

**SMALLEST COMMON DENOMINATORS FOR THE  
HOMOGENEOUS COMPONENTS OF THE  
BAKER–CAMPBELL–HAUSDORFF SERIES**

**Harald Hofstätter**

*Reitschachersiedlung 4/6, 7100 Neusiedl am See, Austria*  
hofi@harald-hofstaetter.at

**Abstract**

In a recent paper the author derived a formula for calculating common denominators for the homogeneous components of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff (BCH) series. In the present work it is proved that this formula actually yields the smallest such common denominators. In an appendix a new efficient algorithm for computing coefficients of the BCH series is presented, which is based on these common denominators, and requires only integer arithmetic rather than less efficient rational arithmetic.

**1. Introduction**

We continue the investigations from our recent paper [5] on the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff (BCH) series, which is formally defined as the element

$$H = \log(e^A e^B) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} (e^A e^B - 1)^k = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} \left( \sum_{i+j>0} \frac{1}{i!j!} A^i B^j \right)^k$$

in the ring  $\mathbb{Q}\langle\langle A, B \rangle\rangle$  of formal power series in the non-commuting variables  $A$  and  $B$  with rational coefficients. The BCH series can be written as a sum  $H = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} H_n$  of homogeneous components

$$H_n = \sum_{w \in \{A, B\}^n} h_w w, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where  $\{A, B\}^n$  denotes the finite set of all words  $w = w_1 \cdots w_n$  ( $w_i \in \{A, B\}$ ) of length (degree)  $n$  over the alphabet  $\{A, B\}$ , and  $h_w = \text{coeff}(w, H)$  denotes the coefficient of such a word in  $H$ . The main result of the present paper is the following strengthening of Theorem 1 of [5] on common denominators for these homogeneous components  $H_n$ .

**Theorem 1.** *For  $n \geq 1$  and prime  $p \geq 2$ , let*

$$l(n, p) = \max\{t : p^t \leq s_p(n)\} = \lfloor \log_p(s_p(n)) \rfloor, \tag{1}$$

where  $s_p(n) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_r$  is the sum of the digits in the  $p$ -adic expansion  $n = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 p + \dots + \alpha_r p^r$ ,  $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq p - 1$ . Define

$$d_n = \prod_{p \text{ prime, } p < n} p^{l(n,p)}, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots \quad (2)$$

Then  $n! d_n$  is the smallest common denominator of all coefficients of words of length  $n$  in the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff series  $H = \log(e^A e^B)$ , or, equivalently,<sup>1</sup>

$$\text{lcm}\{\text{denom}(\text{coeff}(w, H)) : w \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^n\} = n! d_n. \quad (3)$$

The weaker statement that  $n! d_n$  is a (not necessarily the smallest) common denominator, or, equivalently,

$$\text{lcm}\{\text{denom}(\text{coeff}(w, H)) : w \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^n\} \mid n! d_n \quad (4)$$

was proved in [5], where it was also proved that

$$n! d_n = \text{lcm}\{k j_1! \cdots j_k! : j_i \geq 1, j_1 + \dots + j_k = n, k = 1, \dots, n\}. \quad (5)$$

The first few values of  $d_n$  are

$$d_n = 1, 1, 2, 1, 6, 2, 6, 3, 10, 2, 6, 2, 210, 30, 12, 3, 30, 10, 210, 42, 330, 30, 60, 30, 546, \dots,$$

see [11, A338025].

For the proof of Theorem 1 we explicitly construct, for each degree  $n$  and each prime  $p \geq 2$ , a specific word  $w(n, p) \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^n$ , for which

$$v_p(\text{denom}(\text{coeff}(w(n, p), H))) = v_p(n!) + l(n, p) = v_p(n! d_n), \quad (6)$$

where  $v_p(k)$  denotes the exponent of the highest power of  $p$  that divides  $k$ . Since  $v_p(\text{denom}(\text{coeff}(w, H))) \leq v_p(n! d_n)$ ,  $w \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^n$  by (4), this implies

$$\max_{w \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^n} v_p(\text{denom}(\text{coeff}(w, H))) = v_p(n! d_n), \quad p \geq 2 \text{ prime}, \quad (7)$$

and thus (3) by unique factorization. An overview of the construction of  $w(n, p)$  is provided by Algorithm 1.<sup>2</sup> The details of the proof of Theorem 1 are given in Section 2. Although these details may seem rather long and technical, the proof still has a certain appeal as it uses classical results of Lucas, von Staudt and Clausen,

<sup>1</sup>Here,  $\text{lcm } \mathcal{M}$  denotes the *least common multiple* of the elements of the finite set  $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $\text{denom}(r)$  for  $r \in \mathbb{Q}$  is defined as the smallest positive integer  $d$  such that  $r \cdot d \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In particular,  $\text{denom}(0) = 1$ .

<sup>2</sup>Algorithm 1 serves as a guide for the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 2. It is detailed enough for a direct implementation in a computer algebra system. In particular, it yields a definite  $w(n, p)$  for which the discussion in Section 2 would allow several possibilities.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Construction of a specific word  $w(n, p)$  that satisfies (6)

---

**Input:**  $n \geq 1$  and  $p \geq 2$  prime

**Output:**  $(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  such that  $w(n, p) = \mathbf{A}^{q_1} \mathbf{B}^{q_2} \mathbf{A}^{q_3} \dots (\mathbf{A} \vee \mathbf{B})^{q_m}$  satisfies (6)

```

1 Determine  $r, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_r$  such that  $n = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 p + \dots + \alpha_r p^r, 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq p - 1$ 
2  $s := \alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_r$  //  $s = s_p(n)$ 
3  $l := \lfloor \log_p(s) \rfloor$  //  $l = l(n, p)$  as defined in (1)
4 if  $l = 0$ 
5   if  $n < p$  // see the paragraph after Remark 2
6     if  $n = 1$ 
7       return (1)
8     else if  $n = 2$  or  $n$  odd
9       return  $(n - 1, 1)$ 
10    else
11      return  $(n - 2, 2)$ 
12    end
13  else // define  $k$  as in Lemma 1
14     $k := p^{r-1}(p - 1)$ 
15    return  $(n - k, k)$ 
16  end
17 else if  $l = 1$  // define  $k$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $p - 1 \mid k$  as in Lemma 2
18    $h := p - 1$ 
19    $i := 0$ 
20   while  $h > 0$ 
21      $\beta_i := \min\{h, \alpha_i\}$ 
22      $h := h - \beta_i$ 
23      $i := i + 1$ 
24   end
25    $k := \beta_0 + \beta_1 p + \dots + \beta_{i-1} p^{i-1}$ 
26   return  $(n - k, k)$ 
27 else // define  $(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  as in Section 2.2
28   if  $p = 2$  or  $n$  odd
29      $m := p^l$  //  $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  in (20) for  $p = 2$  or  $n$  odd
30   else
31      $m := p^l + 1$  //  $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  in (21) for  $p \neq 2$ 
32   end
33    $(b_1, \dots, b_s) := (\underbrace{p^0, \dots, p^0}_{\alpha_0}, \underbrace{p^1, \dots, p^1}_{\alpha_1}, \dots, \underbrace{p^r, \dots, p^r}_{\alpha_r})$ 
34   return  $(b_m + b_{m+1} + \dots + b_s, b_{m-1}, b_{m-2}, \dots, b_1)$ 
35 end

```

---

Hermite and Bachmann, Glaisher, etc. on divisibility and congruence properties of binomial coefficients, Bernoulli numbers and Stirling numbers of the second kind.

In Section 3 we illustrate some of our results of Section 2 by explicit computations. These computations are based on a new efficient algorithm for the computation of coefficients of the BCH series, which is described in detail in the appendix, and which uses the common denominators  $n!d_n$  in an essential way. This brings us back to our original motivation for the investigation of such common denominators in [5]. The algorithm can be implemented in a straightforward way, it performs all computations in integer arithmetic, and, unlike the algorithm described in [12], it requires no symbolic manipulation software.

