

REPRESENTATIONS OF GL_2 OVER $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ AND CONGRUENCES FOR BINOMIAL COEFFICIENTS

ATSUSHI ICHINO AND KARTIK PRASANNA

ABSTRACT. For an odd prime p , we realize the trivial representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$ on the free $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ -module of rank one as a subquotient of a direct sum of symmetric power representations (twisted by appropriate powers of the determinant) of rank strictly greater than one. The proof eventually reduces to establishing some novel supercongruences for binomial coefficients.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation and main result. One of the most basic examples of a representation of a (non-abelian) group is a finite-dimensional (rational) representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ over \mathbb{C} . Such a representation is always semisimple, and an irreducible representation (up to twist by a character) is classified by its dimension. Namely, for any non-negative integer k , there exists a unique (up to twist by a character) irreducible representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ over \mathbb{C} of dimension $k + 1$. Moreover, such an irreducible representation can be realized on the space $\mathbb{C}[x, y]_k$ of homogeneous polynomials of degree k .

For arithmetic applications, it is natural to consider finite-dimensional representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F)$ over an arbitrary field F . When F has characteristic zero, $\mathrm{GL}_2(F)$ has the same representation theory as $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$. In particular, the representation $F[x, y]_k$ is always irreducible. In contrast, when F has positive characteristic, the representation theory of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F)$ is richer and more intricate. For example, there are non-semisimple finite-dimensional representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(F)$ over F , and the representation $F[x, y]_k$ itself is typically not irreducible or even semisimple. For a finite field $F = \mathbb{F}_{p^n}$, where p is a prime and $n \geq 1$ is an integer, these representations have been widely studied (see e.g. [2]) and have played a significant role in arithmetic applications, such as the mod p and p -adic local Langlands correspondences for $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

In this paper, we consider a more challenging setting: instead of a finite field $F = \mathbb{F}_{p^n}$, we take a finite ring $R = \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$, where p is an odd prime, and study representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(R)$ over R . When $n > 1$, the situation is further obscured and almost nothing seems to be known due to the following inherent difficulties:

- A finitely generated R -module is not necessarily free.
- The map $R \rightarrow R$, $x \mapsto x^p$ is not a ring homomorphism.

We encountered this setting in our study of p -adic modular forms on GSp_4 , which take values in representations of GL_2 over \mathbb{Z}_p . Specifically, we were interested in explicitly constructing an overconvergent solution to a certain p -adic differential equation arising from the Gauss-Manin connection on a Shimura variety associated with GSp_4 . Our strategy (based on successive mod p^n approximations) required us to realize the trivial representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$ on the free $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ -module of rank one using symmetric power representations of higher rank. For $n = 1$, we could use the fact that the trivial representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})$ appears in

$$(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})[x, y]_{2(p-1)}$$

as a quotient (up to twist). Indeed, the projection onto the line spanned by $x^{p-1}y^{p-1}$ is an equivariant map in this case. However, for $n > 1$, it seems unlikely that any single representation $(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})[x, y]_k$ contains the trivial representation as a subquotient (up to twist), which makes it difficult to find the correct formulation. Nevertheless, we are able to precisely formulate and prove an analogous result for all $n > 1$. To illustrate the nature of the main result, it suffices to focus on the case $n = 2$.

Theorem. *Assume that $p \neq 2$. For $n = 2$ (so that $R = \mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$), the trivial representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(R)$ on the free R -module of rank one appears in*

$$R[x, y]_{2(p-1)} \oplus R[x, y]_{2(p^2-p)} \oplus R[x, y]_{2(p^2-1)}$$

as a subquotient, where each direct summand is twisted by an appropriate power of the determinant.

It seems unlikely that we can omit any of the three representations in the above statement. In general (so that $R = \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$), to realize the trivial representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(R)$, we need $2^n - 1$ representations $R[x, y]_{2k_r}$ for $1 \leq r \leq 2^n - 1$, where

$$k_0 < k_1 < \cdots < k_{2^n-1}$$

denote the first 2^n non-negative integers whose digits are either 0 or $p - 1$ in base p (see Theorem 2.1). The proof of this theorem eventually reduces to establishing certain supercongruences for the coefficients of explicit hypergeometric polynomials. Surprisingly, even the congruence for the simplest-looking coefficients (the leading coefficients), which corresponds to the case $i = 0$ in Theorem 3.1, seems to be new and rather difficult to prove: it states that

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \binom{-1/2}{k_r/2} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^n}.$$

There is a large body of work on p -adic differential equations and related congruences for binomial coefficients, starting with the pioneering work of Dwork [1]. However, we have not yet found a connection between our result and previous work on this topic. Discovering such a link would be very interesting. It would also be interesting to generalize our result to other representations of GL_2 or to other algebraic groups.

In the following subsection, we describe how the above theorem is related to congruences for binomial coefficients, and outline the main idea of the proof.

