

# CUSP FORMS WITHOUT COMPLEX MULTIPLICATION AS $p$ -ADIC LIMITS

DALEN DOCKERY

ABSTRACT. In 2016, Ahlgren and Samart used the theory of holomorphic modular forms to obtain lower bounds on  $p$ -adic valuations related to the Fourier coefficients of three cusp forms. In particular, their work strengthened a previous result of El-Guindy and Ono which expresses a cusp form as a  $p$ -adic limit of weakly holomorphic modular forms. Subsequently, Hanson and Jameson extended Ahlgren and Samart's result to all one-dimensional cusp form spaces of trivial character and having a normalized form that has complex multiplication. Here we prove analogous  $p$ -adic limits for several one-dimensional cusp form spaces of trivial character but whose normalized form does not have complex multiplication.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Expressing holomorphic cusp forms as  $p$ -adic limits of weakly holomorphic modular forms has been of recent interest. In [EGO10] El-Guindy and Ono considered the cusp form with complex multiplication (CM)

$$g(z) := \eta(4z)^2 \eta(8z)^2 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)q^n = q - 2q^5 - 3q^9 + 6q^{13} + \dots$$

and the weakly holomorphic modular form

$$F(z) := -\frac{\eta(4z)^2 \eta(16z)^6}{\eta(32z)^4} = \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} C(n)q^n = -\frac{1}{q} + 2q^3 + q^7 - 2q^{11} + \dots$$

El-Guindy and Ono proved

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F | U(p^{2m+1})}{C(p^{2m+1})} = g, \quad (1)$$

as a  $p$ -adic limit, for all primes  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$  with  $p \nmid C(p)$ . Their proof relied on previous work of Guerzhoy, Kent, and Ono ([GKO10]) on harmonic Maass forms, studying the  $p$ -adic coupling of mock modular forms and their shadows.

Ahlgren and Samart strengthened the  $p$ -adic limit of El-Guindy and Ono, proving the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.1** (Theorem 1.1 of [AS16]). *For all  $m \geq 0$  and all primes  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , we have*

$$v_p(C(p^{2m+1})) = m, \quad (2)$$

$$v_p\left(\frac{F | U(p^{2m+1})}{C(p^{2m+1})} - g\right) \geq m + 1, \quad (3)$$

where  $v_p(\cdot)$  denotes the  $p$ -adic valuation of  $\mathbb{Z}[[q]]$ .

*Remark.* The case  $m = 0$  of (2) proves that  $p \nmid C(p)$  for all primes  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , thus removing it as an assumption.

A key ingredient in their proof is that  $g(z)$  lies in a one-dimensional space of cusp forms. Ahlgren and Samart also proved similar results for two other pairs of forms  $(F(z), g(z))$ .

Hanson and Jameson ([HJ22]) furthered the work of Ahlgren and Samart, proving that  $p$ -adic behavior identical to (2) and (3) holds for *all* normalized cusp forms (i.e., having leading coefficient 1) of one-dimensional cusp form spaces with trivial character. Specifically, Hanson and Jameson proved the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.2** (Theorem 1 of [HJ22]). *Let  $S_k(N)$  be a one-dimensional space such that the unique normalized cusp form  $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} a(n)q^n \in S_k(N)$  has complex multiplication. Then there exists a corresponding weakly holomorphic modular form  $F(z) = \sum_{n \geq -1} C(n)q^n \in S_k^\infty$  such that (2) and (3) hold for all primes  $p$  which are inert in the field of complex multiplication of  $g(z)$ .*

In light of their work, it is natural to investigate those one-dimensional spaces of cusp forms whose normalized form does not have CM. To this end, we now state our main theorem.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $S_k(N)$  be a one-dimensional space such that  $X_0(N)$  has genus  $g_N = 0$ , and let  $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} a(n)q^n \in S_k(N)$  be the unique normalized cusp form. If  $g(z)$  does not have complex multiplication, then there is a corresponding weakly holomorphic modular form  $F(z) = \sum_{n \geq -1} C(n)q^n$  such that*

$$v_p(C(p^m)) = v_p(C(p)) \quad (4)$$

$$v_p\left(\frac{F | T_k(p^m)}{C(p^m)} - g\right) = (k-1)m - v_p(C(p)) \quad (5)$$

for all  $m \geq 1$  and all primes  $p \nmid N$  with  $p \nmid a(p)$  and  $v_p(C(p)) \leq k-1$ . In particular, if  $p \nmid N$  is prime such that  $p \nmid a(p)$  and  $p \nmid C(p)$ , then for all integers  $m \geq 1$ ,

$$v_p(C(p^m)) = 0,$$

$$v_p\left(\frac{F | T_k(p^m)}{C(p^m)} - g\right) = (k-1)m.$$

*Remark.* In striking contrast to (2), (4) shows that  $p$ -adic valuations of the coefficients  $C(p^m)$  are completely determined by that of  $C(p)$ . Because of this disparity, without CM the functions  $g(z)$  are no longer  $p$ -adic limits of  $F(z)$  under applications of the  $U(p)$ -operator. However, replacing the  $U(p)$ -operator with the Hecke operator  $T_k(p^m)$  yields a  $p$ -adic limit analogous to (1), namely