## 2. Proof of Theorem 1

We base our investigations on explicit formulas due to Goldberg [3] for the coefficients of the BCH series, which are given by the following two propositions.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $w = Aw_2 \cdots w_n \in \{A, B\}^n$  be a word of degree  $n \geq 1$  starting with the letter A. Let  $q_1, \dots, q_m \geq 1$  with  $q_1 + \dots + q_m = n$  such that*

$$w = A^{q_1} B^{q_2} A^{q_3} \cdots (A \vee B)^{q_m}, \quad (8)$$

where  $A \vee B$  denotes A if  $m$  is odd and B if  $m$  is even. Then

$$\text{coeff}(w, \log(e^A e^B)) = c(q_1, \dots, q_m) = \frac{(-1)^n}{q_1! \cdots q_m!} \tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m) = \\ \sum_{k=0}^{\tilde{m}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq q_1, \\ \dots \\ 1 \leq j_m \leq q_m}} (-1)^{j_1 + \dots + j_m - k} \binom{\tilde{m}}{k} \frac{j_1! \cdots j_m!}{j_1 + \dots + j_m - k} S(q_1, j_1) \cdots S(q_m, j_m), \quad (9) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\tilde{m} = \left\lfloor \frac{m-1}{2} \right\rfloor,$$

and the  $S(q, j)$  denote Stirling numbers of the second kind defined by

$$S(q, j) = \frac{1}{j!} \sum_{i=0}^j (-1)^{j-i} \binom{j}{i} i^q. \quad (10)$$

*Proof.* The proposition follows by simple manipulations from Theorem 1 of [3], which states that (using denotations from [3])

$$\text{coeff}(w, \log(e^{\mathbf{A}}e^{\mathbf{B}})) = \int_0^1 t^{m'}(t-1)^{m''} G_{q_1}(t) \cdots G_{q_m}(t) dt,$$

where  $m' = m - \tilde{m} - 1$ ,  $m'' = \tilde{m}$ , and  $G_q(t) = \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^{q-j} \alpha_q^{(j)} t^{j-1}$ ,  $\alpha_q^{(j)} = \frac{j!}{q!} S(q, j)$ , such that

$$G_q(t) = \frac{(-1)^q}{q!} \sum_{j=1}^q (-1)^j j! S(q, j) t^{j-1}.$$

□

**Remark 1.** For words  $w = \mathbf{B}w_2 \cdots w_n$  starting with  $\mathbf{B}$  we have  $\text{coeff}(w, \log(e^{\mathbf{A}}e^{\mathbf{B}})) = (-1)^{n+1} c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  with  $q_i$  analogously defined as in (8) and  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  again given by (9), see [3]. Also note that  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  is invariant under permutations of the  $q_i$ . It follows that if  $n$  is even and  $m$  is odd, then  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m) = 0$ .

**Proposition 2.** For words of the form  $w = \mathbf{A}^{n-k} \mathbf{B}^k \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^n$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ ,  $n \geq 2$  we have

$$\text{coeff}(w, \log(e^{\mathbf{A}}e^{\mathbf{B}})) = c(n-k, k) = \frac{(-1)^{n+k}}{n!} \binom{n}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} B_{n-j}, \quad (11)$$

where  $B_n$  denote the Bernoulli numbers ( $B_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$ ).

*Proof.* See [3, Theorem 3].

□

Depending on the integer  $n \geq 1$  and the prime  $p \geq 2$  we are now going to construct specific integers  $q_1, \dots, q_m \geq 1$  which satisfy  $q_1 + \dots + q_m = n$  and

$$v_p(\text{denom}(c(q_1, \dots, q_m))) = v_p(n! d_n) = v_p(n!) + l(n, p). \quad (12)$$

Then  $\mathbf{A}^{q_1} \mathbf{B}^{q_2} \cdots (\mathbf{A} \vee \mathbf{B})^{q_m}$  defined with these integers is a suitable word  $w(p, n) \in \{\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}\}^n$  for (6), which suffices for the proof of Theorem 1.

Here and in the following  $v_p(k)$  denotes the  $p$ -adic valuation of  $k$ , i.e., the exponent of the highest power of the prime  $p$  that divides the integer  $k$ . By convention,  $v_p(0) = \infty$ . More generally, for rationals  $u/v$  with  $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $v \neq 0$  (not necessarily in lowest terms),  $v_p(u/v) = v_p(u) - v_p(v)$ . For the computation of  $v_p$  for factorials we will use Legendre's formula

$$v_p(k!) = \frac{k - s_p(k)}{p-1}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots,$$

where, as in (1),  $s_p(k)$  is the sum of the digits in the  $p$ -adic expansion of  $k$ , cf. [10].

### 2.1. The case $l(n, p) \leq 1$

We first assume  $l(n, p) \leq 1$ , i.e.,  $s_p(n) < p^2$ , and deal with the case  $l(n, p) \geq 2$  afterwards. We try to find an integer  $k$  depending on  $n, p$ , such that (12) holds with  $m = 2, q_1 = n - k, q_2 = n$ . For this we first examine the sum in (11).

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $p \geq 2$  prime,  $n \geq 2$ , and  $1 \leq k \leq n - 1$ . Let  $r$  be the unique integer such that  $r \equiv n \pmod{p-1}$  and  $0 \leq r \leq p-2$ , and let  $\tilde{k}$  be the unique integer such that  $\tilde{k} \equiv k \pmod{p-1}$  and  $1 \leq \tilde{k} \leq p-1$ .<sup>3</sup> Then there exist an integer  $a$  (unique modulo  $p$ ) and a rational number  $U, v_p(U) \geq 0$ , such that*

$$(-1)^{n+k}(n-k)!k!c(n-k, k) = \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} B_{n-j} = -\frac{a}{p} + U \quad (13)$$

and

$$a \equiv \begin{cases} \binom{\tilde{k}}{r} \pmod{p}, & \text{if } r \geq 1, \\ 1 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } r = 0, p-1 \mid k, \\ 0 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } r = 0, p-1 \nmid k. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

*Proof.* The Bernoulli numbers can be written in the form

$$B_n = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{p} + U_n, & \text{if } p-1 \mid n, \\ U_n, & \text{if } p-1 \nmid n \end{cases} \quad \text{for some } U_n \in \mathbb{Q}, v_p(U_n) \geq 0, \quad n = 1, 2, \dots,$$

which is an easy consequence of the von Staudt–Clausen theorem, cf. [1]. This implies (13) with  $U = \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} U_{n-j}$  and

$$a = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k, \\ j \equiv r \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{k}{j}, \quad (15)$$

which for  $r \geq 1$  is  $\equiv \binom{\tilde{k}}{r} \pmod{p}$ , which is a result due to Glaisher, cf. [9, Eq. (1)]. In the case  $r = 0$  the congruence (14) follows from (15) by an application of

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq j \leq k-1, \\ j \equiv 0 \pmod{p-1}}} \binom{k}{j} \equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

a result of Hermite and Bachmann, cf. [8, Corollary 1]. (Note that here  $j \leq k-1$  instead of  $\leq k$  as before.)  $\square$

**Remark 2.** If  $p-1 \mid k$ , then we have

$$\binom{\tilde{k}}{r} = \binom{p-1}{r} = \frac{(p-1) \cdots (p-r)}{1 \cdots r} \equiv (-1)^r \equiv (-1)^n \pmod{p}$$

<sup>3</sup>Note that here  $\tilde{k} \geq 1$  is required, so that in particular  $\tilde{k} = p-1$  if  $p-1 \mid k$ .

in (14), where for the last congruence we have used  $n = q(p-1) + r$  with  $p-1$  even if  $p \geq 3$  (and  $-1 \equiv +1$  if  $p = 2$ ).

If  $n < p$ , then it follows easily from Proposition 3 that  $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  in (13), and thus  $v_p \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} B_{n-j} \right) \geq 0$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, n-1$ . Because  $v_p \left( \binom{n}{k} \right) = 0$ ,  $v_p(n!) = 0$ , and  $l(n, p) = 0$  for  $n < p$ , this implies (12) for  $n < p$  and all  $q_1 = n - k$ ,  $q_2 = k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n-1$ .<sup>4</sup>

In the following we assume  $n \geq p$ .