1.2. Sketch of the proof. To compare the three representations in the theorem stated in the previous subsection, it is better to realize them within a single representation, which is carried out in Section 2. Inspired by the Fock model of the Weil representation, we are led to use an integral version of the Clebsch-Gordan decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}[M_2] &= \mathbb{C}[z_{11}, z_{12}] \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[z_{21}, z_{22}] \\ &= \bigoplus_{k_1=0}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{k_2=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{C}[z_{11}, z_{12}]_{k_1} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[z_{21}, z_{22}]_{k_2} \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{k_1=0}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{k_2=0}^{\infty} \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\min\{k_1, k_2\}} \mathbb{C}[x, y]_{k_1+k_2-2i}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we denote by $\mathbb{C}[M_2]$ the space of polynomial functions of $\begin{pmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} \\ z_{21} & z_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ and omit the necessary twists for each direct summand on the right-hand side. For $R = \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ and $k \geq 0$, we realize (the dual of) $R[x, y]_{2k}$ as $\mathcal{L}_{2k}/p^n\mathcal{L}_{2k}$ (up to twist), where $\mathcal{L}_{2k} \subset \mathbb{Z}[M_2]$ is a certain free submodule of rank $2k + 1$ such

that $\mathcal{L}_{2k} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{C}[x, y]_{2k}$. Put $\mathcal{M}_r = \mathcal{L}_{2k_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[1/2]$ for $0 \leq r \leq 2^n - 1$ and $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{r=1}^{2^n-1} \mathcal{M}_r$. Then we have natural equivariant injective maps

$$\mathcal{M}_0/(\mathcal{M}_0 \cap p^n \mathcal{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M})/((\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M}) \cap p^n \mathcal{R}) \leftarrow \mathcal{M}/(\mathcal{M} \cap p^n \mathcal{R}),$$

where $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}[1/2][M_2]$. It turns out that $\mathcal{M}_0 \cap p^n \mathcal{R} = p^n \mathcal{M}_0$, so that the image \mathcal{N}_0 of the first map is a free R -module of rank one. If we can find polynomials $\psi_0 \in \mathcal{M}_0$ and $\psi \in \mathcal{M}$ such that ψ_0 generates \mathcal{M}_0 and the congruence

$$\psi_0 - \psi \in p^n \mathcal{R}$$

holds, then the preimage \mathcal{N} of \mathcal{N}_0 under the second map is also a free R -module of rank one, which implies that the preimage of \mathcal{N} in $\mathcal{M}/p^n \mathcal{M}$ gives rise to the desired subquotient.

The construction of ψ_0 and ψ is also given in Section 2, but it is extremely difficult to prove the above congruence. In fact, by explicitly computing the coefficients of ψ_0 and ψ , the congruence is equivalent to

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} \sum_l (-1)^{r+k_r/2+l} 2^{-k_r} \binom{k_r}{k_r/2+j} \binom{k_r-2j}{k_r-i+l} \binom{k_r+2j}{i-l} \binom{p^n-k_r}{l} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^n}$$

for all $i, j \geq 0$, where l runs over all integers. Although it is not impossible to prove this directly using a case-by-case argument for $n = 2$, its extension to general n seems hopeless.

Thus, a further reduction is necessary, which is carried out in Section 3. By computing ψ_0 and ψ in a different way and making a suitable change of variables, we show that the above congruence reduces to

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \binom{k_r/2}{i} \binom{-1/2-i}{k_r/2} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^n}$$

for all $i \geq 0$ (see Theorem 3.1). For $n = 2$, its direct proof is much easier than that of the original congruence. However, its extension to general n still seems infeasible.

In Section 4, we prove Theorem 3.1 as a special case of a further generalization (see Theorem 4.1), which takes the form

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \binom{m(r)}{i} \binom{m(2^a-1)-i}{m(r)} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^n}$$

for all $n \geq 1$, $a \geq n$, and $i \geq 0$, where m is a certain monotonically increasing function. The proof of Theorem 4.1 is given by induction for each fixed n, a, i . To make the inductive argument work, we introduce new variables $0 \leq k \leq n$ and $0 \leq j \leq n - k$, and formulate an intermediate statement in Theorem 4.4, which is too technical to state here. Consequently, we proceed by double induction on k and j to prove Theorem 4.1, where the key ingredient is a result of Granville [4] on congruences for binomial coefficients modulo p^n . We remark that $p = 2$ is allowed at this stage, in which case Theorem 4.1 implies that

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \binom{r}{i} \binom{2^a-1-i}{r} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^n}$$

for all $n \geq 1$, $a \geq n$, and $i \geq 0$. Surprisingly, we were not able to find a proof of this congruence in the literature.

Notation. For any integers $n \geq 0$ and k , the binomial coefficient $\binom{n}{k}$ is given by

$$\binom{n}{k} = \begin{cases} \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} & \text{if } 0 \leq k \leq n; \\ 0 & \text{if } k < 0 \text{ or } k > n. \end{cases}$$

If $k \geq 0$, then we may define

$$\binom{x}{k} = \frac{x(x-1)\cdots(x-k+1)}{k!}$$

for an arbitrary number x . For any prime p , we denote by v_p the p -adic valuation. We define the p -deprived factorial by

$$n!_p = \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ p \nmid i}} i$$

for $n \geq 0$.

2. REPRESENTATIONS OF GL_2 OVER $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$

In this section, we state our main result and reduce it to congruences for certain polynomials.