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F | T_k(p^m)}{C(p^m)} = g. \quad (6)$$

*Remark.* Similar  $p$ -adic limits to (6) (involving the Hecke operator  $T_k(p^n)$ ) exist in the context of Weierstrass mock modular forms. Specifically, we refer the interested reader to Theorem 1.3 of [AGOR15].

After fixing notation and recalling standard definitions and facts about spaces of modular forms in Section 3, we first identify all possible pairs  $(k, N)$  satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3, i.e. such that  $S_k(N)$  is a one-dimensional space whose normalized form does not have CM and such that  $g_N = 0$ . This is done in Section 4, along with the construction of two families  $\phi_n$  and  $F_m$  of forms for each weight and level. These functions are pivotal to the proof of Theorem 1.3, which we provide in Section 5.

## 2. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to sincerely thank Marie Jameson for her invaluable advice and guidance, as well as Samuel Wilson for their many fruitful conversations and assistance in editing.

## 3. BACKGROUND

Here we recount several well-known facts about spaces of modular forms. Unless otherwise mentioned, most definitions and facts below can be found in a standard text on modular forms, e.g. [DS06] or [Ono04]. For a function  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  on the complex upper half-plane

and a matrix  $\gamma = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ , set

$$f(z) |_{k} \gamma := (cz + d)^{-k} f\left(\frac{az + b}{cz + d}\right).$$

For  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define  $M_k^!(N)$  to be the  $\mathbb{C}$ -vector space of functions  $f : \mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  that are holomorphic on  $\mathbb{H}$  and meromorphic at the cusps of  $\Gamma_0(N)$  and which satisfy  $f(z) |_{k} \gamma = f(z)$  for all  $\gamma = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \Gamma_0(N)$ . Furthermore, let  $M_k^\infty(N) \subseteq M_k^!(N)$  denote the forms that are holomorphic at each cusp except possibly infinity, and its cuspidal subspace of forms vanishing at each cusp except possibly infinity is denoted  $S_k^\infty(N)$ . Finally, we denote by  $M_k(N)$  the forms in  $M_k^\infty(N)$  which are holomorphic at every cusp, with  $S_k(N)$  denoting its cuspidal subspace of forms vanishing at every cusp.

Each  $f \in M_k^!(N)$  has a corresponding Fourier series (at infinity)

$$f(z) = \sum_{n \geq n_0} c(n)q^n,$$

where  $q := \exp(2\pi iz)$ . For a positive integer  $m$ , the  $U$ - and  $V$ -operators are defined on Fourier series by

$$\begin{aligned} \sum c(n)q^n | U(m) &:= \sum c(mn)q^n \\ \sum c(n)q^n | V(m) &:= \sum c(n)q^{mn}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we let  $T_k(p^n)$  be the standard Hecke operators on  $M_k^!(N)$ , whose action on  $q$ -series is given by

$$f(z) | T_k(p^n) = \sum_{j=0}^n p^{(k-1)j} f | U(p^{n-j}) | V(p^j)$$

for all primes  $p \nmid N$ . In particular, for  $p \nmid N$  prime,

$$f(z) | T_k(p) = f | U(p) + p^{k-1} f | V(p).$$

It is well-known that

$$T_k(p^n) : M_k^\infty(N) \rightarrow M_k^\infty(N)$$

for all primes  $p \nmid N$  and all  $n \geq 1$ . Moreover,  $T_k(p^n)$  restricts to the subspace  $S_k^\infty(N)$ , i.e.  $f(z) | T_k(p^n) \in S_k^\infty(N)$  whenever  $f(z) \in S_k^\infty(N)$ .

Another crucial operator on spaces of modular forms is the  $\Theta$ -operator, defined by

$$\Theta := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{d}{dz} = q \frac{d}{dq}.$$

A standard fact about the  $\Theta$ -operator is that

$$\Theta^{k-1} : M_{2-k}^{\infty}(N) \rightarrow S_k^{\infty}(N).$$

The Dedekind  $\eta$ -function is given by

$$\eta(z) := q^{1/24} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n).$$

The following criterion allows one to determine if an eta-quotient, a function of the form  $\prod_{\delta|N} \eta(\delta z)^{r_{\delta}}$  for finitely many non-zero integers  $r_{\delta}$ , is a modular form.