It follows from Proposition 3 and Remark 2 that if  $p-1 \mid k$ , then  $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  in (13), and thus  $v_p \left( \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} B_{n-j} \right) = -1$  in this case. Therefore and according to (11), it remains to find an integer  $k$  with  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$  and  $p-1 \mid k$ , for which we have  $v_p \left( \binom{n}{k} \right) = 1$  in the case  $l(n, p) = 0$ , or  $v_p \left( \binom{n}{k} \right) = 0$  in the case  $l(n, p) = 1$ . Such a  $k$  then ensures that (12) holds with  $m = 2$ ,  $q_1 = n - k$ ,  $q_2 = k$ . The following two lemmas show respectively that a suitable such  $k$  can indeed be chosen in both cases.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $p \geq 2$  prime and let  $n \geq p$  be an integer with  $p$ -adic expansion*

$$n = \alpha_r p^r + \alpha_{r-1} p^{r-1} + \dots + \alpha_0, \quad r \geq 1, \quad \alpha_r \geq 1, \quad 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq p-1,$$

where  $\alpha_{r-1} < p-1$  (which is certainly the case if  $s_p(n) < p$ ). Then

$$v_p \left( \binom{n}{p^{r-1}(p-1)} \right) = 1.$$

*Proof.* Let  $k = p^{r-1}(p-1)$ . Then  $n - k = (\alpha_r - 1)p^r + (\alpha_{r-1} + 1)p^{r-1} + \alpha_{r-2}p^{r-2} + \dots + \alpha_0$ , and thus

$$\begin{aligned} v_p \left( \binom{n}{k} \right) &= \frac{1}{p-1} (s_p(k) + s_p(n-k) - s_p(n)) \\ &= \frac{1}{p-1} ((p-1) + (\alpha_r - 1) + (\alpha_{r-1} + 1) + \alpha_{r-2} + \dots + \alpha_0 - (\alpha_r + \dots + \alpha_0)) \\ &= 1. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $p \geq 2$  prime and let  $n \geq 1$  be an integer with  $p$ -adic expansion*

$$n = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 p + \dots + \alpha_r p^r, \quad 0 \leq \alpha_i \leq p-1.$$

*If an integer  $k \geq 0$  has a  $p$ -adic expansion of the special form*

$$k = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p + \dots + \beta_r p^r, \quad 0 \leq \beta_i \leq \alpha_i, \quad (16)$$

<sup>4</sup>For even  $n \geq 4$  we have  $c(n-k, k) = 0$  for  $k = 1$  and  $k = n-1$ , so that in this case (12) holds by the convention  $\text{denom}(0) = 1$ . If we want to avoid this convention, we can consider  $k = 2$  instead, since  $c(n-2, 2) \neq 0$  for  $n \geq 3$ .

then

$$v_p \left( \binom{n}{k} \right) = 0.$$

Furthermore, if  $s_p(n) = \alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_r \geq p$ , then there exists an integer  $k$  of the form (16) which satisfies  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$  and  $p-1 \mid k$ .

*Proof.* From the given conditions it follows that  $n-k$  has the  $p$ -adic expansion  $n-k = \sum_{i=0}^r (\alpha_i - \beta_i) p^i$ ,  $1 \leq \alpha_i - \beta_i \leq p-1$ . Thus,  $s_p(n-k) = s_p(n) - s_p(k)$  and  $v_p \left( \binom{n}{k} \right) = \frac{1}{p-1} (s_p(k) - s_p(n-k) + s_p(n)) = 0$ .

Now assume  $s_p(n) = \alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_r \geq p$ . Choose integers  $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_r$  such that  $0 \leq \beta_i \leq \alpha_i$  and  $\beta_0 + \dots + \beta_r = p-1$  and define  $k$  according to (16). Note that this is possible because  $p-1 < \alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_r$ . Then  $1 \leq k \leq n-1$  and  $k = \beta_0 + \beta_1 p + \dots + \beta_r p^r \equiv \beta_0 + \dots + \beta_r \equiv 0 \pmod{p-1}$ .  $\square$

## 2.2. The case $l(n, p) \geq 1$

Assuming  $l(n, p) \geq 1$ , i.e.,  $s_p(n) \geq p$ , we construct integers  $q_1, \dots, q_m \geq 1$  depending on  $n, p$ , and  $l = 1, \dots, l(n, p)$ , which satisfy

$$v_p(\text{denom}(c(q_1, \dots, q_m))) = v_p(n!) + l. \quad (17)$$

This is more general than strictly necessary, since for the proof of Theorem 1 it would be sufficient to consider only the case  $l = l(n, p) \geq 2$ . Notice that the case  $l(n, p) = 1$  has been dealt with previously.

We set

$$m = p^l \text{ or } m = p^l + 1.$$

Consider the  $p$ -adic expansion

$$n = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 p + \dots + \alpha_r p^r = \underbrace{p^0 + \dots + p^0}_{\alpha_0} + \underbrace{p^1 + \dots + p^1}_{\alpha_1} + \dots + \underbrace{p^r + \dots + p^r}_{\alpha_r}. \quad (18)$$

From this collection of  $\alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_r = s_p(n)$  powers of  $p$  select  $m-1$  powers  $p^{e_2}, \dots, p^{e_m}$  and define with them

$$q_2 = p^{e_2}, \dots, q_m = p^{e_m}.$$

Here, a specific exponent  $e$  occurs among the exponents  $e_2, \dots, e_m$  at most  $\alpha_e$  times. The remaining powers are collected in  $q_1$  such that

$$q_1 = n - \sum_{i=2}^m q_i,$$

which ensures that the  $q_i$  satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^m q_i = n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^m s_p(q_i) = s_p(n) = \alpha_0 + \dots + \alpha_r.$$



For this construction to be feasible, we have to assume that  $q_1 > 0$ . For  $m = p^l$  this is automatically the case, but for  $m = p^l + 1$  we have  $q_1 = 0$  if and only if  $s_p(n) = m - 1 = p^l$ , which for  $p \neq 2$  can only be the case if  $n$  is odd, because for  $p \neq 2$  and  $n$  even we have  $s_p(n)$  even but  $p^l$  odd.

If  $q_1 > 0$  can be achieved, then even  $q_1 \geq p$  is possible for suitable chosen  $q_i$ . Indeed, because  $s_p(n) \geq p > \alpha_0$  at least one of the powers in the collection of powers in (18) has exponent  $\geq 1$ . Thus, the above construction can be carried out in such a way that this power  $\geq p$  ends up as one of the remaining powers whose sum is  $q_1$ .

The following proposition shows that for each  $n \geq 1$ , prime  $p \geq 2$ , and  $l \geq 1$ , in at least one of the cases<sup>5</sup>  $m = p^l$  or  $m = p^l + 1$  the above construction leads to integers  $q_1, \dots, q_m$  which satisfy

$$\tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m) = \frac{a}{p^l} + U, \quad a \in \mathbb{Z}, a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}, \quad U \in \mathbb{Q}, v_p(U) > -l,$$

where

$$c(q_1, \dots, q_m) = \frac{(-1)^n}{q_1! \cdots q_m!} \tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m).$$

Thus,  $v_p(\text{denom}(\tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m))) = l$  for these  $q_i$ , which together with

$$v_p(q_1! \cdots q_m!) = \frac{1}{p-1} \left( \sum_{i=1}^m q_i - \sum_{i=1}^m s_p(q_i) \right) = \frac{1}{p-1} (n - s_p(n)) = v_p(n!)$$

implies (17).

**Proposition 4.** *Let  $n \geq 1$  and  $p \geq 2$  prime. Suppose  $1 \leq l \leq l(n, p)$  and let  $m = p^l$  or  $m = p^l + 1$ . If  $m = p^l + 1$ , we additionally assume that  $s_p(n) \neq p^l$  (which is automatically the case if  $n$  is even). Depending on  $n$  and  $p$  let  $q_1, \dots, q_m$  with  $q_1 \geq p$  be defined as described above. Furthermore, in the special case  $p = 2$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $m = p^l = 2$ , and  $n$  odd, we assume  $q_1 = n - 1$ ,  $q_2 = 1$ . Then there exists an integer  $a$  (unique modulo  $p$ ) and a rational number  $U$ ,  $v_p(U) > -l$ , such that  $\tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m) = (-1)^n q_1! \cdots q_m! c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  can be written as*

$$\tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m) = \frac{a}{p^l} + U. \quad (19)$$

If  $m = p^l$ , then  $a$  satisfies<sup>6</sup>

$$a \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } p = 2, \\ 0 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } p \neq 2 \text{ and } n \text{ even}, \\ 2 \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } p \neq 2 \text{ and } n \text{ odd}. \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

<sup>5</sup>More specifically, case  $m = p^l$  for  $p = 2$  or  $p \neq 2$  and  $n$  odd, and case  $m = p^l + 1$  for  $p \neq 2$  and  $n$  even.

