0) \\ \& \quad T^- \left( \frac{f_{2,l}}{p} \right) \equiv \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \frac{\binom{r-l}{r-m}}{p} x^m y^{r-m} \right] \quad (\text{as } r - s - 1 \gg 0).$$

Now,

$$T^+(f_{1,l}) = \sum_{\lambda \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{2,p\lambda}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq r} \frac{p^j(-\lambda)^{s-m-j}}{a_p} \sum_{\substack{s-m \leq i < r-m \\ i \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{r-l}{i} \binom{i}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ + \left[ g_{2,0}^0, \sum_{\substack{s-m \leq j < r-m \\ j \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{p^j}{a_p} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right]. \quad (4.4)$$

Here we note that  $s - (\nu + 1) \leq \min\{s - l - 1, s - m\}$  as  $l, m \leq \nu$ . Observe that the first sum truncates to  $j \leq s - (\nu + 1)$  and the second sum is zero mod  $p$  as  $j - \nu(a_p) > 0$  for all  $j \geq s - \nu$ . Hence

$$T^+(f_{1,l}) = \sum_{\lambda \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{2,p\lambda}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq s - (\nu + 1)} \frac{p^j(-\lambda)^{s-m-j}}{a_p} \sum_{\substack{s-m \leq i < r-m \\ i \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{r-l}{i} \binom{i}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ \implies T^+(f_{1,l}) = \sum_{\lambda \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{2,p\lambda}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq s - (\nu + 1)} \frac{p^j(-\lambda)^{s-m-j}}{a_p} S_{r,j,l,m} x^{r-j} y^j \right]$$

where  $S_{r,j,l,m}$  is defined in equation (3.1) in [22]. Now  $(b, c, m) \neq (p, 1, 0)$  implies that either  $b \leq p - 1$  or  $c + m \geq 2$  (or both). So Lemma 3.3(II) in [22] gives  $\nu(S_{r,j,l,m}) \geq t + 1 - c$ , and therefore the valuation of above coefficients is at least  $j + t + 1 - c - \nu(a_p) \geq t - (\nu(a_p) + c - 1) > 0$  giving  $T^+(f_{1,l}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . For  $(b, c, m) = (p, 1, 0)$ , Lemma 3.3(II) in [22] gives  $\nu(S_{r,j,l,m}) \geq t - c$ , so the valuation of above coefficients is at least  $j + t - c - \nu(a_p) \geq t - (c + \nu(a_p)) > 0$ , hence  $T^+(f_{1,l}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .

Again note that  $s - \nu \leq \min\{s - l - 1, s - m\}$  as  $l, m \leq \nu - 1$  in (4.3). Note also that the first sum truncates to  $j \leq s - \nu$ , and the second sum is zero mod  $p$  as  $j - \nu(a_p) - 1 > 0$  for all  $j \geq s - \nu + 1$ . Hence,

$$T^+\left(\frac{f_{1,l}}{p}\right) = \sum_{\lambda \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{2,p\lambda}^0, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq s - \nu} \frac{p^{j-1}(-\lambda)^{s-m-j}}{a_p} S_{r,j,l,m} x^{r-j} y^j \right]$$

Since in this case  $(b, c, m) \neq (p, 1, 0)$ , Lemma 3.3(II) in [22] gives  $\nu(S_{r,j,l,m}) \geq t + 1 - c$  for all  $j \leq s - \nu$ , and therefore the valuation of above coefficients is at least  $j - 1 + t + 1 - c - \nu(a_p) \geq t - (\nu(a_p) + c) > 0$  giving  $T^+\left(\frac{f_{1,l}}{p}\right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Next,

$$T^-(f_{1,l}) = \left[ 1, \sum_{\substack{s-m \leq j < r-m \\ j \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{p^{r-j}}{a_p} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right]$$

where the valuation of the coefficients is at least  $r - j - \nu(a_p) \geq m + p - 1 - \nu(a_p) > 0 \Rightarrow T^-(f_{1,l}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Also,

$$T^-\left(\frac{f_{1,l}}{p}\right) = \left[ 1, \sum_{\substack{s-m \leq j < r-m \\ j \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{p^{r-j-1}}{a_p} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right].$$

For  $j \leq r - m - 2(p - 1)$  the valuation of the above coefficients are at least  $r - j - 1 - \nu(a_p) \geq p - 2 + m + p - 1 - \nu(a_p) > 0$ . For  $j = r - m - (p - 1)$ , the valuation of the coefficient is  $r - j - 1 - \nu(a_p) + \nu\left(\binom{r-l}{r-m-(p-1)}\right) \geq m + \nu\left(\binom{r-l}{r-m-(p-1)}\right) - 1 + p - 1 - \nu(a_p) > m + \nu\left(\binom{r-l}{r-m-(p-1)}\right) - 1 \geq 0$ . Observe that the last inequality is clear as either  $m \geq 1$  or  $\nu\left(\binom{r-l}{p-1-l}\right) \geq 1$ . Therefore we have  $T^-\left(\frac{f_{1,l}}{p}\right) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .

If  $r \equiv m \pmod{p-1}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} T^+(f_0) &= \sum_{\lambda \in I_1^*} [g_{1,\lambda}^0, (-1 + (-\lambda)^{r-s})x^r] + [g_{1,0}^0, -x^r] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\lambda \in I_1} \left[ g_{1,\lambda}^0, \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r-s} p^j \binom{r-s}{j} (-\lambda)^{r-s-j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ \Rightarrow T^+(f_0) &\equiv -[g_{1,0}^0, x^r] \\ T^-(f_0) &= [\alpha, -p^r x^r + p^s x^s y^{r-s}] \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \\ T^+\left(\frac{f_0}{p}\right) &= \sum_{\lambda \in I_1^*} \left[ g_{1,\lambda}^0, \frac{(-1 + (-\lambda)^{r-s})}{p} x^r \right] + [g_{1,0}^0, -\frac{1}{p} x^r] \\ &\quad + \sum_{\lambda \in I_1} \left[ g_{1,\lambda}^0, \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r-s} p^{j-1} \binom{r-s}{j} (-\lambda)^{r-s-j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \end{aligned}$$

Observe that if  $j = 1$ ,  $\binom{r-s}{j} = r - s$  which is divisible by  $p^t$ ,  $t \geq 1$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} T^+\left(\frac{f_0}{p}\right) &\equiv -[g_{1,0}^0, \frac{1}{p} x^r] \\ T^-\left(\frac{f_0}{p}\right) &= [\alpha, -p^{r-1} x^r + p^{s-1} x^s y^{r-s}] \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $a_p f_{3,l}, a_p f_{2,l}, a_p f_0 \equiv 0$ , as  $l, m < \nu(a_p)$  from the hypotheses of (4.2). Similarly,  $\frac{a_p f_{3,l}}{p}, \frac{a_p f_{2,l}}{p}$  since  $l, m < \nu(a_p) - 1$  from the hypotheses of (4.3). Note that  $\frac{a_p f_0}{p} \equiv 0$  since  $\nu(a_p) > 1$ . It is clear

from the hypotheses that  $\nu(a_p) = 1$  is not allowed for (4.3).

$$\begin{aligned} (T - a_p)(f_{3,l}) &\equiv \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j \leq r-m \\ j \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ (T - a_p)(f_{2,l}) &\equiv \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \binom{r-l}{r-m} x^m y^{r-m} \right] \\ (T - a_p)(f_{1,l}) &\equiv - \left[ g_{1,0}^0, \sum_{\substack{s-m \leq j < r-m \\ j \equiv (r-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \right] \\ (T - a_p)(f_{0,l}) &\equiv \begin{cases} -[g_{1,0}^0, x^r] & \text{if } r \equiv m \pmod{p-1} \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $f^l := f_{3,l} - f_{2,l} + f_{1,l} + f_{0,l}$  gives the required result. Finally, we deduce (4.2) and (4.3) from the fact that  $T$  is  $G$ -linear, and so we can replace  $g_{1,0}^0$  by any  $g \in G$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.4.** *Let  $r = s + p^t(p-1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p-1)$  and also suppose that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq c \leq p-1$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $1 < \nu(a_p) < p-1$  and  $s > 2\nu(a_p)$ . Assume  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{\nu, c-1-\epsilon_1\}$  and  $(m, \nu) \neq (\nu, \nu(a_p))$ . If  $t > \nu(a_p) + c - 1$ , then for all  $g \in G$  and for  $0 \leq l \leq \nu$  with  $(l, \nu) \neq (\nu, \nu(a_p))$ , there exists  $f^l \in \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2))$  such that*

$$(T - a_p)f^l \equiv \left[ g, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \alpha(i, l) q(i + c - m - 1) \right] \pmod{X} \quad (4.5)$$

where  $\alpha(i, l)$  is as in (3.2) and  $X := V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P)$ . Further, suppose  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{\nu-1, c-1-\epsilon_1\}$ ,  $0 \leq l \leq \nu-1$ , and  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . Assume  $\nu < \nu(a_p)$  if  $l = \nu-1$  or  $m = \nu-1$ . If for some  $l$  as above  $\binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for  $0 \leq j \leq c-1$  such that  $b-m+j(p-1) > 0$ , then for all  $g \in G$  there exists  $f^l \in \text{ind}_{KZ}^G(\text{Sym}^r(\bar{\mathbb{Q}}_p^2))$  such that

$$(T - a_p) \left( \frac{f^l}{p} \right) \equiv \left[ g, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \frac{\alpha(i, l)}{p} q(i + c - m - 1) \right] \pmod{X}. \quad (4.6)$$

*Proof.* First, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} A &:= \sum_{\substack{0 < j < s-m \\ j \equiv (s-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{r-l}{j} x^{r-j} y^j \\ &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq j' \leq c-1 \\ b-m+j'(p-1) > 0}} \binom{r-l}{b-m+j'(p-1)} q(j'). \end{aligned}$$