**Lemma 3.1** (Theorem 1.64 of [Ono04]). *Suppose that the eta-quotient  $\prod_{\delta|N} \eta(\delta z)^{r_{\delta}}$  satisfies*

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\delta|N} r_{\delta} = k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \sum_{\delta|N} \delta r_{\delta} \equiv 0 \pmod{24}, \quad \sum_{\delta|N} \frac{N}{\delta} r_{\delta} \equiv 0 \pmod{24}.$$

Then  $\prod_{\delta|N} \eta(\delta z)^{r_{\delta}} \in M_k^1(N, \chi)$ . Here  $\chi$  is the Dirichlet character given by  $\chi(n) = \left(\frac{(-1)^k s}{n}\right)$ , where  $s = \prod_{\delta|N} \delta^{r_{\delta}}$ .

Furthermore, the order of vanishing of an eta-quotient at a cusp of  $\Gamma_0(N)$  is straightforward to compute.

**Lemma 3.2** (Theorem 1.65 of [Ono04]). *The order of vanishing of the eta-quotient  $\prod_{\delta|N} \eta(\delta z)^{r_{\delta}} \in$*

$M_k^1(N)$  at  $\frac{c}{d}$  at the cusp  $\frac{c}{d}$  of  $\Gamma_0(N)$  is given by

$$\frac{N}{24} \sum_{\delta|N} \frac{\gcd(d, \delta)^2 r_{\delta}}{\gcd(d, \frac{N}{d}) d \delta}.$$

*Remark.* While Lemma 3.2 is stated in a slightly general way to treat modular forms with character, all forms we will need turn out to have trivial character, i.e. the Dirichlet character  $\chi$  given above is trivial modulo  $N$ . In this case  $\chi = \chi_{\text{triv}}$  is omitted from the notation; that is,  $M_k^1(N, \chi_{\text{triv}}) = M_k^1(N)$ .

#### 4. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

As shown by Hanson and Jameson ([HJ22]), if  $\dim(S_k(N)) = 1$  then it must be the case that  $N \leq 241.5$ ; in addition, we note that also  $k \leq 10$  if  $N > 1$  and  $k \leq 26$  if  $N = 1$ . Using Sage to quickly inspect these possibilities, we find that there are 29 spaces for which  $\dim(S_k(N)) = 1$ . Table 1 below lists the pairs  $(k, N)$  of weight and levels of these spaces, respectively, along with the unique normalized cusp form  $g(z) \in S_k(N)$  and the genus  $g_N$  of the modular curve  $X_0(N)$ . Here  $E_{2k}(z)$  is the normalized Eisenstein series of weight  $2k$ ,  $\Delta(z) := \frac{E_4^3(z) - E_6^2(z)}{1728}$  is the modular discriminant of weight 12, and  $j(z) := \frac{E_4^3(z)}{\Delta(z)}$  is Klein's  $j$ -invariant.

Henceforth, we refer to pairs  $(k, N)$  for which the normalized  $g(z) \in S_k(N)$  does not have CM as non-CM pairs. Notice that the spaces of genus 1 are exactly those of weight 2, so spaces  $S_k(N)$  satisfying the hypotheses of Theorem 1.3 are equivalent to non-CM pairs with  $k \geq 4$ .