<sup>6</sup>If  $p \neq 2$ , then  $m = p^l$  is odd. Thus, if  $p \neq 2$  and  $n$  is even, then not only  $a \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  but actually  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m) = 0$  by Remark 1.

If  $m = p^l + 1$ , then  $a$  satisfies<sup>7</sup>

$$a \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } p = 2, l = 1, n \text{ odd,} \\ 0 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } p = 2, l \geq 2 \text{ or } p = 2, l = 1, n \text{ even,} \\ -\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^{n-1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } p \neq 2. \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

*Proof.* By separating those terms in (9) whose denominators  $j_1 + \dots + j_m - k$  are multiples of  $p^l$  from the others we obtain

$$\tilde{c}(q_1, \dots, q_m) = \frac{1}{p^l} A + U_0 \quad (22)$$

with

$$A = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq j_1 \leq q_1, \\ \dots \\ 1 \leq j_m \leq q_m}} (-1)^{p^l \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor} \binom{\tilde{m}}{k(j_1, \dots, j_m)} \frac{j_1! \cdots j_m!}{\left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor} S(q_1, j_1) \cdots S(q_m, j_m) \quad (23)$$

and  $U_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $v_p(U_0) > -l$ . Here we have used that  $j_1 + \dots + j_m - k$  is a multiple of  $p^l$  if and only if

$$k = k(j_1, \dots, j_m) = j_1 + \dots + j_m \pmod{p^l} = j_1 + \dots + j_m - p^l \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor.$$

From Lemma 3 and Remark 3 below it follows that  $v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!) \geq v_p \left( \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \right)$ , where equality can only hold if

1.  $j_i \leq p - 1$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , or
2.  $p \neq 2$ ,  $l = 1$ , and there exists at least one index  $i$ ,  $2 \leq i \leq m$  such that  $j_i \in \{2, \dots, p - 1, p + 1, \dots, 2p - 1\}$ , or
3.  $p = 2$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $m = p^l = 2$ , and  $(j_1, j_2) \in \{(1, 3), (3, 1)\}$ , or
4.  $p = 2$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $m = p^l + 1 = 3$ , and  $(j_1, j_2, j_3) \in \{(1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 1), (2, 1, 1), (1, 1, 3), (1, 3, 1), (3, 1, 1)\}$ .

In the second case we have  $S(q_1, j_1) \cdots S(q_m, j_m) = S(q_1, j_1) S(p^{e_2}, j_2) \cdots S(p^{e_m}, j_m) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , which follows from the fact that the Stirling numbers of the second kind satisfy

$$S(p^e, j) \equiv \begin{cases} 0 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } j \neq p^f, f = 0, \dots, e, \\ 1 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } j = p^f, f = 0, \dots, e, \end{cases} \quad e \geq 0, j = 1, \dots, p^e, \quad (24)$$

<sup>7</sup>If  $p = 2$  and  $l \geq 1$ , then  $m = p^l + 1$  is odd. Thus, similarly as before, if  $p = 2$ ,  $l \geq 1$  and  $n$  is even, then actually  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m) = 0$ .

see [7, Theorem 4.2]. In the first case this property of the Stirling numbers implies that  $S(q_1, j_1) \cdots S(q_m, j_m) = S(q_1, j_1)S(p^{e_2}, j_2) \cdots S(p^{e_m}, j_m) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  is possible only for  $j_2 = \dots = j_m = 1$ . We have thus established that

$$v_p \left( \frac{j_1! \cdots j_m!}{\left[ \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right]} S(q_1, j_1) \cdots S(q_m, j_m) \right) \geq 0, \quad (25)$$

where for  $p \neq 2$  or  $p = 2, l \geq 2$  equality is possible only for  $j_1 \leq p - 1$  and  $j_2 = \dots = j_m = 1$ . In the latter case a simple calculation yields

$$k(j_1, 1, \dots, 1) = \begin{cases} j_1 - 1, & \text{if } m = p^l, \\ j_1, & \text{if } m = p + 1, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\left[ \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right] = 1,$$

and we have  $S(q_2, j_2) \cdots S(q_m, j_m) = 1$ . Collecting in (22), (23) the terms of  $A$  with  $j_1 \leq \min(p - 1, q_1) = p - 1$ ,<sup>8</sup>  $j_2 = \dots = j_m = 1$ , and combining the other terms (which have  $p$ -adic valuation  $> 0$ ) divided by  $p^l$  with  $U_0$ , we obtain (19) with

$$a = (-1)^p \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \binom{\tilde{m}}{k(j)} j! S(q_1, j), \quad k(j) = \begin{cases} j - 1, & \text{if } m = p^l, \\ j, & \text{if } m = p^l + 1 \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

and suitable  $U \in \mathbb{Q}$  with  $v_p(U) > -l$ .

Case  $p \neq 2$ . Because

$$\tilde{m} = \frac{p^l - 1}{2} = \frac{p - 1}{2} (1 + p + \dots + p^{l-1})$$

and  $k(j) \leq p - 1$ , Lucas's theorem, which states that

$$\binom{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 p + \dots + \alpha_r p^r}{\beta_0 + \beta_1 p + \dots + \beta_r p^r} \equiv \binom{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \binom{\alpha_1}{\beta_1} \cdots \binom{\alpha_r}{\beta_r} \pmod{p}, \quad 0 \leq \alpha_i, \beta_i \leq p - 1$$

(cf., e.g., [2]), implies

$$\binom{\tilde{m}}{k(j)} \equiv \binom{\frac{p-1}{2}}{k(j)} \pmod{p}.$$

Substituting (10) in (26) we thus obtain

$$a \equiv - \sum_i i^{q_1} (-1)^i \sum_j \binom{\frac{p-1}{2}}{k(j)} \binom{j}{i} (-1)^j \pmod{p}. \quad (27)$$

---

<sup>8</sup> $\min(p - 1, q_1) = p - 1$  because  $q_1 \geq p$  by assumption.

Using

$$\sum_{j=-\beta}^{\alpha} \binom{\alpha}{\beta+j} \binom{\gamma+j}{\delta} (-1)^j = (-1)^{\alpha+\beta} \binom{\gamma-\beta}{\delta-\alpha}, \quad \alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha \geq 0, \gamma \geq \beta$$

(cf., e.g., [4, Eq. (5.24)]), we obtain for the case  $m = p^l$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \binom{\frac{p-1}{2}}{j-1} \binom{j}{i} (-1)^j &= (-1)^{\frac{p+1}{2}} \binom{1}{i - \frac{p-1}{2}} \\ &= \begin{cases} (-1)^{\frac{p+1}{2}}, & \text{if } i = \frac{p-1}{2} \text{ or } i = \frac{p+1}{2}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and thus by substituting the sum over  $j$  in (27)

$$\begin{aligned} a &\equiv \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^{q_1} - \left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)^{q_1} \equiv \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^n - \left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right)^n \\ &\equiv \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^n (1 - (-1)^n) = \begin{cases} 2 \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^n \pmod{p}, & \text{if } n \text{ even,} \\ 0 \pmod{p}, & \text{if } n \text{ odd.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Here we used  $x^{q_1} \equiv x^n \pmod{p}$  for  $x \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , which follows from  $x^{n+1} = x^{q_1} x^{p^{e_2}} \cdots x^{p^{e_m}} x \equiv x^{q_1} x^m = x^{q_1} x^{p^l} \equiv x^{q_1+1} \pmod{p}$ , which is a consequence of Fermat's little theorem. Similarly, for the case  $m = p^l + 1$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \binom{\frac{p-1}{2}}{j} \binom{j}{i} (-1)^j = (-1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \binom{0}{i - \frac{p-1}{2}} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}}, & \text{if } i = \frac{p-1}{2}, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and thus

$$a \equiv - \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^{q_1} \equiv - \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)^{n-1} \pmod{p}.$$