Now, we write the last sum into three parts:  $0 \leq j < \epsilon_1$ ,  $\epsilon_1 \leq j' \leq c-m-1$ , and  $c-m \leq j' \leq c-1$ . Here we note that Remark 4.4 in [15] gives the first sum belongs to  $\text{Ker}(P)$  as  $m < \nu(a_p)$ . In the

second range of sum, we put  $a = c - m - j'$  and in the third range of sum we put  $i' = j' - (c - m - 1)$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} A \equiv & \sum_{1 \leq a \leq c-m-\epsilon_1} \binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-a)(p-1)} q(c-m-a) \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq i' \leq m} \binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-1+i')(p-1)} q(c-m-1+i') \pmod{(\text{Ker}(P))}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.1, for  $1 \leq a \leq c - m - \epsilon_1$  we have

$$q(c-m-a) \equiv \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+1} \beta(a, i) q(c-m-1+i) \pmod{(V_r^{(m+1)})}.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A \equiv & \sum_{1 \leq i' \leq m} \binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-1+i')(p-1)} q(c-m-1+i') \\ & + \sum_{1 \leq a \leq c-m-\epsilon_1} \binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-a)(p-1)} \left( \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} (-1)^{i+1} \beta(a, i) q(c-m-1+i) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The above congruence is over  $\text{mod}(V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$ . Now, we interchange the sums in the last sum and combine them with the first sum (replace  $i'$  by  $i$ ); we get

$$A \equiv \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \alpha(i, l) q(c-m-1+i) \pmod{(V_r^{m+1} + \text{Ker}(P))}$$

where  $\alpha(i, l)$  is as in (3.2). Hence, we obtained the first part of our result just by using Proposition 4.2. For the second part, we rerun the proof with  $A := \sum_{\substack{0 < j < s-m \\ j \equiv (s-m) \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{\binom{r-l}{j}}{p} x^{r-j} y^j$  by noting that

$\frac{\binom{r-l}{j}}{p}$  is integral. □

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $r = s + p^t(p-1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p-1)$  and also suppose that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq c \leq p-1$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral,  $s > 2\nu(a_p)$ , and let  $1 \leq m \leq \nu \leq c-1-\epsilon$ . Also assume  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ , and  $q(j) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $c-m \leq j \leq c-1$ . Then  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  in each of the following cases (with the additional condition on  $m$ ) given below:*

- (1)  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{\nu-1, b-c\}$  if  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$ .
- (2)  $b-\nu \leq m \leq \nu$  if  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$ .
- (3)  $m \in ([b-\nu, \nu] \cap [1, b-1]) \cup [b, \nu-1]$  if  $2 \leq b \leq c-2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c-2, p+b-c\}$ .
- (4)  $m \in [1, p+b-c] \cup [p+b-\nu-1, \nu]$  if  $2 \leq b \leq 2(c-1)-p-2$  and  $p+b-c+1 \leq \nu \leq c-3$ .

*Remark 4.6.* (i) We note that the hypothesis  $q(j) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $c-m \leq j \leq c-1$  (see Conjecture 5.2) in Proposition 4.5 is crucial for applying Corollary 4.2.

(ii) Note that the statement (3) of the proposition above is obtained by combining (3) and (4) of

Lemma 3.3.

(iii) Corollary 4.2 is applicable since  $c - 1 - \epsilon \leq c - 1 - \epsilon_1$  if  $1 \leq m \leq c - 1 - \epsilon$ .

*Proof.* Recall the definition of  $\sigma_1(l)$  from (3.5) and observe that  $\frac{\binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)}}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}}$  is integral. By Remark 4.4 in [15], we have  $q(j) \in \text{Ker}(P)$  for all  $j \in [0, \epsilon_1 - 1]$  such that  $b - m + j(p - 1) > 0$ . Therefore, for each  $l \in [0, \nu - \sigma_1(l)]$ , Proposition 4.3 gives

$$(T - a_p) \left( \frac{f^l}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}} \right) \equiv \left[ g, \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq j \leq c-m-1} \frac{\binom{r-l}{b-m+j(p-1)}}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}} q(j) \right] \text{ mod } (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$$

as  $q(j) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $j \in [c - m, c - 1]$  (by the hypothesis). Since  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral, we can also apply Proposition 4.3 in the case when  $l = \nu$  in (4.2) or when  $l, m = \nu - 1$  in (4.3). By Corollary 4.2, we have

$$(T - a_p) \left( \frac{f^l}{p^{\sigma_1(l)}} \right) \equiv [g, d_l q(c)] \text{ mod } (\text{Ker}(P) + V_r^{(m+1)}),$$

where  $d_l$  is as in (3.6). For each  $b, c, \nu$  and  $m$  as in the statement, Lemma 3.3 gives that there exists at least one  $l \in [0, \nu - \sigma_1(l)]$  such that  $d_l \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Hence, we get  $q(c) \in (\text{Ker}(P) + V_r^{(m+1)})$ . Further, note that Remark 4.4 in [15] gives  $x^m y^{r-m} \in \text{Ker}(P)$  as  $m < \nu(a_p)$ . Consequently,  $F_m(x, y) \equiv q(c) \text{ mod } (\text{Ker}(P) + V_r^{(m+1)})$ , thereby giving our proposition.  $\square$

## 5. CONJECTURE

We consider the following matrix

$$A = (\alpha(i, l))_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m+1, \\ 0 \leq l \leq m}}, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\alpha(i, l)$  are defined in (3.2). We note that  $\alpha(i, l)$  has a complicated formula, so proving that the linear system of equations  $AX = e_i$  has a solution is generally hard. However, we make the following conjecture about the solutions to the above linear systems based on SageMath programs.

**Conjecture 5.1** (Matrix form). *Let  $r = s + p^t(p - 1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p - 1)$  and suppose that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq c \leq p - 1$ , and  $t \geq 2$ . Suppose also that  $1 \leq m \leq c - 1 - \epsilon$ . Then the linear systems  $AX = e_i \pmod{p}$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .*

We note that if  $AX = e_{i'} \pmod{p}$  has a solution, then under the hypotheses of Proposition 4.4, we get  $q(c - m - 1 + i') \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$ . One can see this as follows, if  $X^t = (d_0, d_1, \dots, d_m)$  be a solution of  $AX = e_{i'} \pmod{p}$ , then take  $f := \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m} d_l f^l$ , where  $f^l$  are defined in Proposition 4.4.

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} (T - a_p)f &\equiv \left[ g, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m+1} \left( \sum_{0 \leq l \leq m} d_l \alpha(i, l) \right) q(c - m - 1 + i) \right] \text{ mod } (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P)) \\ &\equiv [g, q(c - m - 1 + i')] \text{ mod } (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P)). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as a consequence of the above conjecture, we get the following conjecture for monomials  $q(j)$ .

**Conjecture 5.2** (Monomial form). *Let  $r = s + p^t(p-1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p-1)$  and suppose that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $1 \leq c \leq p-1$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $1 < \nu(a_p) < p-1$  and  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . Suppose also that  $s > 2\nu(a_p)$ . Further we assume that  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{\nu, c-1-\epsilon\}$  and  $(m, \nu) \neq (\nu, \nu(a_p))$ . Then the monomials  $q(j) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $c-m \leq j \leq c-1$ .*

*Remark 5.3.* Note that the crucial hypothesis in Proposition 4.5 on  $q(j)$  is precisely the claim of Conjecture 5.2.

In the following lemma, we prove enough cases of Conjecture 5.1 so that Proposition 4.5 (1) holds unconditionally. In the last section, we discuss evidence for the remaining cases (and also provide proof in many cases) of Conjecture 5.1.

**Lemma 5.4.** *If  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$  and  $1 \leq m \leq \min\{b-c, c-1-\epsilon\}$ , then Conjecture 5.1 is true.*

*Proof.* First, we note that the range of  $m$  is non-empty only when  $b \geq c+1$ , so we will prove our lemma only for  $b \geq c+1$ . Now, let's express  $A$  in (5.1) as follows

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A' & B' \\ A'' & B'' \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.2)$$

where the ranges of  $i$  and  $l$  are divided into non-empty intervals  $[1, m]$ ,  $[m+1, m+1]$  and  $[0, m-1]$ ,  $[m, m]$ , determining the order of the blocks. For  $0 \leq l \leq m$  and  $1 \leq i \leq m+1$ , Lemma 3.2 gives  $\alpha_1(i, l) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  (as  $m \leq b-c$ ), and also that the additional term of  $\alpha(i, l)$  (for  $i \leq m$ ) is given by

$$X(i, l) = \binom{r-l}{b-m+(i+c-m-1)(p-1)} \equiv \binom{b-c-l}{b-c+1-i} \binom{c}{i+c-m-1}.$$

Hence, we get

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{b-c-l}{b-c+1-i} \binom{c}{c-m-1+i} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq m \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq m, i = m+1. \end{cases}$$

The above congruence implies that modulo  $p$ ,  $A'$  is an invertible lower triangular matrix (with all the diagonal entries non-zero modulo  $p$ , given by  $i = l+1$ ), and  $A'', B''$  are zero modulo  $p$ . Hence, for every  $1 \leq i \leq m$ , modulo  $p$  the row rank of  $[A : e_{i'}]$  is same as the row rank of  $A$ . Thus, the linear systems  $AX \equiv e_{i'} \pmod{p}$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i' \leq m$ . □

## 6. ELIMINATION OF JH FACTOR

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $r = s + p^t(p-1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p-1)$  and suppose also that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $2 \leq c \leq p-1$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral,  $1 < \nu(a_p) < c-\epsilon$  and  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . Further, assume **Conjecture 5.2** is true. Then the map  $P$  surjects from  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n_1+1)}}{V_r^{(n_2)}} \right)$ , where  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are defined as follows:*

- (1) If  $c - 1 \leq b \leq p$ , then  $n_1 = \min\{b - c, \nu - 1\}$  and  $n_2 = \min\{b - \nu, \nu + 1\}$ .  
(2) Suppose  $2 \leq b \leq c - 2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$ . Then

$$n_1 = \begin{cases} \nu - 1 & \text{if } b \leq \nu \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \& \quad n_2 = \begin{cases} \nu + 1 & \text{if } b \leq \nu \\ \min\{b - \nu, \nu + 1\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

- (3) If  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 4 - p$  and  $p + b - c + 1 \leq \nu \leq c - 3$ , then  $n_1 = p + b - c$  and  $n_2 = \min\{p + b - \nu - 1, \nu + 1\}$ .