$(k, N)$	normalized $g \in S_k(N)$	CM?	$g_N$
(2, 11)	$\eta(z)^2\eta(11z)^2 = q - 2q^2 - q^3 + 2q^4 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 14)	$\eta(z)\eta(2z)\eta(7z)\eta(14z) = q - q^2 - 2q^3 + q^4 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 15)	$\eta(z)\eta(3z)\eta(5z)\eta(15z) = q - q^2 - q^3 - q^4 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 17)	$q - q^2 - q^4 - 2q^5 + 4q^7 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 19)	$q - 2q^3 - 2q^4 + 3q^5 - q^7 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 20)	$\eta(2z)^2\eta(10z)^2 = q - 2q^3 - q^5 + 2q^7 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 21)	$q - q^2 + q^3 - q^4 - 2q^5 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 24)	$\eta(2z)\eta(4z)\eta(6z)\eta(12z) = q - q^3 - 2q^5 + q^9 + \dots$	no	1
(2, 27)	$\eta(3z)^2\eta(9z)^2 = q - 2q^4 - q^7 + 5q^{13} + \dots$	yes	1
(2, 32)	$\eta(4z)^2\eta(8z)^2 = q - 2q^5 - 3q^9 + 6q^{13} + \dots$	yes	1
(2, 36)	$\eta(6z)^4 = q - 4q^7 + 2q^{13} + 8q^{19} + \dots$	yes	1
(2, 49)	$q + q^2 - q^4 - 3q^8 - 3q^9 + \dots$	yes	1
(4, 5)	$\eta(z)^4\eta(5z)^4 = q - 4q^2 + 2q^3 + 8q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(4, 6)	$\eta(z)^2\eta(2z)^2\eta(3z)^2\eta(6z)^2 = q - 2q^2 - 3q^3 + 4q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(4, 7)	$\frac{\eta(z)^5\eta(7z)^5}{\eta(2z)\eta(14z)} + 4\eta(z)^2\eta(2z)^2\eta(7z)^2\eta(14z)^2 = q - q^2 - 2q^3 - 7q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(4, 8)	$\eta(2z)^4\eta(4z)^4 = q - 4q^3 - 2q^5 + 24q^7 + \dots$	no	0
(4, 9)	$\eta(3z)^8 = q - 8q^4 + 20q^7 - 70q^{13} + \dots$	yes	0
(6, 3)	$\eta(z)^6\eta(3z)^6 = q - 6q^2 + 9q^3 + 4q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(6, 4)	$\eta(2z)^{12} = q - 12q^3 + 54q^5 - 88q^7 + \dots$	no	0
(6, 5)	$q + 2q^2 - 4q^3 - 28q^4 + 25q^5 + \dots$	no	0
(8, 2)	$\eta(z)^8\eta(2z)^8 = q - 8q^2 + 12q^3 + 64q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(8, 3)	$\eta(z)^6\eta(3z)^4(\eta(z)^3 + 9\eta(9z)^3)^2 = q + 6q^2 - 27q^3 - 92q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(10, 2)	$\frac{\eta(2z)^{28}}{\eta(4z)^8} + 16\eta(z)^8\eta(2z)^4\eta(4z)^8 = q + 16q^2 - 156q^3 + 256q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(12, 1)	$\Delta(z) = q - 24q^2 + 252q^3 - 1472q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(16, 1)	$\Delta(z)E_4(z) = q + 216q^2 - 3348q^3 + 13888q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(18, 1)	$\Delta(z)E_6(z) = q - 528q^2 - 4284q^3 + 147712q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(20, 1)	$\Delta(z)E_4^2(z) = q + 456q^2 + 50652q^3 - 316352q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(22, 1)	$\Delta(z)E_4(z)E_6(z) = q - 288q^2 - 128844q^3 - 2014208q^4 + \dots$	no	0
(26, 1)	$\Delta(z)E_4^2(z)E_6(z) = q - 48q^2 - 195804q^3 - 33552128q^4 + \dots$	no	0

TABLE 1. List of  $(k, N)$  with  $\dim(S_k(N)) = 1$ .

The following proposition establishes, for each non-CM pair  $(k, N)$  with  $k \geq 4$ , the existence two modular families  $F_m$  and  $\phi_n$ . Once these families are constructed, the proof of Theorem 1.3 may be carried out in a general way, so as to handle all such cases simultaneously.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $(k, N)$  be a non-CM pair with  $k \geq 4$ .*

(a) *For all integers  $n \geq 2$ , there exists  $\phi_n \in M_{2-k}^\infty(N) \cap \mathbb{Z}((q))$  of the form*

$$\phi_n = q^{-n} + \sum_{m=-1}^{\infty} A_n(m)q^m.$$

(b) *For all integers  $m \geq -1$ , there exists a unique  $F_m \in S_k^\infty(N) \cap \mathbb{Z}((q))$  of the form*

$$F_m = -q^{-m} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} C_m(n)q^n.$$

(c) *Let  $F := F_1 = \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} C(n)q^n$  and  $p \nmid N$  be prime. Then*

$$F | T_k(p^n) = p^{(k-1)n} F_{p^n} + C(p^n)g$$

*for all integers  $n \geq 0$ .*

*Proof.* (a) We begin by defining  $\phi_2$  explicitly for each pair  $(k, N)$ , as well as a modular function  $L \in M_0^\infty(N)$  with a simple pole at infinity. We then define  $\phi_n$  for  $n \geq 3$  inductively by taking appropriate linear combinations of  $\phi_{n-1}L, \phi_{n-1}, \dots, \phi_2$ . For example, for the pair  $(8, 2)$  we have

$$\phi_3 = \phi_2 L + 104\phi_2 = q^{-3} - 2980q^{-1} + 146432 - 3896490q + \dots$$