*Case  $p = 2, l \geq 2$ .* In this case the sum (26) reduces to the single term with  $j = 1$  where  $S(q_1, j) = 1$ , and we obtain

$$a = \binom{\tilde{m}}{k(j)} = \binom{2^{l-1} - 1}{0} = 1 \quad \text{for } m = p^l$$

and

$$a = \binom{\tilde{m}}{k(j)} = \binom{2^{l-1}}{1} = 2^{l-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \quad \text{for } m = p^l + 1, l \geq 2.$$

*Case  $p = 2, l = 1, m = p^l = 2$ .* In this case, equality in (25) can possibly hold only for  $(j_1, j_2) \in \{(1, 1), (3, 1)\}$ , see the cases 1 and 3 above. Here we have already excluded  $(j_1, j_2) = (1, 3)$ , because  $S(q_2, 3) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  if  $q_2 = 2^{e_2} \geq 3$  by (24) (or,

alternatively, by (28) below). We define  $a$  in (19) as the sum of the terms in (23) corresponding to  $(j_1, j_2) \in \{(1, 1), (3, 1)\}$  and define  $U \in \mathbb{Q}$  accordingly. Noting  $\tilde{m} = 1$ ,  $k(3, 1) = 0$ ,  $\lfloor \frac{3+1}{2} \rfloor = 2$ , we obtain  $a \equiv S(q_1, 1) + \frac{1}{2}3!S(q_1, 3) \equiv 1 + q_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ , if  $q_1 \geq 3$ , and  $a \equiv S(q_1, 1) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  otherwise. Here, in the former case we have used

$$S(q, 3) = \frac{3^{q-1} - 1}{2} + 1 - 2^{q-1} = 1 + 3 + \dots + 3^{q-2} + 1 - 2^{q-1} \equiv q \pmod{2} \quad (28)$$

and the fact that  $q_1$  is even, which for  $n$  odd follows from the assumption  $q_1 = n - 1$ , and for  $n$  even from  $q_1 = n - q_2 = n - 2^{e_2}$  where  $e_2 \geq 1$  if  $n$  even.

*Case  $p = 2$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $m = p^l + 1 = 3$ .* In this case, besides  $q_2$  and  $q_3$ , which are powers of 2 by construction, also  $q_1$  is a power of 2. In fact,  $q_1, q_2, q_3$  are pairwise distinct powers of 2. It follows that  $n = q_1 + q_2 + q_3$  is odd if and only if  $q_i = 1$  for a single  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ . In  $v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!) \geq v_p\left(\left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor\right)$  equality is possible only for  $(j_1, j_2, j_3) \in \{(1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 1), (2, 1, 1), (1, 1, 3), (1, 3, 1), (3, 1, 1)\}$ . Because  $S(q_i, 1) = S(q_i, 2) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  and  $S(q_i, 3) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  by (24), it follows that in (25) equality holds precisely if  $(j_1, j_2, j_3) \in \{(1, 1, 1), (1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 1), (2, 1, 1)\}$ . For these  $(j_1, j_2, j_3)$  we have  $k = k(j_1, j_2, j_3) = 1$  for  $(j_1, j_2, j_3) = (1, 1, 1)$  and  $k = 0$  otherwise, and thus  $\binom{\tilde{m}}{k} = \binom{1}{k} = 1$ , so that the corresponding terms in (23) are all  $\equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Such a term appears in (23) if and only if  $j_i \leq q_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . Thus, the number of such terms is 3 if  $q_i = 1$  for one  $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ , i.e., if  $n$  is odd, and 4 otherwise. If we define  $a$  as the sum of these 3 respectively 4 terms and define  $U \in \mathbb{Q}$  accordingly, we obtain (19) with  $a \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  if  $n$  is odd and  $a \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$  if  $n$  is even.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $m = p^l$  or  $m = p^l + 1$  for  $p \geq 2$  prime and  $l \geq 1$ , and  $j_1, \dots, j_m \geq 1$ . Then*

$$v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!) \geq v_p\left(\left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor\right),$$

where equality holds precisely if

$$j_i \leq p - 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, m,$$

or

$$l = 1, \quad m = p, \quad \text{and} \quad j_k = 2p - 1, \quad j_i = p - 1, \quad i \neq k \quad \text{for some } k = 1, \dots, m, \quad (29)$$

or

$$l = 1, \quad m = p + 1, \quad p \leq j_k \leq 2p - 1, \quad 1 \leq j_i \leq p - 1, \quad i \neq k \quad \text{for some } k = 1, \dots, m, \\ \text{and} \quad p^2 \leq j_1 + \dots + j_m \leq p^2 + p - 1. \quad (30)$$

*Proof.* Case  $m = p^l$ . Let

$$r_i = \max\{s : p^s \leq j_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, m, \quad \text{and} \quad r = \max\{r_1, \dots, r_m\}.$$

Then

$$v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!) \geq r_1 + \dots + r_m \geq r.$$

On the other hand,  $j_i \leq p^{r_i+1} - 1 \leq p^{r+1} - 1$ . Hence,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \leq \left\lfloor \frac{m \cdot (p^{r+1} - 1)}{p^l} \right\rfloor = p^{r+1} - 1,$$

and thus

$$v_p \left( \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \right) \leq r \leq v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!).$$

Now assume that equality holds. Then  $r_k = r$  for some  $k$  and  $r_i = 0$  for  $i \neq k$ . Furthermore,  $v_p(j_k!) = r$  and thus  $j_k \leq 2p - 1$ . Hence,  $r = 0$  or  $r = 1$ . In the case  $r = 0$  it follows  $j_i \leq p - 1$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, m$ . Assume  $r = 1$ . Then

$$v_p \left( \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \right) = 1, \quad \text{thus} \quad \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \geq \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \geq p$$

and

$$p^{l+1} \leq j_1 + \dots + j_m \leq 2p - 1 + (p^l - 1)(p - 1) = p^{l+1} - p^l + p$$

or  $p^l \leq p$ , which implies  $l \leq 1$ , and thus  $l = 1$  because  $l \geq 1$  by assumption. For  $l = 1$  we have  $j_1 + \dots + j_m = p^2$ , which can only hold for  $j_k = 2p - 1$  and  $j_i = p - 1$ ,  $i \neq k$ .

Case  $m = p^l + 1$ . We first assume that  $r_k = r$  and  $r_i = 0$ ,  $i \neq k$  for some  $k = 1, \dots, m$ , where  $r_i, r$  are defined as before. Also as before, this implies  $r = 0$  or  $r = 1$ . For the case  $r = 0$  we have  $j_i \leq p - 1$ ,  $i = 0, \dots, m$ . Thus,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{(p^l + 1)(p - 1)}{p^l} < p$$

and

$$v_p \left( \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \right) = 0 = v_p(j_1!, \dots, j_m!).$$

Note that this is one of the cases for which equality holds.

For the case  $r = 1$  we have  $p \leq j_k \leq 2p - 1$  and  $j_i \leq p - 1$ ,  $i \neq k$  for some  $k = 1, \dots, m$ . Thus,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{2p - 1 + p^l(p - 1)}{p^l} \leq p + 1$$

and

$$v_p \left( \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \right) \leq 1 = r = r_1 + \dots + r_m = v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!).$$

If equality holds, then

$$p^{l+1} \leq j_1 + \dots + j_m \leq 2p - 1 + p^l(p - 1) = p^{l+1} - p^l + 2p - 1$$

or  $p^l \leq 2p - 1$ , which implies  $l = 1$  and  $p^2 \leq j_1 + \dots + j_m \leq p^2 + p - 1$ .