2.1. Symmetric and divided powers. Let Δ be the monoid consisting of matrices $\alpha \in \mathrm{M}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $\det \alpha \neq 0$. Define an action of Δ on $\mathbb{Z}[z_1, z_2]$ by

$$(\alpha\phi)(z) = \phi(z\alpha)$$

(regarded as functions of $z = (z_1, z_2)$) for $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $\phi \in \mathbb{Z}[z_1, z_2]$. For example, the induced actions of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ are given by

$$z_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}, \quad z_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2},$$

respectively. For any integer $k \geq 0$, we denote by $L'_k \subset \mathbb{Z}[z_1, z_2]$ the module of homogeneous polynomials of degree k . Let $L_k \subset L'_k$ be the submodule generated by $\{\binom{k}{i} z_1^{k-i} z_2^i \mid 0 \leq i \leq k\}$. Then L_k and L'_k are free \mathbb{Z} -modules of rank $k+1$ which are stable under the action of Δ . Moreover, if we define a non-degenerate bilinear pairing $(\cdot, \cdot) : L_k \times L'_k \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\left(\binom{k}{i} z_1^{k-i} z_2^i, \binom{k}{j} z_1^{k-j} z_2^j \right) = \begin{cases} (-1)^i & \text{if } i+j=k; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $0 \leq i, j \leq k$, then we have

$$(\alpha\phi, \alpha\phi') = (\det \alpha)^k (\phi, \phi')$$

for $\alpha \in \Delta$, $\phi \in L_k$, and $\phi' \in L'_k$.

Fix a prime p and an integer $n \geq 1$. Put

$$V_k = L_k/p^n L_k, \quad V'_k = L'_k/p^n L'_k,$$

so that V_k and V'_k are free $\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}$ -modules of rank $k+1$, and can be regarded as representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$. For any integer m , we write $V_{k,m}$ for the representation of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$ on V_k twisted by \det^m . Then the pairing (\cdot, \cdot) induces an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}}(V'_k, \mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z}) \cong V_{k,-k}$$

of representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$.

Now we state our main result. For any integer $r \geq 0$, we write $r = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r_i 2^i$ with $r_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and put

$$k_r = (p-1) \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r_i p^i.$$

Note that the non-negative integers k_r are exactly those whose digits are either 0 or $p-1$ in base p .

Theorem 2.1. *Assume that $p \neq 2$. Then V_{0,p^n} appears in*

$$\bigoplus_{r=1}^{2^n-1} V_{2k_r, p^n-k_r}$$

as a subquotient.

2.2. Another realization. To prove Theorem 2.1, we realize and compare the representations $V_{2k,m}$ in a single representation. Define an action of Δ on $\mathbb{Z}[z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]$ by

$$(\alpha\phi)(z) = \phi(z\alpha)$$

(regarded as functions of $z = \begin{pmatrix} z_{11} & z_{12} \\ z_{21} & z_{22} \end{pmatrix}$) for $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $\phi \in \mathbb{Z}[z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]$. For example, the induced actions of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ are given by

$$D = z_{12} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{11}} + z_{22} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{21}}, \quad E = z_{11} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{12}} + z_{21} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{22}},$$

respectively. Define $\phi, \nu \in \mathbb{Z}[z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]$ by

$$\phi(z) = z_{11}^2 + z_{21}^2, \quad \nu(z) = z_{11}z_{22} - z_{12}z_{21}.$$

Note that $E\phi = D\nu = E\nu = 0$. For any integers $k, l \geq 0$, put

$$\phi_{k,l} = \frac{1}{l!} D^l \phi^k.$$

If $l \geq 2k + 1$, then we have $\phi_{k,l} = 0$.

Lemma 2.2. *We have $\phi_{k,l} \in \mathbb{Z}[z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]$.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{k,l}(z) &= \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{i=0}^l \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{l}{i} \binom{k}{j} z_{12}^{l-i} z_{22}^i \frac{\partial^l}{\partial z_{11}^{l-i} \partial z_{21}^i} z_{11}^{2k-2j} z_{21}^{2j} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^l \sum_{j=0}^k \binom{2k-2j}{l-i} \binom{2j}{i} \binom{k}{j} z_{11}^{2k-2j-l+i} z_{12}^{l-i} z_{21}^{2j-i} z_{22}^i. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the assertion. \square

For any integers $k, m \geq 0$, let $\mathcal{L}_{2k,m} \subset \mathbb{Z}[z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]$ be the submodule generated by $\{\phi_{k,l} \cdot \nu^m \mid 0 \leq l \leq 2k\}$. Then $\mathcal{L}_{2k,m}$ is a free \mathbb{Z} -module of rank $2k + 1$.

Lemma 2.3. *The module $\mathcal{L}_{2k,m}$ is stable under the action of Δ . Moreover, we have*

$$\mathcal{L}_{2k,m}/p^n \mathcal{L}_{2k,m} \cong V_{2k,m}$$

as representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^n\mathbb{Z})$.