$$\phi_4 = \phi_3 L + 24\phi_3 + 2704\phi_2 = q^{-4} - 71936q^{-1} + 3793608 - 12159360q + \dots,$$

and so on. Table 2 gives an explicit description of all required  $L$  and  $\phi_2$ . Most of these functions are eta-quotients, in which case their modular behavior is readily verified by Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2. For two pairs  $(k, N)$  in which this is not possible, we let  $b_{2,N}(z)$  denote the unique normalized form in the one-dimensional spaces  $M_2(N)$ ;  $\phi_2$  is then defined as the product of  $b_{2,N}(z)$  with an eta-quotient, whose modularity is again checked by the aforementioned lemmas. Note that these functions  $b_{2,N}(z)$  are able to be described explicitly using theta functions, but we avoid doing so here so as to not introduce excess notation.

(b) Similarly, let  $F_{-1} := -g$  and inductively define  $F_m$  for  $m \geq 0$  as linear combinations of  $F_{n-1}L, F_{n-1}, \dots, F_{-1}$ . For example, in the case of the pair  $(8, 2)$

$$F_0 = F_{-1}L + 32F_{-1} = -1 - 224q^2 + 4096q^3 - 31200q^4 + \dots$$

$$F_1 = F_0L + 24F_0 - 500F_{-1} = -q^{-1} + 2144q^2 - 98226q^3 + 1817856q^4 + \dots,$$

and so on.

To show uniqueness, suppose two such  $F_m$  exist, say  $F_m$  and  $F'_m$ . Then  $F_m - F'_m$  must be of the form  $O(q^2) \in S_k(N)$ , but  $g = q + O(q^2)$  spans  $S_k(N)$ , and thus  $F_m - F'_m = 0$ .

(c) The proof is identical to that of Proposition 3(c) of [HJ22]. □

$(k, N)$	$L \in M_0^\infty(N)$	$\phi_2 \in M_{2-k}^\infty(N)$
(12, 1)	$j(z) = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + \dots$	$\frac{E_4^2(z)E_6(z)}{\Delta(z)^2} = q^{-2} + 24q^{-1} - 196560 + \dots$
(16, 1)	$j(z) = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + \dots$	$\frac{E_4(z)E_6(z)}{\Delta(z)^2} = q^{-2} - 216q^{-1} - 146880 + \dots$
(18, 1)	$j(z) = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + \dots$	$\frac{E_4^2(z)}{\Delta(z)^2} = q^{-2} + 528q^{-1} + 86184 + \dots$
(20, 1)	$j(z) = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + \dots$	$\frac{E_6(z)}{\Delta(z)^2} = q^{-2} - 456q^{-1} - 39600 + \dots$
(22, 1)	$j(z) = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + \dots$	$\frac{E_4(z)}{\Delta(z)^2} = q^{-2} + 288q^{-1} + 14904 + \dots$
(26, 1)	$j(z) = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + \dots$	$\frac{1}{\Delta(z)^2} = q^{-2} + 48q^{-1} + 1224 + \dots$
(8, 2)	$\frac{\eta(z)^{24}}{\eta(2z)^{24}} = q^{-1} - 24 + 276q + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(z)^{80}}{\eta(2z)^{64}} = q^{-2} - 80q^{-1} + 3144 - 80960q + \dots$
(10, 2)	$\frac{\eta(z)^{24}}{\eta(2z)^{24}} = q^{-1} - 24 + 276q + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(z)^{16}}{\eta(2z)^{32}} = q^{-2} - 16q^{-1} + 136 + \dots$
(6, 3)	$\frac{\eta(z)^{12}}{\eta(3z)^{12}} = q^{-1} - 12 + 54q + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(z)^6}{\eta(3z)^{18}} b_{2,3}(z) = q^{-2} + 6q^{-1} - 27 - 68q + \dots$
(8, 3)	$\frac{\eta(z)^{12}}{\eta(3z)^{12}} = q^{-1} - 12 + 54q + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(z)^6}{\eta(3z)^{18}} = q^{-2} - 6q^{-1} + q + 28q + \dots$
(6, 4)	$\frac{\eta(z)^8}{\eta(4z)^8} = q^{-1} - 8 + 20q - 62q^3 + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(2z)^8}{\eta(4z)^{16}} = q^{-2} - 8 + 36q^2 - 128q^4 + \dots$
(4, 5)	$\frac{\eta(z)^6}{\eta(5z)^6} = q^{-1} - 6 + 9q + 10q^2 + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(z)^2}{\eta(5z)^{10}} b_{2,5}(z) = q^{-2} + 4q^{-1} + 5 - 16q + \dots$
(6, 5)	$\frac{\eta(z)^6}{\eta(5z)^6} = q^{-1} - 6 + 9q + 10q^2 + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(z)^2}{\eta(5z)^{10}} = q^{-2} - 2q^{-1} - 1 + 2q + \dots$
(4, 6)	$\frac{\eta(z)^5 \eta(3z)}{\eta(2z) \eta(6z)^5} = q^{-1} - 5 + 6q + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(2z)^4 \eta(3z)^6}{\eta(z)^2 \eta(6z)^{12}} = q^{-2} + 2q^{-1} + 1 - 4q + \dots$
(4, 7)	$\frac{\eta(z)^4}{\eta(7z)^4} = q^{-1} - 4 + 2q + 8q^2 + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(z)^2}{10\eta(7z)^{14}} \left( \frac{E_4(z) - E_4(7z)}{240} - g \right) = q^{-2} + q^{-1} + \dots$
(4, 8)	$\frac{\eta(4z)^{12}}{\eta(2z)^4 \eta(8z)^8} = q^{-1} + 4q + 2q^3 + \dots$	$\frac{\eta(4z)^4}{\eta(8z)^8} = q^{-2} - 4q^2 + 10q^6 - 24q^{10} + \dots$