We now assume the opposite as before, namely that  $r_k = r$ ,  $r_i = 0$ ,  $i \neq k$  for some  $k = 0, \dots, m$  does *not* hold. Then

$$v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!) \geq r_1 + \dots + r_m \geq r + 1.$$

On the other hand,

$$\left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{(p^l + 1)(p^{r+1} - 1)}{p^l} = p^{r+1} - 1 + p^{r+1-l} - p^{-l} \leq p^{r+2} - 1.$$

Thus,

$$v_p \left( \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \right) \leq r + 1 \leq v_p(j_1! \cdots j_m!).$$

If we assume that equality holds here, then  $r_k = r$  for some  $k$ ,  $r_h = 1$  for some  $h \neq k$ , and  $r_i = 0$  for  $i \neq k, h$ . From  $v_p(j_h!) = 1$  it follows  $p \leq j_h \leq 2p - 1$ , and from  $v_p(j_k!) = r$  it follows  $j_k \leq 2p - 1$ , and thus  $r \leq 1$ , so  $r = 1$  because  $r \geq r_h = 1$ . Together with  $j_h \leq 2p - 1$  and  $j_i \leq p - 1$  for  $i \neq k, h$ , and  $v_p(\lfloor (j_1 + \dots + j_m)/p^l \rfloor) = 2$ , this implies

$$p^2 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{j_1 + \dots + j_m}{p^l} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{2(2p - 1) + (p^l - 1)(p - 1)}{p^l} = p - 1 + \frac{3p - 1}{p^l},$$

and thus  $p^{l+2} \leq p^{l+1} - p^l + 3p - 1$ , which is impossible for  $p \geq 2$  and  $l \geq 1$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.** If  $p = 2$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $m = p^l = 2$ , then (29) holds precisely for  $(j_1, j_2) \in \{(1, 3), (3, 1)\}$ .

If  $p = 2$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $m = p^l + 1 = 3$ , then (30) holds precisely for  $(j_1, j_2, j_3) \in \{(1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 1), (2, 1, 1), (1, 1, 3), (1, 3, 1), (3, 1, 1)\}$ .

If  $p \geq 3$ ,  $l = 1$ ,  $m = p^l + 1 = p + 1$ , then (30) can hold only if there exist at least two indices  $s \neq t$ , such that  $j_s, j_t \in \{2, \dots, p - 1, p + 1, \dots, 2p - 1\}$ , because on the one hand it cannot be the case that  $j_i = 1$  for all  $i \neq k$  in (30), which would imply  $j_1 + \dots + j_m = m - 1 + j_k \leq 3p - 1 < p^2$  contradicting  $j_1 + \dots + j_m \geq p^2$ , and, on the other hand, if  $2 \leq j_h \leq p - 1$  for some  $h \neq k$  but  $j_i = 1$  for  $i \neq h, k$ , then  $j_k \geq p + 1$ , because  $j_k = p$  would imply  $j_1 + \dots + j_m = m - 2 + j_h + j_k \leq 3p - 2$  contradicting  $j_1 + \dots + j_m \geq p^2$  again.

### 3. Numerical illustrations

We verify the results of Propositions 3 and 4 by some explicit numerical calculations. For given  $n, p$  and suitable  $q_1, \dots, q_m$  we compute the coefficient  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  using,

e.g., Algorithm 2 from the appendix, and determine an integer  $\hat{a}$ , which according to our theory is expected to be  $\equiv a$  (or  $\equiv -a$  in some cases) modulo  $p$ , where the integer  $a$  is defined in these propositions. The details for the computation of  $\hat{a}$  for given prime  $p \geq 2$  and degree  $n \geq p$  are as follows.

- Determine  $q_1, \dots, q_m$ 
  - for  $l = 0, n \geq p, m = 2$  according to Algorithm 1, lines 14–15;
  - for  $l = 1, m = 2$  according to Algorithm 1, lines 18–26;
  - for  $l \geq 1, m = p^l$  or  $m = p^l + 1$  according to Algorithm 1, lines 33–34;<sup>9</sup> note that for  $m = p^l + 1, s_p(n) \neq p^l$  is required.
- Compute  $c = c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  using, e.g., Algorithm 2 from the appendix.
- Set  $\tilde{c} = (-1)^n q_1! \cdots q_m! \cdot c$  and determine integers  $u, v$  and an exponent  $e \geq 0$  such that  $p \nmid u, v$  and  $\tilde{c} = \frac{u}{p^e v}$ .
- Set  $\hat{a} = u\bar{v} \bmod p$  and  $\hat{U} = \tilde{c} - \frac{\hat{a}}{p^e}$ , where  $\bar{v}$  is an inverse of  $v$  modulo  $p$ .

With an integer  $y$  such that  $v\bar{v} = 1 + yp$  (note that  $v\bar{v} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ ) we have

$$\hat{U} = \tilde{c} - \frac{\hat{a}}{p^e} = \frac{u}{p^e v} - \frac{u\bar{v}}{p^e} = \frac{uy}{p^{e-1}v},$$

and thus  $v_p(\hat{U}) > -e$ . It follows that  $\hat{a}$  is the unique integer  $0 \leq \hat{a} \leq p - 1$  that satisfies

$$\tilde{c} = \frac{\hat{a}}{p^e} + \hat{U}, \quad \text{for some } \hat{U} \in \mathbb{Q}, v_p(\hat{U}) > -e.$$

For  $l \leq 1, m = 2$  we expect

$$e = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{a} \equiv -(-1)^{q_2} a \equiv (-1)^{n+1} \pmod{p}$$

by Proposition 3 and Remark 2. Here we have used that  $q_2$  is a multiple of  $p - 1$  by construction, and thus it is even for  $p \neq 2$ .

For  $l \geq 1, m = p^l$  we expect

$$e = l \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{a} \equiv a \equiv 2 \left( \frac{p-1}{2} \right)^n \pmod{p}, \quad \text{if } p \neq 2 \text{ and } n \text{ odd} \quad (31)$$

by Proposition 4. Note that in this case  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m) = 0$  if  $p \neq 2$  and  $n$  even, cf. Remark 1.

For  $l \geq 1, m = p^l + 1$  we similarly expect

$$e = l \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{a} \equiv a \equiv - \left( \frac{p-1}{2} \right)^{n-1} \pmod{p}, \quad \text{if } p \neq 2. \quad (32)$$

---

<sup>9</sup>If  $l = 1$ , Algorithm 1 would branch to the simpler construction for the  $q_i$  in lines 18–26. But the construction of lines 33–34 works also for  $l = 1$ . Systematic computations that verify this construction for the case  $l \geq 2$  are hardly feasible, as discussed in Section 3.2 below. So we have to rely on the case  $l = 1$  for such verifications.



$n$	$p$	$l$	$m$	$(q_1, \dots, q_m)$	$c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$	$e$	$\hat{a}$
26	7	1	2	(14, 12)	$-63102076049869/846912068365871834726400000$	1	6
	7	1	7	(14, 7, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)	0	0	0
	7	1	8	(7, 7, 7, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)	$5260127/12693891496366080000$	1	4
27	7	1	2	(21, 6)	$-6333157/33967061565476143104000$	1	1
	7	1	7	(21, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)	$-1970755117/6416000517923271475200000$	1	5
	7	1	8	(14, 7, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)	$2609686559/51142033113881149440000$	1	5
28	7	0	2	(22, 6)	$252293307089/10162944820390462016716800000$	1	6

Table 1: Results of various computations for the case  $l = l(n, p) \leq 1$ .

### 3.1. The case $l(n, p) \leq 1$

Some results of such computations for  $l = l(n, p) \leq 1$  with  $p = 7$  can be found in Table 1. For one of its entries we give the details of the computations below. It is readily verified that all results for  $e$  and  $\hat{a}$  in the table are as expected.

**Example:** We consider  $n = 27 = 3 \cdot 7 + 6$ ,  $p = 7$ ,  $l = l(n, p) = \lfloor \log_7(3 + 6) \rfloor = 1$ ,  $m = p^l + 1 = 8$ .

- $n = 27 = \underbrace{7+7}_{q_1} + \underbrace{7}_{q_2} + \underbrace{1}_{q_3} + \underbrace{1}_{q_4} + \underbrace{1}_{q_5} + \underbrace{1}_{q_6} + \underbrace{1}_{q_7} + \underbrace{1}_{q_8}$   
such that  $(q_1, \dots, q_m) = (14, 7, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ .
- $c = c(14, 7, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) = 2609686559/51142033113881149440000$ .
- $\tilde{c} = -14! 7! c = -2609686559/116396280 = \frac{u}{p^e v}$  with  $e = 1$ ,  $u = -2609686559 \equiv 3 \pmod{7}$ ,  $v = 16628040 \equiv 2 \pmod{7}$ .
- $\bar{v} \equiv 4 \pmod{7}$ ; thus,  $\hat{a} = u\bar{v} \pmod{7} = 5$ ,  $\hat{U} = \tilde{c} - \frac{5}{7} = -384689537/16628040$ .