*Remark 6.2.* In the proposition above, Conjecture 5.2 is needed to apply Proposition 4.5. Note that the statement (1) above is obtained by combining the statements (1) and (2) of Proposition 4.5. If  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$ , then the range of  $m$  in Proposition 4.5 (2) is empty. Therefore, the case  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$  (appearing later) is covered entirely by the statement of Proposition 4.5 (1).

*Proof.* In all three parts of the proposition, we need to show that the map  $P$  factors through  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n_1+1)}}{V_r^{(n_2)}} \right)$ . In order to do that we apply Lemma 2.1 & 2.2 to the intervals  $[0, n_1]$  &  $[n_2, \nu]$  respectively, whenever they are non-empty. To apply Lemma 2.2 in each cases, we show that  $F_m(x, y) \in \text{Ker}(P)$  for all  $m \in [n_2, \nu]$ . In fact, it suffices to show that  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $m \in [n_2, \nu]$ . We show this by reverse induction on  $m$  after observing that  $F_\nu(x, y) \in \text{Ker}(P)$  because  $F_\nu(x, y) \in (V_r^{(\nu+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  and  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_r^{(\nu+1)}) \subset \text{Ker}(P)$ .

Next, we explain the steps to apply Lemma 2.1 for  $[0, n_1]$ . If  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for  $m \geq 1$ , then there exists  $v_{m+1} \in V_r^{(m+1)}$  such that  $F_m(x, y) - v_{m+1} \in \text{Ker}(P)$ . Let  $W_m$  be the submodule of  $V_r^{(m)}$  generated by  $F_m(x, y) - v_{m+1}$ . By using Lemma 2.4, and given that  $F_m(x, y) - v_{m+1} \in \text{Ker}(P)$ , we observe that  $W_m$  satisfies the required conditions of Lemma 2.1. Hence, to apply Lemma 2.1 for  $[0, n_1]$ , we show that  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $m \in [1, n_1]$  and construct the required  $W_0$  separately. In each of the above cases, Proposition 4.5 gives  $F_m(x, y) \in (V_r^{(m+1)} + \text{Ker}(P))$  for all  $m \in [1, n_1] \cup [n_2, \nu]$ . Therefore, to complete the proof, we construct  $W_0$  in Lemma A.5 for cases (1) and (3) above, and only for  $b \leq \nu$  in case (2) ( $m = 0$  is not applicable when  $b \geq \nu + 1$ ).  $\square$

**Theorem 6.3.** Let  $r = s + p^t(p - 1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p - 1)$  and suppose also that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $2 \leq c \leq p - 1$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral,  $1 < \nu(a_p) < c - \epsilon$  and  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . Assume **Conjecture 5.2** is true. Then the map  $P$  surjects from  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(n_0)}}{V_r^{(n_0+1)}} \right)$ , where  $n_0$  is defined as follows:

- (1) If  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$ , then  $n_0 = \nu$ .  
(2) If  $c - 1 \leq b \leq c + \nu - 2$  and  $\nu = c - 2$ , then  $n_0 = b - c + 1$ .  
(3) Suppose  $2 \leq b \leq c - 2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$ . Then  $n_0 = \nu$  if  $b \leq \nu$  and  $n_0 = 0$  if  $b = \nu + 1$ .  
(4) If  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 4 - p$  and  $\nu \in \{p + b - c + 1, c - 3\}$ , then  $n_0 = p + b - c + 1$ .



## 7. MAIN RESULT

In the following proposition, we determine  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p}$  for all  $k' > k$ , where  $k' = r + 2$ ,  $k = s + 2$  and  $r, s$  are as given in the statement below. We apply Lemma 2.5 in the proposition below to consider only those  $b, c, \nu$  where the reduction is necessarily irreducible. In particular, we have removed the point  $b = 2c - 4 - p$  coming from Theorem 6.3 (3) since it is a case with possibly reducible reduction  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p}$ .

**Proposition 7.1.** *Let  $p \geq 5$ . Let  $r = s + p^t(p - 1)d$ , with  $p \nmid d$ ,  $s = b + c(p - 1)$  and suppose also that  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $2 \leq c \leq p - 1$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral,  $1 < \nu(a_p) < c - \epsilon$  and  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . Assume **Conjecture 5.2** is true and let  $k' = r + 2$ .*

- (1) *If  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$  such that  $b \neq 2\nu + 1$  and  $(b, \nu) \neq (p, 1)$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+\nu(p-1)} \right)$ .*
- (2) *If  $c - 1 \leq b \leq c + \nu - 2$  and  $\nu = c - 2$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(b-c+1)(p-1)} \right)$ .*
- (3) *Suppose  $2 \leq b \leq c - 2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$ . Also assume that  $b \neq 2\nu + 2 - p$  if  $b \leq 2c - 2 - p$ . Then  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(\nu+1)(p-1)} \right)$  if  $b \leq \nu$ , and  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right)$  if  $b = \nu + 1$ .*
- (4) *If  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 5 - p$  and  $\nu \in \{p + b - c + 1, c - 3\}$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{k_0} \right)$ , where  $k_0 = b + 1 + (p + b - c + 2)(p - 1)$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the corollary in the following parts.

**Case (1).**  $c + \nu - 1 \leq b \leq p$

By Theorem 6.3, we have

$$P : \text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(\nu)}}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}.$$

Observe that  $b \geq 2\nu$  as by assumption  $b \geq \nu + c - 1$ , and  $\nu \leq c - 1$ . We also observe that the equality  $b = 2\nu$  occurs only for  $\nu = c - 1$ . But  $b = 2c - 2$  gives  $\epsilon = 1$ , and so we must have by hypothesis that  $\nu \leq c - 2$ . Thus, as such we must have  $b \geq 2\nu + 1$ . Therefore, if  $b \neq 2\nu + 1$  and  $(b, \nu) \neq (p, 1)$ , then by Lemma 2.5 (with  $n = \nu$ ), we have

$$\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+\nu(p-1)} \right) \text{ as } 2\nu + 2 \leq b \leq p$$

**Case (2).**  $c - 1 \leq b \leq c + \nu - 2$  and  $\nu = c - 2$  (so  $b \leq 2c - 4$ )

By Theorem 6.3, we have

$$P : \text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(b-c+1)}}{V_r^{(b-c+2)}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k',a_p}.$$

**Subcase (i)**  $b = c - 1$

If  $b \neq p - 2$ , then Lemma 2.5 (with  $n = 0$ ) gives  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right)$ . If  $b = p - 2$ , then by (2.3) (with  $n = 0$  and  $r' = 2p - 3$ ), we see that the image of  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_{p-2})$  in  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r}{V_r^{(1)}} \right)$  is generated by  $[1, x^r]$  and the latter belongs to  $\text{Ker}(P)$  by Remark 4.4 in [15]. Hence,  $P$  factors through  $\text{ind}_{KZ}^G(V_1 \otimes D^{p-2})$ . Therefore, Proposition 3.3 in [15] gives  $\bar{V}_{k',a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{2+(p-2)(p+1)} \right)$ . We conclude by observing that  $\omega_2^{2+(p-2)(p+1)}$  is conjugate to  $\omega_2^{b+1}$  as  $b = p - 2$  and  $2 + (p - 2)(p + 1) = p(b + 1)$ .

**Subcase (ii)**  $c \leq b \leq 2c - 4$

In this case, we note that  $b \geq 2n + 2$  with  $n = b - c + 1$  as  $b \leq 2c - 4$ , and also note that  $(b, n) \neq (p, 1)$  as  $c \leq p - 1$ . Hence, Lemma 2.5 (with  $n = b - c + 1$ ) gives  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(b-c+1)(p-1)} \right)$ .

**Case (3).**  $2 \leq b \leq c - 2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$

**Subcase (i)**  $b \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$

By Theorem 6.3, we get

$$P : \text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(\nu)}}{V_r^{(\nu+1)}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k', a_p}.$$

Observe that  $2\nu + 1 - (p - 1) \leq b \leq 2\nu$  as  $b \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$ . The equality  $b = 2\nu + 2 - p$  occurs only if  $b \leq 2c - 2 - p$ , and these are possibly reducible cases. Therefore, by Lemma 2.5, we have  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(\nu+1)(p-1)} \right)$  as  $2\nu + 1 - (p - 1) < b \leq 2\nu$ .

**Subcase (ii)**  $b = \nu + 1$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$

By Theorem 6.3 we get

$$P : \text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r}{V_r^{(1)}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k', a_p}.$$

If  $b \neq p - 2$ , then Lemma 2.5 gives  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right)$ . Observe that  $b = p - 2$  occurs only if  $(\nu, c) = (c - 2, p - 1)$ , and in this case, we proceed exactly the same as in the proof of part (1) above to get the required result.

**Case (4).**  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 5 - p$  and  $\nu \in \{p + b - c + 1, c - 3\}$

In this case, Theorem 6.3 gives

$$P : \text{ind}_{KZ}^G \left( \frac{V_r^{(p+b-c+1)}}{V_r^{(p+b-c+2)}} \right) \twoheadrightarrow \bar{\Theta}_{k', a_p}.$$

Observe that if  $n = p + b - c + 1$ , then  $2n + 1 - (p - 1) < b < 2n$  as  $b \leq 2c - 5 - p$ . Hence, using Lemma 2.5, we obtain  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(p+b-c+2)(p-1)} \right)$ .  $\square$

The following theorem is the main result of this section, where we prove local constancy by assuming Conjecture 5.2.