TABLE 2. Defining  $L$  and  $\phi_2$  for  $(k, N)$ ,  $k \geq 4$ .

For non-CM pairs with  $k \geq 4$ , the coefficients of  $F_m$  and  $\phi_n$  satisfy a property known as Zagier duality. Along with the uniqueness of the functions  $F_m$  established in Proposition 4.1(b), the duality of these coefficients immediately implies that the functions  $\phi_n$  are also uniquely defined in such cases.

**Lemma 4.2.** *Let  $(k, N)$  be a non-CM pair with  $k \geq 4$ , and let  $\phi_n = q^{-n} + \sum_{m \geq -1} A_n(m)q^m \in M_{2-k}^\infty(N)$  and  $F_m = -q^{-m} + \sum_{n \geq 2} C_m(n)q^n \in S_k^\infty(N)$  be as above. Then for all  $n \geq 2$  and all  $m \geq -1$ , we have*

$$C_m(n) = A_n(m).$$

*Proof.* Zagier duality for the canonical bases of  $S_k^\infty(N)$  and  $M_{2-k}^\infty(N)$  has been established for all  $N$  of genus 0. Specifically, we refer to a collection of works by Jenkins and collaborators, such as [JT14], [HJ14],[IJW17], [JT17], and [JM19].  $\square$

### 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.3

We are now equipped to prove our main theorem. Fix a non-CM pair  $(k, N)$  with  $k \geq 4$ , and let  $p \nmid N$  be a prime such that  $p \nmid a(p)$  and  $v_p(C(p)) \leq k - 1$ . We first show that (4) holds, from which (5) will quickly follow.

From Proposition 4.1(a),  $\phi_p$  is of the form

$$\phi_p = q^{-p} + \sum_{n=-1}^{\infty} A_p(n)q^n.$$

Since  $k$  is even,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) &= -p^{k-1}q^{-p} - A_p(-1)q^{-1} + A_p(1)q + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^{k-1}A_p(n)q^n \\ &= -p^{k-1}q^{-p} - C_{-1}(p)q^{-1} + C_1(p)q + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^{k-1}A_p(n)q^n \\ &= -p^{k-1}q^{-p} + a(p)q^{-1} + C(p)q + O(q^2), \end{aligned}$$

by the Zagier duality established in Lemma 4.2. From Proposition 4.1(c), we also have

$$\begin{aligned} F \mid T_k(p) &= p^{k-1}F_p + C(p)g \\ &= -p^{k-1}q^{-p} + C(p)q + O(q^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$F \mid T_k(p) - \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) = -a(p)q^{-1} + O(q^2) \in S_k^\infty(\Gamma_0(N)),$$

so by the uniqueness established in Proposition 4.1(b), this difference must be

$$a(p)F = a(p)F_1 = -a(p)q^{-1} + O(q^2).$$

Set  $a := a(p)$  for ease of notation and rearrange so that

$$F \mid U(p) = \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) + aF - p^{k-1}F \mid V(p).$$

Since  $F \mid V(p) \mid U(p) = F$ , we see

$$\begin{aligned} F \mid U(p^2) &= F \mid U(p) \mid U(p) \\ &= \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) \mid U(p) + aF \mid U(p) - p^{k-1}F \mid V(p) \mid U(p) \\ &= \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) \mid U(p) + a[\Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) + aF - p^{k-1}F \mid V(p)] - p^{k-1}F \\ &= \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) \mid U(p) + a\Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) + (a^2 - p^{k-1})F - ap^{k-1}F \mid V(p) \end{aligned}$$