Proof. Let $\Delta' \subset \Delta$ be the submonoid consisting of diagonal matrices and put $\Gamma = \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, so that $\Delta = \Gamma\Delta'\Gamma$. Then it follows from the proof of Lemma 2.2 that

$$\alpha\phi_{k,l} = a_1^{2k-l} a_2^l \phi_{k,l}$$

for $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \Delta'$ and $0 \leq l \leq 2k$. Also, we have $\alpha\nu^m = (\det \alpha)^m \nu^m$ for $\alpha \in \Delta$. This shows that $\mathcal{L}_{2k,m}$ is stable under the action of Δ' . Next we consider the action of Γ . Let $H = ED - DE$ be the action of $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ on $\mathbb{Z}[z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]$. Then we have

$$H\phi_{k,l} = (2k - 2l)\phi_{k,l}$$

by the above formula. Also, we have

$$D\phi_{k,l} = (l+1)\phi_{k,l+1}$$

by definition, and

$$E\phi_{k,l} = (2k-l+1)\phi_{k,l-1}$$

by induction on l , where we interpret $\phi_{k,-1} = 0$. From this, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \phi_{k,l} &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} D^i \phi_{k,l} = \sum_{i=0}^{2k-l} \binom{l+i}{i} \phi_{k,l+i}, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \phi_{k,l} &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i!} E^i \phi_{k,l} = \sum_{i=0}^l \binom{2k-l+i}{i} \phi_{k,l-i}. \end{aligned}$$

Since Γ is generated by $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, this shows that $\mathcal{L}_{2k,m}$ is stable under the action of Γ . Hence the first assertion follows.

Let $f : \mathcal{L}_{2k,m} \rightarrow L_{2k}$ be the isomorphism of \mathbb{Z} -modules given by

$$f(\phi_{k,l} \cdot \nu^m) = \binom{2k}{l} z_1^{2k-l} z_2^l$$

for $0 \leq l \leq 2k$. Then the above formulas imply that

$$f(\alpha\phi) = (\det \alpha)^m \alpha f(\phi)$$

for $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{L}_{2k,m}$. Hence the second assertion follows. \square

Now assume that $p \neq 2$ (so that the integers k_r are even). Put $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}[1/2][z_{11}, z_{12}, z_{21}, z_{22}]$ and

$$\psi_r = (-1)^{k_r/2} 2^{-k_r} \phi_{k_r, k_r} \cdot \nu^{p^n - k_r} \in \mathcal{R}$$

for $0 \leq r \leq 2^n - 1$. Then we have

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \psi_r \in p^n \mathcal{R},$$

whose proof is postponed to Sections 3 and 4.

In the rest of this section, we deduce Theorem 2.1 from (2.1). For $0 \leq r \leq 2^n - 1$, put

$$\mathcal{M}_r = \mathcal{L}_{2k_r, p^n - k_r} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Z}[1/2],$$

so that $\psi_r \in \mathcal{M}_r$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\mathcal{M}_r/p^n \mathcal{M}_r \cong V_{2k_r, p^n - k_r}$ as representations of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/p^n \mathbb{Z})$. Also, we have $p^n \mathcal{M}_r \subset \mathcal{M}_r \cap p^n \mathcal{R}$, which is an equality if $r = 0$ since \mathcal{M}_0 is generated by $\psi_0 = \nu^{p^n}$. Let \mathcal{N}_0 be the image of the equivariant injective map

$$\mathcal{M}_0/p^n \mathcal{M}_0 = \mathcal{M}_0/(\mathcal{M}_0 \cap p^n \mathcal{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M})/((\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M}) \cap p^n \mathcal{R}),$$

where $\mathcal{M} = \bigoplus_{r=1}^{2^n-1} \mathcal{M}_r$. Let \mathcal{N} be the preimage of \mathcal{N}_0 under the equivariant injective map

$$\mathcal{M}/(\mathcal{M} \cap p^n \mathcal{R}) \rightarrow (\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M})/((\mathcal{M}_0 \oplus \mathcal{M}) \cap p^n \mathcal{R}).$$

Since \mathcal{N}_0 is generated by the image of ψ_0 , it follows from (2.1) that the induced map $\mathcal{N} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_0$ is an isomorphism. Hence \mathcal{N}_0 appears in the preimage of \mathcal{N} under the equivariant surjective map

$$\mathcal{M}/p^n \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}/(\mathcal{M} \cap p^n \mathcal{R})$$

as a quotient. Since $\mathcal{N}_0 \cong V_{0, p^n}$ and $\mathcal{M}/p^n \mathcal{M} \cong \bigoplus_{r=1}^{2^n-1} V_{2k_r, p^n - k_r}$, Theorem 2.1 follows.

3. SOME CONGRUENCES FOR BINOMIAL COEFFICIENTS

In this section, we reduce the proof of (2.1) to the following congruences for binomial coefficients. Fix an odd prime p . Then the non-negative integers k_r defined in the previous section are even. For $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ and $n \geq 1$, we write $x \equiv 0 \pmod{p^n}$ if $x \in p^n\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$.

Theorem 3.1. *For $n \geq 1$ and $i \geq 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \binom{k_r/2}{i} \binom{-1/2-i}{k_r/2} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^n}.$$

Note that the left-hand side belongs to $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ since $\binom{x}{k} \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ for $x \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $k \geq 0$. The proof of this theorem will be given in the next section.