**Theorem 7.2.** *Let  $k = b + c(p - 1) + 2$  with  $2 \leq c \leq p - 1$ ,  $2 \leq b \leq p$  and  $p \geq 5$ . Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral,  $1 < \nu(a_p) < c - \epsilon$ , and let  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ . Assume **Conjecture 5.2** is true.*

- (1) *If  $b \geq c + \nu - 1$  such that  $b \neq 2\nu + 1$  and  $(b, \nu) \neq (p, 1)$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+\nu(p-1)} \right)$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p - 1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .*
- (2) *If  $c - 1 \leq b \leq 2c - 4$  and  $\nu = c - 2$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(b-c+1)(p-1)} \right)$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p - 1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ .*
- (3) *Suppose  $2 \leq b \leq c - 2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c - 2, p + b - c\}$ . Also assume that  $b \neq 2\nu + 2 - p$  if  $b \leq 2c - 2 - p$ . Then for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p - 1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ,  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1+(\nu+1)(p-1)} \right)$  if  $b \leq \nu$ , and  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind} \left( \omega_2^{b+1} \right)$  if  $b = \nu + 1$ .*

(4) If  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 5 - p$  and  $\nu \in \{p + b - c + 1, c - 3\}$ , then  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \text{ind}(\omega_2^{k_0})$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , where  $k_0 = b + 1 + (p + b - c + 2)(p - 1)$ .

In the above cases the Berger's constant  $m(k, a_p)$  exists and  $m(k, a_p) \leq \lceil \nu(a_p) \rceil + c + 1$ .

*Remark 7.3.* Here, we make an important remark that statement (1) is unconditional on Conjecture 5.2. This is because Conjecture 5.2 is a consequence of Conjecture 5.1, and the latter is proved in Lemma 5.4 for the cases required in statement (1) above (see also Remark 6.2 above).

*Proof.* Observe that since  $\nu(a_p) < c - \epsilon$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} 3\nu(a_p) + \frac{(k-1)p}{(p-1)^2} + 1 &< 4c + 1 - 3\epsilon + \frac{(b+1)p}{(p-1)^2} + \frac{c}{(p-1)} \\ &< b + c(p-1) + 2 = k \quad \forall p \geq 5. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality follows as  $(b+1)(p^2 - 3p + 1) + c(p^2 - 6p + 4)(p-1) + 3\epsilon(p-1)^2 > 0$ . Therefore, we get  $k > 3\nu(a_p) + \frac{(k-1)p}{(p-1)^2} + 1$  so, by Theorem 2.3 there exists a constant  $m = m(k, a_p)$  such that for all  $k'' \in k + p^{m-1}(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ , we have  $\bar{V}_{k'', a_p} \cong \bar{V}_{k, a_p}$ . Observe that Proposition 7.1 determines  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$  (punctured disk around  $k = s + 2$ ) with  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$  and shows that  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p}$  is constant function of  $k'$  for each  $k$ . Note that both the disks  $k + p^{m-1}(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and  $k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$  have the same center. Therefore, we have  $\bar{V}_{k', a_p} \cong \bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  for all  $k' \in k + p^t(p-1)\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . Hence, we get  $m(k, a_p) \geq t + 1$  and also determine  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  in each case of the theorem. Thus, we have the desired result.  $\square$

**Corollary 7.4.** Fix  $a_p$  such that  $\nu(a_p)$  is non-integral and  $1 < \nu(a_p) < p - 1$ . Let  $p \geq 13$  and assume **Conjecture 5.2** is true. Suppose that  $k \notin \{2\nu + 3 + c(p-1), 2\nu + 4 - p + c(p-1)\}$  and  $(k, \nu) \neq (p + 2 + c(p-1), 1)$ , where  $c$  is given below. Theorem 7.2 computes  $\bar{V}_{k, a_p}$  in the following cases:

(1) If  $\nu = 1$ , then for all

$$k \in \bigcup_{c=2+\epsilon}^{p-1} [c + 2 + c(p-1), p + 2 + c(p-1)] \bigcup_{c=3}^{p-1} \{4 + c(p-1)\}.$$

(2) If  $\nu = 2$ , then for all

$$k \in \bigcup_{c=3+\epsilon}^{p-1} [c + 3 + c(p-1), p + 2 + c(p-1)] \bigcup_{c=4}^{p-1} [4 + c(p-1), 5 + c(p-1)] \bigcup \{4p + 2\}.$$

(3) If  $\nu = 3$ , then for all

$$k \in \bigcup_{c=4+\epsilon}^{p-2} [c + 4 + c(p-1), p + 2 + c(p-1)] \bigcup_{c=5}^{p-1} [4 + c(p-1), 6 + c(p-1)] \bigcup \{5p + 2, 5p + 3\}.$$

(4) If  $4 \leq \nu \leq \frac{p-1}{2}$ , then for all

$$k \in \bigcup_{c=\nu+1+\epsilon}^{p+1-\nu} [c + \nu + 1 + c(p-1), p + 2 + c(p-1)] \bigcup_{c=\nu+2}^{p-\nu+2} [4 + c(p-1), \nu + 3 + c(p-1)] \\ \bigcup_{c=p-\nu+3}^{p-1} [c + \nu + 1 - p + c(p-1), \nu + 3 + c(p-1)] \bigcup [2 + (\nu + 2)p, \nu + (\nu + 2)p].$$

(5) If  $\frac{p+1}{2} \leq \nu \leq p - 7$ , then for all

$$k \in \bigcup_{c=\nu+3}^{p-1} [c + \nu + 1 - p + c(p-1), \nu + 3 + c(p-1)] \bigcup [(\nu + 1)p + \nu + 2, (\nu + 1)p + \nu + p].$$

(6) If  $p - 6 \leq \nu \leq p - 5$ , then for all

$$k \in \bigcup_{c=\nu+2}^{\frac{p+\nu+3}{2}} [2c - p + c(p-1), \nu + 3 + c(p-1)] \bigcup_{c=\nu+4}^{p-1} [c + \nu + 1 - p + c(p-1), 2c - 1 - p + c(p-1)] \\ \bigcup [\nu + 4 + (\nu + 2)(p-1), 2\nu + 2 + (\nu + 2)(p-1)] \bigcup \{2\nu + 4 + (\nu + 2)(p-1)\}.$$

(7) If  $\nu = p - 4$ , then for all

$$k \in \bigcup_{c=p-2}^{p-1} [2c - p + c(p-1), p - 1 + c(p-1)] \bigcup [1 + (p-1)^2, p - 5 + (p-1)^2] \bigcup \{p - 3 + (p-1)^2\}.$$

(8) If  $\nu = p - 3$ , then for all  $k \in [p - 2 + (p-1)^2, p + 2 + (p-1)^2]$

*Remark 7.5.* We note that  $\nu = p - 2$  cannot occur. This is because we must also have  $\nu = p - 2 \leq c - 1 - \epsilon$ , and so  $\epsilon = 0$ . Thus,  $\nu = p - 2$  could come only from Theorem 7.2 (1) wherein  $p \geq b \geq c + \nu - 1$ , forcing  $p \leq 4$ .

## 8. PROOF OF MORE CASES OF CONJECTURE 5.1

In proving the following lemma, the main observation is to obtain some simple expression for  $\alpha(i, l)$ , which is essentially equivalent to giving some simple expression for  $\alpha_1(i, l)$  (see (3.2)). Lemma 3.2 gives that  $\alpha_1(i, l) \equiv \alpha'(i, l)$  (for definition of  $\alpha'(i, l)$  see (3.4)). To prove (1) - (3) of the theorem below, we show modulo  $p$ ,  $\alpha'(i, l) = 0$  if  $l \geq i$  and  $\alpha'(i, l) = (-1)^{b-m+l} u_l v_i (m+1-i) \binom{i-1}{l}$  if  $l \leq i-1$  by using Lemmas A.1 & 3.5. To prove the last part of the following lemma, we use Lemmas 3.7 & A.2 to do a similar analysis. Recall that  $m \in [1, c - 1 - \epsilon]$  in Conjecture 5.1.

**Theorem 8.1.** *Conjecture 5.1 is true in the following cases (with the additional condition on  $m$ ):*

- (1)  $m \in [1, b - c]$  if  $b \geq c + 1$ .
- (2)  $m \in [1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cap [b - c + 1, c - 1 - \epsilon]$  if  $b \geq c$ .
- (3)  $m \in ([1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cup [b, c - 2]) \cap [1, p + b - c]$  if  $2 \leq b \leq c - 1$ .
- (4)  $m \in [p + b - c + 1, \frac{p+b-2}{2}] \cap [p + b - c + 1, c - 3]$  if  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 3 - p$ .

Before we give the proof of the theorem above, we would like to state a corollary of it and make some remarks.

**Corollary 8.2.** *Conjecture 5.1 is true in the following cases (with the additional condition on  $m$ ):*

- (1) For all  $m$  if  $b \geq 2c - 3$ .
- (2)  $m \in [1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cup [b, c-2]$  if  $2c - 2 - p \leq b \leq 2c - 4$ .
- (3)  $m \in [1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cup [b, c-3]$  if  $2c - 4 - p \leq b \leq 2c - 3 - p$ .
- (4)  $m \in [1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cup [b, \frac{p+b-2}{2}]$  if  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 5 - p$ .

*Proof.* When  $b \geq 2c - 2$ , the full range of  $m$  i.e.  $[1, c-1-\epsilon]$  is contained in  $[1, b-c]$  as  $c-1-\epsilon \leq b-c$ , and so Theorem 8.1 (1) gives Corollary 8.2 (1) in this case. For  $b = 2c - 3$  we use Theorem 8.1 (1) & (2) for  $1 \leq m \leq c - 3$  and  $m = c - 2$  respectively to prove Corollary 8.2 (1). Next, when  $c \leq b \leq 2c - 4$ , observe that  $[b, c-2]$  is empty and  $[1, \frac{b-1}{2}] = [1, b-c] \cup ([1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cap [b-c+1, c-1-\epsilon])$  as  $b-c < \frac{b-1}{2}$  (since  $b \leq 2c - 4$ ). Therefore, the statement (2) of Corollary 8.2 is obtained by Theorem 8.1 (1) & (2) when  $c \leq b \leq 2c - 4$  and only by Theorem 8.1 (3) when  $2c - 2 - p \leq b \leq c - 1$ . Lastly, note that  $([1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cup [b, c-2]) \cap [1, p+b-c] = [1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cup [b, p+b-c]$  if  $b \leq 2c - 3 - p$ . Thus, the last two statements of the corollary follow by Theorem 8.1 (3) & (4) as  $[p+b-c+1, \frac{p+b-2}{2}] \cap [p+b-c+1, c-3]$  is equal to  $[p+b-c+1, c-3]$  if  $b \geq 2c - 4 - p$  and equal to  $[p+b-c+1, \frac{p+b-2}{2}]$  if  $b \leq 2c - 5 - p$ .  $\square$

*Remark 8.3.* From the above corollary, we see that Conjecture 5.1 remains to be proven in the following cases:

- (1)  $m \in [\frac{b}{2}, b-1] \cap [1, c-2]$  if  $2c - 2 - p \leq b \leq 2c - 4$ .
- (2)  $m \in [\frac{b}{2}, b-1]$  if  $2c - 4 - p \leq b \leq 2c - 3 - p$ .
- (3)  $m \in [\frac{b}{2}, b-1] \cup [\frac{p+b-1}{2}, c-3]$  if  $2 \leq b \leq 2c - 5 - p$ .