We verify (32),

$$a \equiv - \left( \frac{p-1}{2} \right)^{n-1} = -3^{26} = -(3^6)^4 \cdot 3^2 \equiv -9 \equiv 5 \equiv \hat{a} \pmod{7},$$

where we have used  $3^6 = 3^{7-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$  by Fermat's little theorem.

### 3.2. The case $l(n, p) \geq 2$

It can be shown that the smallest degree  $n$  for which  $l(n, p)$  is equal to a given number  $l \geq 2$  is given by  $n = 2p^x - 1$ , where  $x = \frac{p^l - 1}{p - 1}$ . Some values of these degrees are shown in the following table.

$p$	$l = 2$	$l = 3$	$l = 4$
2	15	255	65535
3	161	3188545	$\approx 2.43 \cdot 10^{19}$
5	31249	$\approx 9.31 \cdot 10^{21}$	$\approx 2.19 \cdot 10^{109}$

$n$	$p$	$l$	$m$	$(q_1, \dots, q_m)$	$c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$	$e$	$\hat{a}$
161	3	2	9	(81, 27, 27, 9, 9, 3, 3, 1, 1)	(168-digits number)/(248-digits number)	2	2
242	3	2	10	(81, 81, 27, 27, 9, 9, 3, 3, 1, 1)	(288-digits number)/(408-digits number)	2	2
255	2	3	8	(128, 64, 32, 16, 8, 4, 2, 1)	(330-digits number)/(460-digits number)	3	1

Table 2: Results of various computations for the case  $l = l(n, p) \geq 2$ . Here  $n = 242$  is the smallest *even* degree that satisfies  $l(n, 3) = 2$ . The results conform with (31), (32), and (21), case  $p = 2$ , respectively.

Explicit computations with such degrees are obviously impossible in most cases. Some results of feasible computations can be found in Table 2.

### 3.3. A simpler construction for the case $l(n, p) \geq 2$ ?

If  $l(n, p) = 1$ , then there exists a simpler method than the one of Section 2.2 for obtaining a partition  $(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  of  $n$  ( $m \geq 1$ ,  $q_i \geq 1$ ,  $q_1 + \dots + q_m = n$ ) that satisfies (12), namely the method of Section 2.1 which produces such a partition of the form  $(n - k, n)$ . If on the other hand  $l(n, p) \geq 2$ , then no such partition of length  $m = 2$  can exist. This follows from the explicit formula (11) involving Bernoulli numbers and the fact that the denominators of the Bernoulli numbers are square-free, which is a consequence of the von Staudt–Clausen theorem, cf. [1].

We define the sets

$$Q(n, p) = \left\{ (q_1, \dots, q_m) : m \geq 1, q_1 \geq q_2 \geq \dots \geq q_m \geq 1, q_1 + \dots + q_m = n, \right. \\ \left. v_p(\text{denom}(c(q_1, \dots, q_m))) = v_p(n!) + l(n, p) \right\}$$

consisting of all partitions  $(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  of  $n$  in descending order that satisfy (12). Note that because of the invariance of  $c(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  under permutations of the  $q_i$  (cf. Remark 1), all possible values for the coefficients of degree  $n$  already occur under these special ones corresponding to partitions of  $n$  in descending order.

In particular, for  $p = 2$  and degrees  $n = 15, 23, 27, 29, 30, 31$  that satisfy  $l(n, 2) = 2$ , we obtain<sup>10</sup>

$$Q(15, 2) = \{(8, 4, 2, 1)\}, \quad Q(23, 2) = \{(16, 4, 2, 1)\}, \quad Q(27, 2) = \{(16, 8, 2, 1)\}, \\ Q(29, 2) = \{(16, 8, 4, 1)\}, \quad Q(30, 2) = \{(16, 8, 4, 2)\},$$

<sup>10</sup>Without much sophistication, we compute the sets  $Q(n, p)$  by an exhaustive search under all possible partitions. For example, for  $n = 31$ , there are 6842 partitions in descending order that have to be examined. For  $n = 161$ , which is the smallest degree  $n$  satisfying  $l(n, 3) = 2$ , the number of such partitions is 118159068427, a number far to large for a exhaustive search to be feasible. Therefore, we limit ourselves to the case  $p = 2$ .

and

$$Q(31, 2) = \{(24, 4, 2, 1), (20, 8, 2, 1), (18, 8, 4, 1), (17, 8, 4, 2), (16, 12, 2, 1), \\ (16, 10, 4, 1), (16, 9, 4, 2), (16, 8, 6, 1), (16, 8, 5, 2), (16, 8, 4, 3)\}.$$

Here for each  $n \in \{15, 23, 27, 29, 30\}$  the set  $Q(n, 2)$  consists of a single partition of  $n$ , which therefore must be the one defined by Algorithm 1, lines 33–34 (which is in descending order by construction). Permuting the components of the partitions in  $Q(31, 2)$  in such a way that the powers of 2 appear from position 2 in descending order we obtain

$$\tilde{Q}(31, 2) = \{(24, 4, 2, 1), (20, 8, 2, 1), (18, 8, 4, 1), (17, 8, 4, 2), (12, 16, 2, 1), \\ (10, 16, 4, 1), (9, 16, 4, 2), (6, 16, 8, 1), (5, 16, 8, 2), (3, 16, 8, 4)\}.$$

Now each of these partitions  $(q_1, \dots, q_m)$  is of the form described in Section 2.2 such that Proposition 4 applies to them.

Thus, at least in the few cases just discussed, the construction of the  $q_1, \dots, q_m$  in Section 2.2 is essentially the only possible one. In any case, this suggests that for  $l(n, p) \geq 2$ , this construction cannot be significantly simplified.

### A. An efficient algorithm for the computation of BCH coefficients

In Algorithm 2 we present a new method for the efficient computation of BCH coefficients, using a self-explanatory pseudocode, which can straightforwardly be implemented in any general purpose programming language<sup>11</sup> or any computer algebra system. An implementation in the Julia programming language is available at [6]. The following comments should provide sufficient evidence for the correctness of the algorithm.

*Input:* We consider the word  $w = \mathbf{A}^{q_1} \mathbf{B}^{q_2} \dots (\mathbf{A} \vee \mathbf{B})^{q_m}$  or  $w = \mathbf{B}^{q_1} \mathbf{A}^{q_2} \dots (\mathbf{B} \vee \mathbf{A})^{q_m}$  as a concatenation of  $m$  alternating blocks of As or Bs whose lengths are  $q_1, \dots, q_m$ . The boolean variable *Afirst* indicates whether the first block is an A-block (or otherwise a B-block).

*Line 1:*  $N = q_1 + \dots + q_m$  is the length of the word  $w$ .

*Line 2:*  $d = n! d_N$  is the common denominator for all coefficients of degree  $\leq N$  defined by (2).

---

<sup>11</sup>Depending on the available integer data type, the size of the degrees  $N$  may be limited. For standard 64-bit integers,  $N \leq 19$ , and for 128-bit integers (which, e.g., are available as numbers of type `_int128_t` for many compilers for the C programming language on modern computer architectures),  $N \leq 30$ . Higher degrees usually require a library for multi-precision integer arithmetic.