Continuing to apply  $U(p)$  this way, we write

$$F \mid U(p^m) = \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \alpha_{i,m} \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) \mid U(p^i) \right] + \beta_m F + \gamma_m F \mid V(p). \quad (7)$$



for coefficients  $\alpha_{i,m}, \beta_m, \gamma_m$ . We now determine  $\alpha_{i,m}, \beta_m$ , and  $\gamma_m$ , as (4) will follow by comparing the coefficients of  $q$  in (7). Observe

$$\begin{aligned} F | U(p^{m+1}) &= F | U(p^m) | U(p) = \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \alpha_{i,m} \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) | U(p^{i+1}) \right] + \beta_m F | U(p) + \gamma_m F \\ &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{i-1,m} \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) | U(p^i) \right] + \beta_m (\Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) + aF - p^{k-1}F | V(p)) + \gamma_m F \\ &= \beta_m \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) + \left[ \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_{i-1,m} \Theta^{k-1}(\phi_p) | U(p^i) \right] + (a\beta_m + \gamma_m) F - p^{k-1}\beta_m F | V(p). \end{aligned}$$

As such, the coefficients  $\alpha_{i,m}, \beta_m$ , and  $\gamma_m$  satisfy the recurrences

$$\alpha_{i,m+1} = \begin{cases} \beta_m, & i = 0 \\ \alpha_{i-1,m}, & i \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

$$\beta_{m+1} = a\beta_m + \gamma_m \quad (9)$$

$$\gamma_{m+1} = -p^{k-1}\beta_m. \quad (10)$$

Notice that applying (8) inductively yields  $\alpha_{i,m+1} = \beta_{m-i}$ , and by substituting (10) into (9) we find

$$\beta_{m+1} = a\beta_m - p^{k-1}\beta_{m-1}.$$

This second-order recurrence can be solved to yield the explicit formula

$$\beta_m = \frac{(a + \sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}})^{m+1} - (a - \sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}})^{m+1}}{2^{m+1}\sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}}}.$$

From the Binomial Theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_m &= \frac{1}{2^{m+1}\sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}}} \sum_{i=0}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{i} a^{m+1-i} \left( \sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}}^i - (-1)^i \sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}}^i \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m \sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}}} \sum_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \text{ odd}}}^{m+1} \binom{m+1}{i} a^{m+1-i} \sqrt{a^2 - 4p^{k-1}}^i \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{\substack{i=0 \\ i \text{ even}}}^m \binom{m+1}{i+1} a^{m-i} (a^2 - 4p^{k-1})^{i/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \binom{m+1}{2i+1} a^{m-2i} (a^2 - 4p^{k-1})^i \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \binom{m+1}{2i+1} a^{m-2i} \sum_{j=0}^i \binom{i}{j} (a^2)^{i-j} (-4p^{k-1})^j \\ &= \frac{1}{2^m} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \sum_{i=j}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \binom{m+1}{2i+1} \binom{i}{j} (-4)^j a^{m-2j} p^{(k-1)j}. \end{aligned}$$

As such, we may write

$$\beta_m = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} c_{m,j} p^{(k-1)j}, \quad (11)$$

where

$$c_{m,j} := \frac{(-4)^j a^{m-2j}}{2^m} \sum_{i=j}^{\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor} \binom{m+1}{2i+1} \binom{i}{j}. \quad (12)$$

Now we compare the coefficients of  $q$  in (7) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} C(p^m) &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \alpha_{i,m} p^{(k-1)i} A_p(p^i) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \beta_{m-i-1} p^{(k-1)i} A_p(p^i) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \beta_i p^{(k-1)(m-i-1)} A_p(p^{m-i-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} c_{i,j} p^{(k-1)(m+j-i-1)} A_p(p^{m-i-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

thanks to (11).

If  $m = 1$ , we have nothing to prove, so assume  $m \geq 2$ . Notice that  $m + j - i - 1 \geq 1$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$  and  $0 \leq j \leq \lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor$ , except for when  $i = m - 1$  and  $j = 0$ . Hence, all terms in the double sum of (13) are divisible by at least  $p^{k-1}$ , other than  $c_{m-1,0} A_p(1)$ . But by (12)

$$c_{m-1,0} A_p(1) = \frac{a^{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{m-1}{2} \rfloor} \binom{m}{2i+1} A_p(1) = \frac{a^{m-1}}{2^{m-1}} \cdot 2^{m-1} A_p(1) = a^{m-1} C(p),$$

using Lemma 4.2. Now since  $p \nmid a$  by assumption,

$$v_p(c_{m-1,0} A_p(1)) = v_p(a^{m-1} C(p)) = v_p(C(p)) \leq k - 1.$$

Therefore,  $v_p(C(p^m)) = v_p(C(p))$ , which completes the proof of (4).