Using SageMath, we have verified that the matrix  $A$  defined in (5.1) is invertible for the above ranges of  $b, c, m$  and primes  $p$  up to 97.

We now prove Theorem 8.1. It will be clear from the proof below that the matrix  $A$  defined in (5.1) is non-invertible for the ranges of  $b, c, m$  in Theorem 8.1, and moreover, the last row of  $A$  is zero mod  $p$ .

*Proof.* Recall that from §5, we have the matrix

$$A = (\alpha(i, l))_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m+1 \\ 0 \leq l \leq m}}$$

where  $\alpha(i, l)$  is as defined in (3.2). Now, we show that the system of linear equations  $AX = e_i \pmod{p}$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

**Case (i)**  $b \geq c + 1$  and  $m \in [1, b - c]$ . This is proved in Lemma 5.4.

**Case (ii)**  $b \geq c$  and  $m \in [1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cap [b - c + 1, c - 1 - \epsilon]$

In this case, we write  $A$  as follows

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A' & B' \\ A'' & B'' \end{pmatrix}$$

where the ranges of  $i$  and  $l$  are divided into non-empty intervals  $[1, b - c + 1]$ ,  $[b - c + 2, m + 1]$  and  $[0, b - c]$ ,  $[b - c + 1, m]$  respectively, determining the order of blocks.

**Subcase (a)**  $0 \leq l \leq b - c$  and  $1 \leq i \leq b - c + 1$

For the above ranges of  $i$  and  $l$ , Lemma 3.2 gives  $\alpha_1(i, l) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and

$$\binom{r-l}{b-m+(i+c-m-1)(p-1)} \equiv \binom{b-c-l}{b-c+1-i} \binom{c}{i+c-m-1}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(i, l) &\equiv \binom{b-c-l}{b-c+1-i} \binom{c}{c-m-1+i} \\ &\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \iff i < l + 1. \end{aligned}$$

According to the calculation above, modulo  $p$  the matrix  $A'$  is an invertible lower triangular matrix.

**Subcase (b)**  $b - c + 1 \leq l \leq m$  and  $b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m + 1$

In this case, we note that  $m \leq p + b - c$  as  $b \geq c$  and  $m \leq c - 1 - \epsilon \leq p - 1$ . Using Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \alpha'(i, l) + \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } b - c + 1 \leq l \leq m, b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m \\ \alpha'(i, l) & \text{if } b - c + 1 \leq l \leq m, i = m + 1 \end{cases}$$

where  $\alpha'(i, l)$  is as defined in (3.4). By Lemma A.1, we have

$$\alpha'(i, l) \equiv u_l v_i \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq k \leq c_1} (-1)^k (c - k) \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{k} \binom{i + c - m - 2 - k}{i - (b - c + 2)} \binom{l + c - m - 1 - k}{l},$$

where  $c_1 = \min\{c - m - 1, b - m\}$ ,  $u_l = (-1)^l l! (p + b - c - l)! (c - 1)!$  and

$$v_i = \frac{(-1)^{i+1+c-m} (i - (b - c + 2))!}{(i - 1)! (m + 1 - i)! (c - m - 1 + i)!}$$

We note that  $b \geq 2m + 1$ . Using the above calculations and Lemma 3.5 along with Remark 3.6, we obtain

$$\alpha'(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \leq l \\ (-1)^{b-m+l} u_l v_i (m + 1 - i) \binom{i-1}{l} & \text{if } l \leq i - 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence, we get for  $b - c + 1 \leq l \leq m$

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m, i \leq l \\ (-1)^{b-m+l} u_l v_i (m + 1 - i) \binom{i-1}{l} + \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } c'_1 \leq i \leq m, l \leq i - 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } i = m + 1 \end{cases}$$

where  $c'_1 = b - c + 2$ . The last case is clear as  $(-1)^{b-m+l} u_l v_i (m + 1 - i) \binom{i-1}{l} = 0$  for  $i = m + 1$ . For  $i \leq m$ , we note that

$$\begin{aligned} &\binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{b+c+1+i} l! (p+b-c-l)! (c-1)! (i - (b - c + 2))! \binom{i-1}{l}}{(i-1)! (m+1-i)! (c-m-2+i)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have for  $b - c + 1 \leq l \leq m$

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \frac{(-1)^{b+c+1+i} l! (p+b-c-l)! (c-1)! (i-(b-c+2))!}{(i-1)! (m+1-i)! (c-m-2+i)!} \binom{i-1}{l} & \text{if } b-c+2 \leq i \leq m, i \leq l \\ \frac{(-1)^{b+c+i+1} c l! (p+b-c-l)! (c-1)! (i-(b-c+2))!}{(i-1)! (m+1-i)! (c-m-1+i)!} \binom{i-1}{l} & \text{if } b-c+2 \leq i \leq m, l \leq i-1 \\ 0 & \text{if } i = m+1 \end{cases}$$

$$\equiv \begin{cases} u'_i v'_i \binom{i-1}{l} & \text{if } b-c+2 \leq i \leq m, b-c+1 \leq l \leq m \\ 0 & \text{if } i = m+1 \end{cases}$$

where  $u'_i = l!(p+b-c-l)!$  and

$$v'_i = \begin{cases} \frac{(-1)^{b+c+1+i} (c-1)! (i-(b-c+2))!}{(i-1)! (m+1-i)! (c-m-2+i)!} & \text{if } b-c+2 \leq i \leq m, i \leq l \\ \frac{(-1)^{b+c+i+1} c (c-1)! (i-(b-c+2))!}{(i-1)! (m+1-i)! (c-m-1+i)!} & \text{if } b-c+2 \leq i \leq m, l \leq i-1. \end{cases}$$

From the above congruence on  $\alpha(i, l)$ , we have

$$B'' \equiv \begin{pmatrix} B''' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p}, \quad \text{where } B''' = \left( u'_i v'_i \binom{i-1}{l} \right)_{\substack{b-c+2 \leq i \leq m \\ b-c+1 \leq l \leq m-1}}$$

and 0 denotes the zero matrix of the required size. We note that  $B'''$  is invertible (lower triangular with non-zero diagonal entries).

We finally also note that by Lemma 3.2 the matrix  $A'' \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  since both  $\alpha'(i, l)$  and  $X(i, l)$  are zero mod  $p$  when  $b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m + 1$  and  $0 \leq l \leq b - c$ . Thus,

$$A \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A' & B' \\ 0 & B'' \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $A'$  is invertible mod  $p$ , and  $B''$  is as above. Hence for every  $1 \leq i' \leq m$ , modulo  $p$  the row rank of  $[A : e_{i'}]$  is the same as the row rank of  $A$  (which is  $m$ ). Thus, the linear systems  $AX = e_{i'} \pmod{p}$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i' \leq m$ .

**Case (iii)**  $2 \leq b \leq c - 1$  and  $m \in ([1, \frac{b-1}{2}] \cup [b, c-2]) \cap [1, p+b-c]$

Observe that  $i \in [1, m+1] \subset [b-c+2, p+b-c+1]$  and  $l \in [0, m] \subset [b-c+1, p+b-c]$ . Therefore, Lemma 3.2 gives

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \alpha'(i, l) + \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq m \\ \alpha'(i, l) & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq m, i = m+1 \end{cases}$$

where  $\alpha'(i, l)$  is as defined in (3.4). If  $m \in [1, \frac{b-1}{2}]$ , then all the computations of Subcase (b) of Case (ii) for  $\alpha(i, l)$  will carry over here and give that the matrix  $A$  is of the form  $B''$  i.e.,

$$A \equiv \begin{pmatrix} B''' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p}, \quad \text{where } B''' = \left( u'_i v'_i \binom{i-1}{l} \right)_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq m \\ 0 \leq l \leq m-1}}.$$

Thus, following the same argument as in the previous case, we get that the linear systems  $AX = e_{i'} \pmod{p}$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i' \leq m$ .

If  $m \in [b, c-2]$ , then using Lemma 3.2, we observe that  $\alpha_1(i, l) \equiv 0 \pmod p$  (indeed in this case, the summation in (3.4) of  $\alpha'(i, l)$  is empty as  $\epsilon_1 \geq 1$ ). Hence, we have

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq m \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq m, i = m+1. \end{cases}$$

For the above values of  $l$  and  $i$ , we note that  $\binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} = 0 \iff i < l+1$ . Therefore, we can see  $A$  as a block matrix of the form given in (5.2), where modulo  $p$ ,  $A'$  is invertible and  $A'', B''$  are zero. Thus, the linear systems  $AX = e_{i'} \pmod p$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i' \leq m$ .

**Case (iv)**  $2 \leq b \leq 2c-3-p$  and  $m \in [p+b-c+1, \frac{p+b-2}{2}] \cap [p+b-c+1, c-3]$

In this case, we note that  $\epsilon_1 = 1$  or  $2$  as  $b \leq m$ . If  $m \geq p+b-c+2$ , then we write  $A$  as follows

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A' & B' \\ A'' & B'' \\ A''' & B''' \end{pmatrix}$$

where the ranges of  $i$  and  $l$  are divided into non-empty intervals  $[1, p+b-c+1]$ ,  $[p+b-c+2, m]$ ,  $[m+1, m+1]$  and  $[0, p+b-c]$ ,  $[p+b-c+1, m]$  respectively, determining the order of blocks.