---

**Algorithm 2:** Efficient computations of BCH coefficients
 

---

**Input:**  $(q_1, \dots, q_m) \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}^m$ ,  $Afirst \in \{\text{true}, \text{false}\}$ 
**Output:**  $\text{coeff}(w, \log(e^A e^B))$  for  $w = A^{q_1} B^{q_2} \dots$  or  $w = B^{q_1} A^{q_2} \dots$  depending on  $Afirst$ 

```

1   $N := \sum_{i=1}^m q_i$ 
2   $d := N! \cdot d_N$ 
3   $C := (0) \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \times N}$ 
4   $Acurrent := Afirst$ 
5  if  $m$  is even
6     $Acurrent := \text{not } Afirst$ 
7  end
8   $n := 0$ 
9  for  $i := m, m-1, \dots, 1$ 
10   for  $r := 1, \dots, q_i$ 
11      $n := n + 1$ 
12      $h := 0$ 
13     if  $i = m$ 
14        $h := d/n!$ 
15     else if  $Acurrent$  and  $i = m - 1$ 
16        $h := d/(r!q_m!)$ 
17     end
18      $C_{1,n} := h$ 
19     for  $k := 2, \dots, n - 1$ 
20        $h := 0$ 
21       for  $j := 1, \dots, r$ 
22         if  $n > j$  and  $C_{k-1, n-j} \neq 0$ 
23            $h := h + C_{k-1, n-j}/j!$ 
24         end
25       end
26       if  $Acurrent$  and  $i \leq m - 1$ 
27         for  $j := 1, \dots, q_{i+1}$ 
28           if  $n > r + j$  and  $C_{k-1, n-r-j} \neq 0$ 
29              $h := h + C_{k-1, n-r-j}/(r!j!)$ 
30           end
31         end
32       end
33        $C_{k,n} := h$ 
34     end
35      $C_{n,n} := d$ 
36   end
37    $Acurrent := \text{not } Acurrent$ 
38 end
39 return  $\frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^N (-1)^{k+1} C_{k,N}/k$ 

```

---

*Line 3:* The array  $(C_{k,n}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{N \times N}$  is initialized to zero. It will eventually contain  $C_{k,n} = d \cdot \text{coeff}(v(n), Y^k)$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$ , where

$$Y = e^A e^B - 1 = \sum_{i+j>0} \frac{1}{i!j!} A^i B^j,$$

and  $v(n) = w_{N-n+1} \cdots w_N$  is the right subword of  $w = w_1 \cdots w_N$  of length  $n$  starting at position  $N - n + 1$ .

*Lines 9–38:* The outermost loop over  $i$  processes the  $m$  blocks in reverse order. The boolean variable *Acurrent* indicates whether the current  $i$ -th block is an A-block.

*Lines 10–36:* The loop over  $r = 1, \dots, q_i$  combines with the outer loop over  $i$  to form a loop over  $n = r + q_{i+1} + \dots + q_m$  which processes the right subwords  $v(n)$  of lengths  $n$ .

*Lines 12–18:* If  $k = 1$  then the current right subword  $v(n)$  can only contribute to  $C_{k,n} = C_{1,n} = d \cdot \text{coeff}(v(n), Y)$ , if it has the form  $v(n) = A^s B^t$  with  $s + t = n$ , and thus if it is contained in the last two blocks. This contribution is  $d/n!$  if  $v(n)$  is entirely contained in the last (i.e., the  $m$ -th) block such that  $v(n) = A^n$  or  $v(n) = B^n$ , or it is  $d/(r!q_m!)$  if  $v(n)$  is contained in the last two blocks, where the next to last (i.e., the  $(m - 1)$ -th) block has to be an A-block such that  $v(n) = A^r B^{q_m}$ .

*Lines 19–34:* Let  $u(n, j)$  denote the left subword of  $v(n)$  of length  $j$  such that

$$v(n) = u(n, j)v(n - j), \quad j = 0, \dots, n.$$

For  $k = 2, \dots, n - 1$  we have

$$\text{coeff}(v(n), Y \cdot Y^{k-1}) = \sum_{j=0}^n \text{coeff}(u(n, j), Y) \cdot \text{coeff}(v(n - j), Y^{k-1}).$$

Here we have  $\text{coeff}(v(n - j), Y^{k-1}) = 0$  for  $j = n$ . Similarly as before (cf. lines 12–18), we have  $\text{coeff}(u(n, j), Y) \neq 0$  only if  $j \geq 1$  and if either  $u(n, j)$  is entirely contained in the current  $i$ -th block (or, more precisely, the current right subblock of length  $r$  of the  $i$ -th block), or if it is entirely contained in the union of the  $i$ -th and the  $(i + 1)$ -th block, where the  $i$ -th block has to be an A-block. In the former case  $u(n, j) = A^j$  or  $u(n, j) = B^j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, r$  such that  $\text{coeff}(u(n, j), Y) = 1/j!$ , and in the latter case  $u(n, j) = A^r B^{j_1}$  with  $r + j_1 = j$ ,  $j_1 = 1, \dots, q_{i+1}$  such that  $\text{coeff}(u(n, j), Y) = 1/(r!j_1!)$ . It follows

$$C_{k-1,n} = d \cdot \text{coeff}(v(n), Y^k) = \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{1}{j!} C_{k-1,n-j} + f_i \sum_{j_1=1}^{q_{i+1}} \frac{1}{r!j_1!} C_{k-1,n-r-j_1},$$

where  $f_i = 1$  if the  $i$ -th block is an A-block and  $f_i = 0$  otherwise. This sum is computed in lines 20–33. Note that here  $C_{k-1,n-j}$  and  $C_{k-1,n-r-j_1}$  either are understood to be  $= 0$  if the second index is 0, or they have already been computed during a previous pass of the loop over  $n$  (i.e., the loops over  $i$  and  $r$  combined).

Obviously the tests for  $C_{k-1,n-j} \neq 0$  respectively  $C_{k-1,n-r-j} \neq 0$  in lines 22 and 28 are not strictly necessary, but are there for efficiency reasons.

*Line 35:* A word of degree  $n$  occurs in  $Y^n$  if and only if for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , its  $i$ -th letter corresponds to exactly one term of degree 1 of the  $i$ -th factor  $Y$  of  $Y^N$ . Thus,  $v(N)$  occurs in  $Y^n$  exactly once and with coefficient 1 so that  $C_{n,n} = d \cdot \text{coeff}(v(n), Y^n) = d$ .

Note that the case  $k = n$  could also be handled by the above loop over  $k$ . Here it is handled separately for efficiency and because it is so simple.

*Line 39:* The final result is computed according to

$$\text{coeff}(w, \log(e^A e^B)) = \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} \text{coeff}(w, Y^k) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} C_{k,N}.$$

The main feature of the algorithm is that it performs all of its computations in integer arithmetic. This means in particular, that the divisions in lines 14, 16, 23, 29, and the divisions by  $k$  in line 39 never have a remainder. (Of course, this does not apply to the final division by  $d$  in line 39.) To prove this, it is not enough to know that the final result is a rational number with a denominator that is divisible by  $d = N!d_N$ . It must also be ensured that during the calculation no intermediate results not representable as integers can occur, which cancel out at the end. Without going into details, this holds because the computations of the algorithm follow the same pattern as the calculation of the common denominator  $d = D_N = N!d_N$  in the proof of [5, Proposition 1], where the generic case is assumed and no cancellations are taken into account.

## References

- [1] L. Carlitz, The Staudt–Clausen theorem, *Math. Mag.* **34** (1961) 131–146.
- [2] N. J. Fine, Binomial coefficients modulo a prime, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **54**, (1947) 589–592.
- [3] K. Goldberg, The formal power series for  $\log e^x e^y$ , *Duke Math. J.* **23** (1956), 13–21.
- [4] R. L. Graham, D. E. Knuth, and O. Patashnik, *Concrete Mathematics - A Foundation for Computer Science*, 2nd ed., Addison-Wesley (1994).
- [5] H. Hofstätter, Denominators of coefficients of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff series, available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.03440>.

- [6] H. Hofstätter, Efficient algorithms for computing coefficients of the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff series, [https://github.com/HaraldHofstaetter/BCH\\_series.jl](https://github.com/HaraldHofstaetter/BCH_series.jl).
- [7] F. Howard, Congruences for the Stirling numbers and associated Stirling numbers, *Acta Arith.* **55** (1991), 29–41.
- [8] K. MacMillan and J. Sondow, Proofs of power sum and binomial coefficient congruences via Pascal’s identity, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **118** (2011), 549–551.
- [9] S. Mattarei, On a special congruence of Carlitz. *Integers* **6** (2006), #A9.
- [10] D. Mihet, Legendre’s and Kummer’s theorems again, *Resonance* **15**, (2010), 1111-1121.
- [11] N. J. A. Sloane, ed., The Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, <http://oeis.org>.
- [12] A. Van-Brunt and M. Visser, Simplifying the Reinsch algorithm for the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff series, *J. Math. Phys.* **57** (2016), 023507.