Recall that

$$\phi(z) = z_{11}^2 + z_{21}^2, \quad \nu(z) = z_{11}z_{22} - z_{12}z_{21}.$$

Put

$$\psi(z) = z_{12}^2 + z_{22}^2, \quad \chi(z) = z_{11}z_{12} + z_{21}z_{22},$$

so that

$$(3.1) \quad D\phi = 2\chi, \quad D^2\phi = 2\psi, \quad D^3\phi = 0.$$

Put $\xi = \phi\psi = \nu^2 + \chi^2$ and $\eta = \chi^2$.

Lemma 3.2. *For any even integer $k \geq 0$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{k!} D^k \phi^k = 2^k \sum_{i=0}^{k/2} \binom{k/2}{i} \binom{(k-1)/2}{i} \xi^i \eta^{k/2-i}.$$

Proof. By the Leibniz rule, we have

$$D^k \phi^k = \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_k} \frac{k!}{m_1! \cdots m_k!} D^{m_1} \phi \cdots D^{m_k} \phi,$$

where m_1, \dots, m_k run over non-negative integers such that $m_1 + \cdots + m_k = k$. By (3.1), we may assume that $m_1, \dots, m_k \leq 2$. For $m \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, let N_m be the number of $0 \leq j \leq k$ such that $m_j = m$. Then we have $N_0 + N_1 + N_2 = k$ and $N_1 + 2N_2 = k$, so that $N_0 = N_2$ and $N_1 = k - 2N_2$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} D^k \phi^k &= \sum_{i=0}^{k/2} \binom{k}{2i} \binom{2i}{i} \frac{k!}{2^i} \phi^i (2\chi)^{k-2i} (2\psi)^i \\ &= 2^k k! \sum_{i=0}^{k/2} \binom{k}{2i} \binom{2i}{i} 2^{-2i} (\phi\psi)^i \chi^{k-2i}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\binom{k}{2i} \binom{2i}{i} 2^{-2i} = \frac{k(k-1) \cdots (k-2i+1)}{2^{2i} (i!)^2} = \binom{k/2}{i} \binom{(k-1)/2}{i},$$

the assertion follows. \square

By this lemma, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_r &= (-1)^{k_r/2} \nu p^{n-k_r} \sum_{i=0}^{k_r/2} \binom{k_r/2}{i} \binom{(k_r-1)/2}{i} \xi^i \eta^{k_r/2-i} \\ &= (-1)^{(p^n-1)/2} \nu \eta^{(p^n-1)/2} (1-\xi\eta^{-1})^{(p^n-1-k_r)/2} \sum_{i=0}^{k_r/2} \binom{k_r/2}{i} \binom{(k_r-1)/2}{i} (\xi\eta^{-1})^i\end{aligned}$$

in $\mathcal{R}[1/\eta]$. Thus, to prove (2.1), it suffices to show that

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r (1-t)^{(p^n-1-k_r)/2} F_{k_r/2}(t) \in p^n \mathbb{Z}[1/2][t],$$

where

$$F_m(t) = \sum_{i=0}^m \binom{m}{i} \binom{m-1/2}{i} t^i \in \mathbb{Z}[1/2][t]$$

for $m \geq 0$. Note that $F_m(t)$ is equal to the hypergeometric polynomial ${}_2F_1(-m, -m+1/2; 1; t)$. Changing the variable $t \mapsto 1-t$, we see that (3.2) is equivalent to

$$(3.3) \quad \sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r t^{(p^n-1-k_r)/2} F_{k_r/2}(1-t) \in p^n \mathbb{Z}[1/2][t].$$

Lemma 3.3. *For $m \geq 0$, we have*

$$F_m(1-t) = \sum_{i=0}^m (-1)^i \binom{m}{i} \binom{-1/2-i}{m} t^{m-i}.$$

Proof. By [3, (3.17)], we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^m \binom{m}{i} \binom{x}{i} t^i = \sum_{i=0}^m \binom{m}{i} \binom{x+i}{m} (t-1)^{m-i},$$

so that

$$F_m(1-t) = \sum_{i=0}^m (-1)^{m-i} \binom{m}{i} \binom{m-1/2+i}{m} t^{m-i}.$$

Since

$$(-1)^m \binom{m-1/2+i}{m} = \binom{-i-1/2}{m},$$

the assertion follows. □

By this lemma, (3.3) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \sum_{i=0}^{(p^n-1)/2} (-1)^i \binom{k_r/2}{i} \binom{-i-1/2}{k_r/2} t^{(p^n-1)/2-i} \in p^n \mathbb{Z}[1/2][t].$$

Hence Theorem 3.1 implies (3.3), which in turn implies (2.1).

4. MORE CONGRUENCES FOR BINOMIAL COEFFICIENTS

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 3.1, which completes the proof of Theorem 2.1. In fact, we prove the following generalization of Theorem 3.1.