If  $m = p+b-c+1$ , then we write  $A$  as follows

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A' & B' \\ A''' & B''' \end{pmatrix}$$

where the ranges of  $i$  and  $l$  are divided into non-empty intervals  $[1, m]$ ,  $[m+1, m+1]$  and  $[0, m-1]$ ,  $[m, m]$  respectively, determining the order of blocks.

**Subcase (a)**  $0 \leq l \leq p+b-c$

Observe that using Lemma 3.2, we get

$$\binom{r-l}{b-m+(c-m-1+i)(p-1)} \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq p+b-c+1 \\ 0 & \text{if } p+b-c+2 \leq i \leq m+1 \end{cases}$$

and  $\alpha_1(i, l) \equiv \alpha'(i, l) = 0$  (indeed in this case, the summation in (3.4) of  $\alpha'(i, l)$  is empty as  $c-m-\epsilon_1 < c-b$ ). Thus, we have

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} \binom{c-1}{c-m-2+i} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq p+b-c+1 \\ 0 & \text{if } p+b-c+2 \leq i \leq m+1 \end{cases}$$

Note that for  $1 \leq i \leq p+b-c+1$ , we have

$$\binom{p+b-c-l}{p+b-c+1-i} = 0 \iff i < l+1.$$

Hence, modulo  $p$  we get  $A'$  is lower triangular invertible (because all the diagonal entries are non-zero modulo  $p$ , given by  $i = l+1$ ), and  $A'', A'''$  are zero modulo  $p$ .

**Subcase (b)**  $p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq m$  and  $p+b-c+2 \leq i \leq m+1$

Here,  $l \in [p+b-c+1, m]$  and  $i \in [p+b-c+2, m+1]$ . So using (3.4) and Lemma A.2, we get



$$\alpha'(i, l) \equiv u_l v_i \sum_{\epsilon_1 - 1 \leq k \leq c - m - 2} (-1)^k (c - 1 - k) \binom{c - m - 2 + i}{k} \binom{i + c - m - 3 - k}{i - (p + b - c + 2)} \binom{l + c - m - 2 - k}{l},$$

where  $u_l = (-1)^l l! (2p + b - c - l)! (c - 2)!$  and

$$v_i = \frac{(-1)^{i + c - m} (i - (p + b - c + 2))!}{(i - 1)! (m + 1 - i)! (c - m - 2 + i)!}.$$

Since  $m \leq \frac{p + b - 2}{2}$  it follows that  $b \geq 2m + 1 - (p - 1)$  and  $\epsilon_1 = 1$ . Using the above calculations and Lemma 3.7 along with Remark 3.8, we obtain

$$\alpha'(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } l \geq i \\ (-1)^{b - m + l} u_l v_i (m + 1 - i) \binom{i - 1}{l} & \text{if } l \leq i - 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence, by using Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{2p + b - c - l}{2p + b - c + 1 - i} \binom{c - 2}{c - m - 3 + i} & \text{if } p + b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m, i \leq l \\ (-1)^{b - m + l} u_l v_i (m + 1 - i) \binom{i - 1}{l} + \binom{2p + b - c - l}{2p + b - c + 1 - i} \binom{c - 2}{c - m - 3 + i} & \text{if } \alpha_0 \leq i \leq m, l \leq i - 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } i = m + 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $\alpha_0 = p + b - c + 2$ .

Note that for  $p + b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{2p + b - c - l}{2p + b - c + 1 - i} \binom{c - 2}{c - m - 3 + i} \\ & \equiv \frac{(-1)^{b - c + i} l! (2p + b - c - l)! (i - (p + b - c + 2))! (c - 2)! \binom{i - 1}{l}}{(i - 1)! (m + 1 - i)! (c - m - 3 + i)!} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\alpha(i, l) \equiv \begin{cases} u'_l v'_i \binom{i - 1}{l} & \text{if } p + b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m \\ 0 & \text{if } i = m + 1, \end{cases}$$

where  $u'_l = l! (2p + b - c - l)!$  and

$$v'_i = \begin{cases} \frac{(-1)^{b - c + i} (i - (p + b - c + 2))! (c - 2)!}{(m + 1 - i)! (c - m - 3 + i)! (i - 1)!} & \text{if } i \leq l \\ \frac{(-1)^{b - c + i} (i - (p + b - c + 2))! (c - 1)!}{(m + 1 - i)! (c - m - 2 + i)! (i - 1)!} & \text{if } l \leq i - 1. \end{cases}$$

Hence,  $B'''$  is zero modulo  $p$  and

$$B'' \equiv \begin{pmatrix} B''_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{p}, \quad \text{where } B''_1 = \left( u'_l v'_i \binom{i - 1}{l} \right)_{\substack{p + b - c + 2 \leq i \leq m \\ p + b - c + 1 \leq l \leq m - 1}}.$$

Hence, modulo  $p$  the matrix  $B''_1$  is lower triangular invertible.

Using the above calculations, we get

$$A \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A' & B' \\ 0 & B'' \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where modulo  $p$  the matrix  $A'$  is an invertible, and  $B''$  is full rank ( $A''' \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and  $B''' \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  are just row matrix). Hence, for every  $1 \leq i' \leq m$ , modulo  $p$  the row rank of  $[A : \mathbf{e}_{i'}]$  is same as the row rank of  $A$ . Thus, the linear systems  $AX = e_{i'} \pmod{p}$  has a solution for all  $1 \leq i' \leq m$ .  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** We owe a great debt to the work in [9] and [6] critical to our work. The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to Shalini Bhattacharya for giving useful suggestions regarding this problem. The second author acknowledges the valuable support from IISER Tirupati during his postdoctoral research fellowship at the institute.

#### APPENDIX A.

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $0 \leq c \leq p-1$  and  $1 \leq m \leq c-1$ . For  $\max\{1, b-c+2\} \leq i \leq m+1$  and  $\max\{0, b-c+1\} \leq l \leq \min\{m, p+b-c\}$  then*

$$\alpha'(i, l) \equiv u_l v_i \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq k \leq c_1} (-1)^k (c-k) \binom{c-m-1+i}{k} \binom{i+c-m-2-k}{i-(b-c+2)} \binom{l+c-m-1-k}{l},$$

where  $\alpha'(i, l)$  defined in (3.4),  $c_1 = \min\{c-m-1, b-m\}$ ,  $u_l = (-1)^l l!(p+b-c-l)!(c-1)!$  and  $v_i = \frac{(-1)^{i+1+c-m}(i-(b-c+2))!}{(i-1)!(m+1-i)!(c-m-1+i)!}$ .

*Proof.* Recall from the definition of  $\alpha'(i, l)$  in (3.4), we have

$$\alpha'(i, l) = (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{\max\{c-b, 1\} \leq a \leq c-m-\epsilon_1} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-c+a} \binom{c-1}{c-m-a} \beta(a, i)$$

as  $b-c+1 \leq l \leq p+b-c$ . Using Lemma 3.1, we get

$$\alpha'(i, l) = (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{\max\{c-b, 1\} \leq a \leq c-m-\epsilon_1} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-c+a} \binom{c-1}{c-m-a} \binom{i+a-2}{a-1} \binom{m+a}{i+a-1}.$$

Next,

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-c+a} \binom{c-1}{c-m-a} \binom{i+a-2}{a-1} \binom{m+a}{i+a-1} \\ &= \frac{(p+b-c-l)!(c-1)!(i+a-2)!(m+a)!}{(b-c+a)!(p-(l+a))!(c-m-a)!(m+a-1)!(a-1)!(i-1)!(i+a-1)!(m+1-i)!} \\ &\equiv \frac{(p+b-c-l)!(c-1)!(i+a-2)!(l+a-1)!(m+a)(-1)^{l+a}}{(b-c+a)!(c-m-a)!(a-1)!(i-1)!(i+a-1)!(m+1-i)!} \end{aligned}$$

The last congruence follows by noting that  $(p-(l+a))! \equiv \frac{(-1)^{l+a}}{(l+a-1)!} \pmod{p}$ . On multiplying and dividing by  $l!(i+c-m-1)!(i-(b-c+2))!$  on the right-hand side of the above equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-c+a} \binom{c-1}{c-m-a} \binom{i+a-2}{a-1} \binom{m+a}{i+a-1} \\ &\equiv (-1)^{i+1+c-m+a} u_l v_i (m+a) \binom{i+c-m-1}{c-m-a} \binom{i+a-2}{i-(b-c+2)} \binom{l+a-1}{l}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha'(i, l) &\equiv u_l v_i \sum_{\max\{c-b, 1\} \leq a \leq c-m-\epsilon_1} (-1)^{c-m+a} (m+a) \binom{i+c-m-1}{c-m-a} \binom{i+a-2}{i-(b-c+2)} \binom{l+a-1}{l} \\ &= u_l v_i \sum_{\epsilon_1 \leq k \leq c_1} (-1)^k (c-k) \binom{i+c-m-1}{k} \binom{i+c-m-2-k}{i-(b-c+2)} \binom{l+c-m-1-k}{l}.\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows by putting  $k = c - m - a$ .  $\square$

Following similar steps as in the proof of Lemma A.1, we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma A.2.** *Let  $2 \leq b \leq p$ ,  $0 \leq c \leq p-1$  and  $1 \leq m \leq c-2$ . For  $p+b-c+2 \leq i \leq m+1$  and  $p+b-c+1 \leq l \leq \min\{m, 2p+b-c\}$  then*

$$\alpha'(i, l) \equiv u_l v_i \sum_{\epsilon_1-1 \leq k \leq c_1} (-1)^k (c-1-k) \binom{c-m-2+i}{k} \binom{i+c-m-3-k}{i-(p+b-c+2)} \binom{l+c-m-2-k}{l},$$

where  $\alpha'(i, l)$  defined in (3.4),  $c_1 = c - m - 2$ ,  $u_l = (-1)^l l! (2p + b - c - l)! (c - 2)!$  and

$$v_i = \frac{(-1)^{i+c-m} (i-(p+b-c+2))!}{(i-1)! (m+1-i)! (c-m-2+i)!}.$$

**Lemma A.3.** *Let  $n, c, i, l \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $l \geq \max\{0, n\}$  and  $i \geq \max\{1, n+1\}$ . Also assume that  $1 \leq m \leq c-1$  and  $n+c-m-1 \geq 0$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-1} (-1)^k (c-k) \binom{c-m-1+i}{k} \binom{c-m-2+i-k}{i-(n+1)} \binom{l+c-m-1-k}{l} \\ &= \begin{cases} C_1 + C_2 & \text{if } i \leq l \\ C_1 + C_2 + (-1)^{n+c-m-1+l} (m+1-i) \binom{i-1}{l} & \text{if } l \leq i-1. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_1 = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} (-1)^j c \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(n+1+j)} \binom{l-(n+1+j)}{l-(n+c-m+j)}$$

$$C_2 = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_2} (-1)^j (n+c-m+j) \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(n+1+j)} \binom{l-(n+1+j)}{l-(n+c-m-1+j)}$$

where  $m_1 = \min\{i-(n+1), l-(n+c-m)\}$  and  $m_2 = \min\{i-(n+1), l-(n+c-m-1)\}$ . Further,  $C_1 = 0$  if  $l < n+c-m$  and  $C_2 = 0$  if  $l < n+c-m-1$ .