To establish (5), note that from Proposition 4.1

$$\frac{F \mid T_k(p^m)}{C(p^m)} - g = \frac{p^{(k-1)m} F_{p^m}}{C(p^m)}.$$

Thus clearly

$$v_p \left( \frac{F \mid T_k(p^m)}{C(p^m)} - g \right) = v_p \left( \frac{p^{(k-1)m} F_{p^m}}{C(p^m)} \right) = (k-1)m - v_p(C(p^m)) = (k-1)m - v_p(C(p)),$$

thanks to (4). Note that equality holds since  $p \nmid F_{p^m}$ , as the coefficient of  $q^{p^m}$  in  $F_{p^m}$  is  $-1$ .

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

By coupling Theorem 1.3 with Hanson and Jameson's main result (Theorem 1 of [HJ22]),  $p$ -adic limits have been established for a large portion of cusp forms in one-dimensional spaces  $S_k(N)$ . More precisely, only  $p$ -adic limits for non-CM forms of weight 2 remain to be shown. While such limits appear to hold computationally, our present approach is not equipped to handle these cases. The main difficulty in treating weight 2 forms stems from the potential lack of Zagier duality for levels  $N$  with  $g_N = 1$ . In these cases, for a prime  $p$  one has to construct  $\phi_p$  of the form

$$\phi_p = q^{-p} + a(p)q^{-1} + C + C(p)q + O(q^2)$$

for some constant  $C$ , rather than leveraging duality to guarantee that  $A_p(-1) = C_{-1}(p) = a(p)$  and  $A_p(1) = C_1(p) = C(p)$ . However, once these  $\phi_n$  are constructed, the proof technique in Section 5 will immediately apply.

One could also investigate cusp forms without CM lying in spaces of dimension larger than 1. For instance, in this direction Dicks ([Dic22]) proved  $p$ -adic limits for all weight 2 newforms in one-dimensional cuspidal subspaces that are expressible as eta-quotients. It is plausible that Dicks' methods could be adapted to handle newforms without CM, perhaps even in the few remaining  $\dim(S_k(N)) = 1$  cases.

## REFERENCES

- [AGOR15] Claudia Alfes, Michael Griffin, Ken Ono, and Larry Rolen. Weierstrass mock modular forms and elliptic curves. *Res. number theory*, 1:24, 2015.
- [AS16] Scott Ahlgren and Detchat Samart. A note on cusp forms as  $p$ -adic limits. *Journal of Number Theory*, 168:360–373, 2016.
- [Dic22] Robert Dicks. Weight 2 cm newforms as  $p$ -adic limits. *The Ramanujan journal*, 58:1321–1322, 2022.
- [DS06] Fred Diamond and Jerry Shurman. *A First Course in Modular Forms*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer New York, 2006.
- [EGO10] Ahmad El-Guindy and Ken Ono. Gauss's  ${}_2F_1$  hypergeometric function and the congruent number elliptic curve. *Acta Arithmetica*, 144:231–239, 01 2010.
- [GKO10] Pavel Guerzhoy, Zachary Kent, and Ken Ono.  $p$ -adic coupling of mock modular forms and shadows. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 107(14):6169–6174, 2010.
- [HJ14] Andrew Haddock and Paul Jenkins. Zeros of weakly holomorphic modular forms of level 4. *International Journal of Number Theory*, 10(02):455–470, 2014.
- [HJ22] Michael Hanson and Marie Jameson. Cusp forms as  $p$ -adic limits. *Journal of Number Theory*, 234:349–362, 2022.
- [IJW17] Victoria Iba, Paul Jenkins, and Merrill Warnick. Divisibility properties of coefficients of modular functions in genus zero levels. *Integers*, 19:A7, 2017.
- [JM19] Paul Jenkins and Grant Molnar. Zagier duality for level  $p$  weakly holomorphic modular forms. *The Ramanujan Journal*, 50, 10 2019.
- [JT14] Paul Jenkins and DJ Thornton. Congruences for coefficients of modular functions. *The Ramanujan journal*, 38:619–628, 2014.
- [JT17] Paul Jenkins and DJ Thornton. Weakly holomorphic modular forms in prime power levels of genus zero. *Integers*, 18:A18, 2017.
- [Ono04] Ken Ono. *The Web of Modularity: Arithmetic of the Coefficients of Modular Forms and  $q$ -series: Arithmetic of the Coefficients of Modular Forms and  $Q$ -series*. Regional conference series in mathematics. American Mathematical Society, 2004.