4.1. Generalized congruences. Fix a prime p and an integer $1 \leq b \leq p-1$. For any integer $r \geq 0$, we write $r = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r_i 2^i$ with $r_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and put

$$m(r) = b \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r_i p^i.$$

If $p = 2$ and $b = 1$, then we have $m(r) = r$. Also, for any integers $a \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r \leq 2^a - 1$, we have

$$(4.1) \quad m(r) + m(d_a(r)) = m(2^a - 1),$$

where

$$d_a(r) = 2^a - 1 - r.$$

Note that the map $r \mapsto d_a(r)$ is an involution on $\{0, 1, \dots, 2^a - 1\}$.

Theorem 4.1. *For $n \geq 1$, $a \geq n$, and $i \geq 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \binom{m(r)}{i} \binom{m(2^a - 1) - i}{m(r)} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^n}.$$

Note that Theorem 3.1 is a special case of this theorem. Indeed, if $p \neq 2$ and $b = (p-1)/2$, then we have $m(r) = k_r/2$ and $m(2^a - 1) = (p^a - 1)/2$. By continuity of the function $x \mapsto \binom{x}{k}$ on \mathbb{Z}_p for $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\binom{(p^a - 1)/2 - i}{k_r/2} \equiv \binom{-1/2 - i}{k_r/2} \pmod{p^n}$$

for $a \gg 0$. Hence Theorem 4.1 implies Theorem 3.1.

Also, if $a = n$, then Theorem 4.1 obviously holds. Indeed, putting

$$X = \sum_{r=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^r \binom{m(r)}{i} \binom{m(2^n - 1) - i}{m(r)},$$

we have

$$X = \sum_r (-1)^r \frac{(m(2^n - 1) - i)!}{i! \cdot (m(r) - i)! \cdot (m(d_n(r)) - i)!}$$

by (4.1), where r runs over integers such that $0 \leq r \leq 2^n - 1$ and $i \leq \min\{m(r), m(d_n(r))\}$. Changing the variable $r \mapsto d_n(r)$, we deduce that $X = -X$, so that $X = 0$. Hence we may assume that $a > n$.

4.2. A result of Granville. First we introduce some notation. For any integers $n, j, l \geq 0$, put $t_j(n) = \lfloor n/p^j \rfloor$ and let $0 \leq t_{j,l}(n) \leq p^l - 1$ be the integer such that $t_{j,l}(n) \equiv t_j(n) \pmod{p^l}$. Namely, if we write $n = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} n_i p^i$ with $n_i \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$, then we have

$$t_j(n) = \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} n_i p^{i-j}, \quad t_{j,l}(n) = \sum_{i=j}^{j+l-1} n_i p^{i-j}.$$

Note that

$$(4.2) \quad v_p(t_j(n)!) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} t_{j+l}(n)$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad t_j(n) + t_j(n') \leq t_j(n + n')$$

for $n, n' \geq 0$. Put $\epsilon_j(n, n') = 1$ if there is a carry in the j th digit when adding n and n' in base p , and $\epsilon_j(n, n') = 0$ otherwise. Then we have

$$t_{j,1}(n + n') = t_{j,1}(n) + t_{j,1}(n') + \epsilon_{j-1}(n, n') - p\epsilon_j(n, n'),$$

where we interpret $\epsilon_{-1}(n, n') = 0$.

Lemma 4.2 ([4, (2.4)]). *For $n, n', j \geq 0$, we have*

$$t_j(n + n') - t_j(n) - t_j(n') = \epsilon_{j-1}(n, n').$$

In other words, the equality in (4.3) holds if and only if there is no carry in the $(j-1)$ th digit when adding n and n' in base p .

In [4], Granville generalized Lucas' theorem on binomial coefficients modulo p and gave a remarkable formula for binomial coefficients modulo an arbitrary power of p . The proof of his formula is based on the following, which also plays a key role in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 4.3 ([4, Corollary 1]). *For $n, j, l \geq 0$, we have*

$$t_j(n)! / t_{j+1}(n)! p^{t_{j+1}(n)} = t_j(n)!_p \equiv \delta^{t_{j+1}(n)} t_{j,l}(n)!_p \pmod{p^l},$$

where

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p = 2 \text{ and } l \geq 3; \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

4.3. Further generalizations. We will obtain Theorem 4.1 as a special case of more general congruences. Fix $n \geq 1$ and $a > n$. For $0 \leq r \leq 2^n - 1$ (so that $r < d_a(r)$) and $i, j \geq 0$, put

$$x_j(r, i) = \begin{cases} \frac{t_j(m(2^a - 1) - i)!}{t_j(i)! \cdot t_j(m(r) - i)! \cdot t_j(m(d_a(r)) - i)!} & \text{if } i \leq m(r); \\ 0 & \text{if } i > m(r). \end{cases}$$

Note that $x_j(r, i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. Indeed, if $i \leq m(r)$, then putting

$$e_j(r, i) = t_j(m(2^a - 1) - i) - t_j(i) - t_j(m(r) - i) - t_j(m(d_a(r)) - i),$$

we have $e_j(r, i) \geq 0$ by (4.1) and (4.3), and

$$(4.4) \quad v_p(x_j(r, i)) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} e_{j+l}(r, i) \geq 0$$

by (4.2).