*Remark A.4.* When  $m = c-1$  and  $j = l-(n+c-m-1)$  then the binomial coefficient  $\binom{l-(n+1+j)}{l-(n+c-m-1+j)} = \binom{-1}{0} = 1$ . This term appears in the last term of the sum in  $C_2$  if  $l-(n+c-m-1) \leq i-(n+1)$ .

*Proof.* First, we consider the following binomial expansion

$$(x-1)^{c-m-1+i} x^{-1} = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-1+i} (-1)^k \binom{c-m-1+i}{k} x^{c-m-2+i-k}.$$

By differentiating  $i - (n + 1)$  times and dividing by  $(i - n - 1)!$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i - (n+1)} (-1)^j \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{i - (n + 1) - j} (x - 1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{-(j+1)} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-2+i} (-1)^k \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{k} \binom{c - m - 2 + i - k}{i - (n + 1)} x^{n+c-m-1-k} + (-1)^{n+c-m-2} x^{n-i}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\binom{c-m-2+i-k}{i-(n+1)} = 0$  if  $n + c - m - 1 < k \leq c - m - 2 + i$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i - (n+1)} (-1)^j \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{i - (n + 1) - j} (x - 1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{-(j+1)} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n+c-m-1} (-1)^k \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{k} \binom{c - m - 2 + i - k}{i - (n + 1)} x^{n+c-m-1-k} + (-1)^{n+c-m-2} x^{n-i}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above equation, we multiply by  $\frac{x^{l-n}}{l!}$ , and then differentiate  $l$  times. We get the following

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i - (n+1)} (-1)^j \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{i - (n + 1) - j} \left( \frac{D^l}{l!} \right) \left( (x - 1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n+c-m-1} (-1)^k \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{k} \binom{c - m - 2 + i - k}{i - (n + 1)} \binom{l + c - m - 1 - k}{l} x^{c-m-1-k} \\ & \quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+c-m-2}}{l!} D^l(x^{l-i}) \end{aligned}$$

where  $D := \frac{d}{dx}$  differential operator. Observe that  $\binom{l+c-m-1-k}{l} = 0$  if  $c - m - 1 < k \leq n + c - m - 1$  and  $\binom{c-m-2+i-k}{i-(n+1)} = 0$  if  $n + c - m - 1 < k \leq c - m - 1$ . Therefore, even if  $n < 0$ , we can extend the sum above to  $k \leq c - m - 1$ , giving us

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i - (n+1)} (-1)^j \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{i - (n + 1) - j} \left( \frac{D^l}{l!} \right) \left( (x - 1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-1} (-1)^k \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{k} \binom{c - m - 2 + i - k}{i - (n + 1)} \binom{l + c - m - 1 - k}{l} x^{c-m-1-k} \\ & \quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+c-m-2}}{l!} D^l(x^{l-i}) \end{aligned}$$

Again, we multiply by  $x^{m+1}$  and after that differentiate one time the above equation to obtain the following

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i - (n+1)} (-1)^j \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{i - (n + 1) - j} D \left( x^{m+1} \left( \frac{D^l}{l!} \right) \left( (x - 1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-1} (-1)^k (c - k) \binom{c - m - 1 + i}{k} \binom{c - m - 2 + i - k}{i - (n + 1)} \binom{l + c - m - 1 - k}{l} x^{c-1-k} \\ & \quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+c-m-2}}{l!} D(x^{m+1} D^l(x^{l-i})) \end{aligned}$$

By putting  $x = 1$  in the above equation, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-1} (-1)^k (c-k) \binom{c-m-1+i}{k} \binom{c-m-2+i-k}{i-(n+1)} \binom{l+c-m-1-k}{l} \\
 &= \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i-(n+1)} (-1)^j \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(n+1)-j} D \left( x^{m+1} \left( \frac{D^l}{l!} \right) \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \right) \Big|_{x=1} \\
 & \quad + \frac{(-1)^{n+c-m-1}}{l!} D(x^{m+1} D^l(x^{l-i})) \Big|_{x=1}. \tag{A.1}
 \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & D \left( \frac{x^{m+1} D^l}{l!} \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \right) \\
 &= \sum_{0 \leq a \leq l} \binom{n+c-m+j}{a} D \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j-a} x^{m+1} \left( \frac{D^{l-a}}{(l-a)!} \right) (x^{l-(n+1+j)}) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Observe that  $\binom{n+c-m+j}{a} = 0$  if  $n+c-m+j < a$ . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & D \left( \frac{x^{m+1} D^l}{l!} \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \right) \\
 &= \sum_{0 \leq a \leq n_1} \binom{n+c-m+j}{a} D \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j-a} x^{m+1} \left( \frac{D^{l-a}}{(l-a)!} \right) (x^{l-(n+1+j)}) \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $n_1 = \min\{l, n+c-m+j\}$ . Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 & D \left( \frac{x^{m+1} D^l}{l!} \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \right) \\
 &= \sum_{0 \leq a \leq n_1} \binom{n+c-m+j}{a} (n+c-m+j-a) \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m-1+j-a} x^{m+1} \left( \frac{D^{l-a}}{(l-a)!} \right) (x^{l-(n+1+j)}) \right) \\
 & \quad + \sum_{0 \leq a \leq n_1} \binom{n+c-m+j}{a} \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j-a} D \left( x^{m+1} \left( \frac{D^{l-a}}{(l-a)!} \right) (x^{l-(n+1+j)}) \right) \right)
 \end{aligned}$$

Note that at  $x = 1$  the former sum is zero if  $l < n+c-m-1$  and the latter sum is zero if  $l < n+c-m$  (i.e., if  $m_2 < 0$  and if  $m_1 < 0$  respectively). We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{0 \leq j \leq i-(n+1)} (-1)^j \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(n+1)-j} D \left( x^{m+1} \left( \frac{D^l}{l!} \right) \left( (x-1)^{n+c-m+j} x^{l-(n+1+j)} \right) \right) \Big|_{x=1} \\
 &= \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_2} (-1)^j (n+c-m+j) \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(n+1+j)} \binom{l-(n+1+j)}{l-(n+c-m-1+j)} \\
 & \quad + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq m_1} (-1)^j c \binom{c-m-1+i}{i-(n+1+j)} \binom{l-(n+1+j)}{l-(n+c-m+j)}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence, from (A.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq k \leq c-m-1} (-1)^k (c-k) \binom{c-m-1+i}{k} \binom{c-m-2+i-k}{i-(n+1)} \binom{l+c-m-1-k}{l} \\ &= C_2 + C_1 + \frac{(-1)^{n+c-m-1}}{l!} D(x^{m+1} D^l(x^{l-i}))|_{x=1}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $l \geq i$ , then  $D^l(x^{l-i}) = 0$  since  $l \geq i \geq 1$ , giving us the required identity in this case. If  $l \leq i-1$ , then

$$\frac{(-1)^{n+c-m-1}}{l!} D(x^{m+1} D^l(x^{l-i}))|_{x=1} = (-1)^{n+c-m-1+l} (m+1-i) \binom{i-1}{l}.$$

Hence, we obtain our identity in this case too.  $\square$

**Lemma A.5.** *Assume all the hypotheses of Proposition 6.1. Then there exists  $W_0$  of Lemma 2.1 for parts (1) and (3) in all cases, and for part (2) only when  $b \leq \nu$  of Proposition 6.1.*

*Proof.* We will prove our lemma in the following three cases.

**Case (1).**  $c-1 \leq b \leq p$  and  $\nu \leq c-1-\epsilon$

We begin by observing that we need to construct  $W_0$  only when  $b \geq c$  as  $[0, n_1]$  is empty for  $b = c-1$ .

**Subcase (i)**  $c \leq b \leq p-1$

We observe that  $\nu \binom{r}{p-1} \geq 1$  (as  $c \geq 2$ ) and also  $\binom{r}{b+j(p-1)} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for all  $0 \leq j \leq c-1$ . Therefore, by Proposition 4.3 (for  $l = 0$  and  $m = 0$ ) we have

$$(T - a_p) \left( \frac{f^0}{p} \right) \equiv \left[ g, \sum_{\substack{0 < j < s \\ j \equiv b \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{\binom{r}{j}}{p} x^{r-j} y^j \right].$$

But  $x^{r-j} y^j \equiv x^{r-\bar{j}} y^{\bar{j}} \pmod{(V_r^{(1)})}$  where  $\bar{j} \equiv j \pmod{p-1}$  and  $2 \leq \bar{j} \leq p$ . Observe that  $\frac{\binom{r}{j}}{p} \in \mathbb{Z}$  for all  $0 < j < s$  such that  $j \equiv r \pmod{p-1}$ . Hence, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{0 < j < s \\ j \equiv r \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{\binom{r}{j}}{p} x^{r-j} y^j \equiv \eta x^{r-b} y^b \pmod{(V_r^{(1)})}$$

where

$$\eta = \sum_{\substack{0 < j < s \\ j \equiv s \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{\binom{r}{j}}{p} \equiv \sum_{\substack{0 < j < s \\ j \equiv s \pmod{p-1}}} \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{p} \equiv \frac{b-s}{b} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Here the first congruence follows as  $\frac{\binom{r}{j}}{p} \equiv \frac{\binom{s}{j}}{p} \pmod{p^{t-1-\nu(j!)}}$  and  $t-1-\nu(j!) > \nu(a_p) > 1$  (since  $t > \nu(a_p) + c$ ,  $\nu(j!) \leq \nu((s-(p-1))!) \leq c-1$ ). The second last congruence follows from Lemma 2.5 of [11]. Hence, we have

$$(T - a_p) \left( \frac{f^0}{\eta p} \right) \equiv [g, x^{r-b} y^b] \pmod{(V_r^{(1)})}$$

as  $\eta$  is  $p$ -adic unit. Therefore, there exists a  $v_1 \in V_r^{(1)}$  such that

$$(T - a_p) \left( \frac{f^0}{\eta p} \right) \equiv [g, x^{r-b}y^b - v_1]$$

Using (2.3) (with  $r' = p-1+b$ ), we observe that the monomial  $x^{r-b}y^b$  and  $x^r$  generates the quotient  $V_{p-1-b} \otimes D^b$  and submodule  $V_b$  of  $\frac{V_r}{V_r^{(1)}}$  respectively. But  $x^r$  belongs to  $\text{Ker}(P)$  by Remark 4.4 in [15]. Let  $W_0$  is the sub module generated by  $x^r, x^{r-b}y^b - v_1$  if  $b \geq c$ . Observe that  $W_0$  satisfies all the required conditions.

**Subcase (ii)  $b = p$**

In this case by using (2.2) we have the following

$$0 \longrightarrow V_1 \longrightarrow \frac{V_r}{V_r^{(1)}} \longrightarrow V_{p-2} \otimes D \longrightarrow 0.$$

In the above exact sequence, the first map sends  $x$  to  $x^r$  and the second map sends  $x^{r-1}y$  to  $x^{p-2}$ . By the Remark 4.4 of [15], we have  $x^r, x^{r-1}y \in \text{Ker}(P)$  as  $1 < \nu(a_p)$ . We define  $W_0$  in this case as the submodule generated by  $x^r$  and  $x^{r-1}y$ , and observe that  $W_0$  satisfies the required conditions of Lemma 2.1.

**Case (2)  $2 \leq b \leq c-2$  and  $1 \leq \nu \leq \min\{c-2, p+b-c\}$**

In this case, we need to construct  $W_0$  only when  $b \leq \nu$  as it is clear from the statement of Proposition 6.1. By Proposition 4.3 (for  $m = 0$  and  $0 \leq l \leq \min\{\nu, p+b-c\}$ ), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (T - a_p) (f^l) &\equiv \left[ g, \sum_{0 \leq j \leq c-1} \binom{r-l}{b+j(p-1)} x^{r-(b+j(p-1))} y^{(b+j(p-1))} \right] \\ &\equiv \left[ g, \left( \sum_{0 \leq j \leq c-1} \binom{r-l}{b+j(p-1)} \right) x^{r-b} y^b \right] \pmod{(V_r^{(1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

The last congruence follows from the same observation as in Case (1) above. By applying Lemma 3.4 in [22] for  $m = 0$  (see the second and fifth case), we get

$$\binom{r-l}{b+j(p-1)} \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-j} \binom{c-1}{j} & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq p+b-c, 0 \leq j \leq b \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq l \leq p+b-c, b+1 \leq j \leq c-1. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (T - a_p) (f^l) &\equiv \left[ g, \left( \sum_{0 \leq j \leq b} \binom{p+b-c-l}{b-j} \binom{c-1}{j} \right) x^{r-b} y^b \right] \pmod{(V_r^{(1)})} \\ &\equiv \left[ g, \binom{p+b-1-l}{b} x^{r-b} y^b \right] \pmod{(V_r^{(1)})}. \end{aligned}$$

The latter congruence is followed by Vandermonde's identity. Since  $b \leq \nu$ , one can take  $l = b$  in Proposition 4.3, in which case  $\binom{p+b-1-l}{b} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . Thus,

$$[g, x^{r-b}y^b] \in V_r^{(1)} + \text{Ker}(P).$$

Using (2.3) (with  $r' = p-1+b$ ), we observe that the monomial  $x^{r-b}y^b$  and  $x^r$  generates the quotient  $V_{p-1-b} \otimes D^b$  and submodule  $V_b$  of  $\frac{V_r}{V_r^{(1)}}$  respectively. But  $x^r$  belongs to  $\text{Ker}(P)$  by Remark 4.4 in [15]. Therefore, taking  $W_0$  to be the submodule generated by  $x^r$  and  $x^{r-b}y^b$  has the required properties.

**Case (3)**  $2 \leq b \leq 2c-4-p$  and  $p+b-c+1 \leq \nu \leq c-3$

Observe that  $b \leq \nu$  in this case, thus applying Proposition 4.3 with same ranges  $m = 0$  and  $0 \leq l \leq \min\{\nu, p+b-c\}$  as in Case (2) giving required  $W_0$ .  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Bodan Arsovski. On the reductions of certain two-dimensional crystalline representations. *Doc. Math.*, 26:1929–1979, 2021.
- [2] L. Barthel and R. Livné. Irreducible modular representations of  $\text{GL}_2$  of a local field. *Duke Math. J.*, 75(2):261–292, 1994.
- [3] L. Barthel and R. Livné. Modular representations of  $\text{GL}_2$  of a local field: the ordinary, unramified case. *J. Number Theory*, 55(1):1–27, 1995.
- [4] John Bergdall and Brandon Levin. Reductions of some two-dimensional crystalline representations via Kisin modules. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2022(4):3170–3197, 2022.
- [5] Laurent Berger. Représentations modulaires de  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$  et représentations galoisiennes de dimension 2. *Astérisque*, (330):263–279, 2010.
- [6] Laurent Berger. Local constancy for the reduction mod  $p$  of 2-dimensional crystalline representations. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 44(3):451–459, 2012.
- [7] Laurent Berger and Christophe Breuil. Sur quelques représentations potentiellement cristallines de  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ . *Astérisque*, (330):155–211, 2010.
- [8] Laurent Berger, Hanfeng Li, and Hui June Zhu. Construction of some families of 2-dimensional crystalline representations. *Math. Ann.*, 329(2):365–377, 2004.
- [9] Shalini Bhattacharya. Reduction of certain crystalline representations and local constancy in the weight space. *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux*, 32(1):25–47, 2020.
- [10] Shalini Bhattacharya and Abhik Ganguli. Weights for mod  $p$  quaternionic forms in the unramified case (Preprint).
- [11] Shalini Bhattacharya and Eknath Ghate. Reductions of Galois representations for slopes in  $(1, 2)$ . *Doc. Math.*, 20:943–987, 2015.
- [12] Shalini Bhattacharya, Eknath Ghate, and Sandra Rozensztajn. Reductions of Galois representations of slope 1. *J. Algebra*, 508:98–156, 2018.
- [13] Christophe Breuil. Sur quelques représentations modulaires et  $p$ -adiques de  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ . I. *Compositio Math.*, 138(2):165–188, 2003.
- [14] Christophe Breuil. Sur quelques représentations modulaires et  $p$ -adiques de  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ . II. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 2(1):23–58, 2003.
- [15] Kevin Buzzard and Toby Gee. Explicit reduction modulo  $p$  of certain two-dimensional crystalline representations. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 2009(12):2303–2317, 2009.
- [16] Kevin Buzzard and Toby Gee. Explicit reduction modulo  $p$  of certain 2-dimensional crystalline representations, II. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 45(4):2013, 779–788.



- [17] Anand Chitrao, Eknath Ghate, and Seidai Yasuda. Semi-stable representations as limits of crystalline representations. *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [18] Pierre Colmez and Jean-Marc Fontaine. Construction des représentations  $p$ -adiques semi-stables. *Invent. Math.*, 140(1):1–43, 2000.
- [19] Jean-Marc Fontaine and Yi Ouyang. Theory of  $p$ -adic Galois representations. <http://staff.ustc.edu.cn/~yiouyang/galoisrep.pdf>.
- [20] Abhik Ganguli. On the reduction modulo  $p$  of certain modular  $p$ -adic Galois representations. *J. Number Theory*, 172:392–412, 2017.
- [21] Abhik Ganguli and Eknath Ghate. Reductions of Galois representations via the mod  $p$  local Langlands correspondence. *J. Number Theory*, 147:250–286, 2015.
- [22] Abhik Ganguli and Suneel Kumar. On the local constancy of certain mod  $p$  Galois representations. *Res. Number Theory*, 10(2): Paper No. 52, 2024.
- [23] Eknath Ghate. A zig-zag conjecture and local constancy for Galois representations. In *Algebraic Number Theory and Related Topics 2018*, RIMS Kôkyûroku Bessatsu, B86, pages 249–268. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. (RIMS), Kyoto, 2021.
- [24] Eknath Ghate. Zig-zag holds on inertia for large weights. *arXiv preprint*, 2022.
- [25] Eknath Ghate and Vivek Rai. Reductions of Galois representations of slope  $\frac{3}{2}$ . *arXiv preprint*, 2020.
- [26] Eknath Ghate and Ravitheja Vangala. The monomial lattice in modular symmetric power representations. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 25(1):121–185, 2022.
- [27] D. J. Glover. A study of certain modular representations. *J. Algebra*, 51(2):425–475, 1978.
- [28] Suneel Kumar. On the local constancy of certain mod  $p$  Galois representations. *PhD Thesis, IISER Mohali*, 2023.
- [29] Sandra Rozensztajn. An algorithm for computing the reduction of 2-dimensional crystalline representations of  $\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ . *International Journal of Number Theory*, 14(07):1857–1894, 2018.