For $0 \leq k \leq n$ and $0 \leq r \leq 2^{n-k} - 1$, we define a subset $S_k(r)$ of $\{0, 1, \dots, 2^n - 1\}$ as follows:

- If $k = 0$, then we put $S_0(r) = \{r\}$.
- If $1 \leq k \leq n$, then we put $S_k(r) = S'_k(r) \cup S''_k(r)$, where

$$S'_k(r) = \{r + 2^{n-k+1}r' \mid 0 \leq r' \leq 2^{k-1} - 1\},$$

$$S''_k(r) = \{d_n(s) \mid s \in S'_k(r)\}.$$

Since $d_n(s) = d_{n-k+1}(r) + 2^{n-k+1}d_{k-1}(r')$ for $s = r + 2^{n-k+1}r' \in S_k(r)$, we can also write

$$S''_k(r) = \{d_{n-k+1}(r) + 2^{n-k+1}r' \mid 0 \leq r' \leq 2^{k-1} - 1\}.$$

Note that

$$(4.5) \quad S_k(r) \cup S_k(d_{n-k}(r)) = S_{k+1}(r)$$

for $0 \leq k < n$ and $0 \leq r \leq 2^{n-k-1} - 1$. Indeed, the assertion is obvious for $k = 0$, whereas

$$\begin{aligned} S'_k(r) \cup S''_k(d_{n-k}(r)) &= S'_{k+1}(r), \\ S''_k(r) \cup S'_k(d_{n-k}(r)) &= S''_{k+1}(r) \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq k < n$.

For $i, j \geq 0$, put

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) = \sum_{s \in S_k(r)} (-1)^s x_j(s, i).$$

Note that the left-hand side of Theorem 4.1 is equal to $X_{0,n}(0, i)$. In particular, the following implies Theorem 4.1.

Theorem 4.4. *For $0 \leq k \leq n$, $0 \leq r \leq 2^{n-k} - 1$, $i \geq 0$, and $0 \leq j \leq n - k$, we have*

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k}.$$

4.4. Proof of Theorem 4.4. Fix $n \geq 1$ and $a > n$. For $0 \leq r \leq 2^n - 1$ and $i, j \geq 0$, put

$$y_j(r, i) = \begin{cases} x_j(r, i)/x_{j+1}(r, i) & \text{if } i \leq m(r); \\ 0 & \text{if } i > m(r). \end{cases}$$

Note that $y_j(r, i) \in \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$. Indeed, if $i \leq m(r)$, then we have $v_p(y_j(r, i)) = e_{j+1}(r, i) \geq 0$ by (4.4). Moreover, if $i > m(r)$, then it follows from Proposition 4.3 that

$$(4.6) \quad y_j(r, i)/p^{e_{j+1}(r, i)} \equiv \delta^{e_{j+1}(r, i)} \frac{t_{j,l}(m(2^a - 1) - i)!_p}{t_{j,l}(i)!_p \cdot t_{j,l}(m(r) - i)!_p \cdot t_{j,l}(m(d_a(r)) - i)!_p} \pmod{p^l}$$

for $l \geq 0$.

Lemma 4.5. *For $0 \leq k < n$, $0 \leq r \leq 2^{n-k-1} - 1$, $0 \leq i \leq m(d_n(d_{n-k}(r)))$, and $0 \leq j < n - k$, we have*

$$y_j(d_n(d_{n-k}(r)), i) \equiv y_j(d_n(r), i) \pmod{p^{n-j-k}}.$$

Proof. Put $r' = d_{n-k}(r)$, $s = d_n(r)$, and $s' = d_n(r')$, so that the assertion of the lemma is

$$y_j(s', i) \equiv y_j(s, i) \pmod{p^{n-j-k}}.$$

The following figure describes the positions of r, r', s, s' when $k \geq 1$.

\mathfrak{s}'

Since $s = 2^n - 2^{n-k} + r'$ and $0 \leq r' \leq 2^{n-k} - 1$, we have

$$m(s) = m(2^n - 2^{n-k}) + m(r').$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} m(d_a(s')) &= m(2^a - 2^n + r') = m(2^a - 2^n) + m(r') \\ &= m(2^a - 2^n) - m(2^n - 2^{n-k}) + m(s), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$m(2^n - 2^{n-k}) + m(d_a(s')) - i = m(2^a - 2^n) + m(s) - i.$$

Similarly, we have

$$m(2^n - 2^{n-k}) + m(d_a(s)) - i = m(2^a - 2^n) + m(s') - i.$$

This and Lemma 4.2 imply that for $0 \leq l \leq n - k$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_l(m(2^n - 2^{n-k})) + t_l(m(d_a(s')) - i) &= t_l(m(2^a - 2^n)) + t_l(m(s) - i), \\ t_l(m(2^n - 2^{n-k})) + t_l(m(d_a(s)) - i) &= t_l(m(2^a - 2^n)) + t_l(m(s') - i), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$e_l(s', i) = e_l(s, i).$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_{j,n-j-k}(m(d_a(s')) - i) &= t_{j,n-j-k}(m(s) - i), \\ t_{j,n-j-k}(m(d_a(s)) - i) &= t_{j,n-j-k}(m(s') - i). \end{aligned}$$

From this and (4.6), the assertion follows. \square

From now on, we fix $i \geq 0$. For $j \geq 0$ and $0 \leq k \leq n$, we consider the following statement:

$$(*)_{j,k} \quad X_{j,k}(r, i) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k} \text{ for all } 0 \leq r \leq 2^{n-k} - 1.$$

We write $(*)_k$ for the collection of $(*)_{j,k}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq n - k$.

We need to show that $(*)_k$ holds for all $0 \leq k \leq n$. We proceed by induction on k . Obviously, $(*)_0$ holds.

Lemma 4.6. *Fix $1 \leq k \leq n$. Assume that $(*)_{k'}$ holds for all $0 \leq k' < k$. Then we have*

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) \equiv y_j(d_n(r), i)X_{j+1,k}(r, i) \pmod{p^k}$$

for $0 \leq j \leq n - k$ and $0 \leq r \leq 2^{n-k} - 1$.

Proof. For $0 \leq k' \leq k$, we define a subset $R_{k'}(r)$ of $S_k(r)$ by

$$R_{k'}(r) = \{s \in S_k(r) \mid 0 \leq s \leq 2^{n-k'} - 1\}.$$

In particular, we have $R_0(r) = S_k(r)$ and $R_k(r) = \{r\}$. Moreover, if $0 \leq k' < k$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k'}(r) &= \{r + 2^{n-k+1}r' \mid 0 \leq r' \leq 2^{k-k'-1} - 1\} \\ &\cup \{d_{n-k+1}(r) + 2^{n-k+1}r' \mid 0 \leq r' \leq 2^{k-k'-1} - 1\}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$(4.7) \quad R_{k'}(r) = R_{k'+1}(r) \cup \{d_{n-k'}(s) \mid s \in R_{k'+1}(r)\}.$$

Recall that

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) = \sum_{s \in S_k(r)} (-1)^s y_j(s, i) x_{j+1}(s, i) = \sum_{s \in R_0(r)} y_j(s, i) X_{j+1,0}(s, i).$$

It suffices to show that

$$(**)_{k'} \quad X_{j,k}(r, i) \equiv \sum_{s \in R_{k'}(r)} y_j(d_n(s), i) X_{j+1,k'}(s, i) \pmod{p^k}$$

for $1 \leq k' \leq k$. Indeed, if $k' = k$, then the right-hand side is equal to $y_j(d_n(r), i) X_{j+1,k}(r, i)$, so that $(**)_{k'}$ is simply a restatement of the lemma.

We proceed by induction on k' . First consider the base case $k' = 1$. By (4.7), we have

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) = \sum_{s \in R_1(r)} (y_j(s, i)X_{j+1,0}(s, i) + y_j(d_n(s), i)X_{j+1,0}(d_n(s), i)).$$

For $s \in R_1(r)$, if $i \leq m(s)$, then noting that $k \leq n - j$, we have

$$y_j(s, i) \equiv y_j(d_n(s), i) \pmod{p^k}$$

by Lemma 4.5. This implies that

$$y_j(s, i)X_{j+1,0}(s, i) \equiv y_j(d_n(s), i)X_{j+1,0}(s, i) \pmod{p^k}.$$

If $i > m(s)$, then the above congruence obviously holds since $X_{j+1,0}(s, i) = 0$. Hence we have

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) \equiv \sum_{s \in R_1(r)} y_j(d_n(s), i)(X_{j+1,0}(s, i) + X_{j+1,0}(d_n(s), i)) \pmod{p^k}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$X_{j+1,0}(s, i) + X_{j+1,0}(d_n(s), i) = X_{j+1,1}(s, i)$$

by (4.5). From this, we deduce that $(**)_{1}$ holds.

Now fix $1 \leq k' < k$ and assume that $(**)_{k'}$ holds. By (4.7), we have

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) \equiv \sum_{s \in R_{k'+1}(r)} (y_j(d_n(s), i)X_{j+1,k'}(s, i) + y_j(d_n(d_{n-k'}(s)), i)X_{j+1,k'}(d_{n-k'}(s), i)) \pmod{p^k}.$$

For $s \in R_{k'+1}(r)$, if $i \leq m(d_n(d_{n-k'}(s)))$, then noting that $k - k' \leq n - j - k'$, we have

$$y_j(d_n(d_{n-k'}(s)), i) \equiv y_j(d_n(s), i) \pmod{p^{k-k'}}$$

by Lemma 4.5. Since $(*)_{k'}$ holds by assumption, this implies that

$$y_j(d_n(d_{n-k'}(s)), i)X_{j+1,k'}(d_{n-k'}(s), i) \equiv y_j(d_n(s), i)X_{j+1,k'}(d_{n-k'}(s), i) \pmod{p^k}.$$

If $i > m(d_n(d_{n-k'}(s)))$, then the above congruence obviously holds since $X_{j+1,k'}(d_{n-k'}(s), i) = 0$. Hence we have

$$X_{j,k}(r, i) \equiv \sum_{s \in R_{k'+1}(r)} y_j(d_n(s), i)(X_{j+1,k'}(s, i) + X_{j+1,k'}(d_{n-k'}(s), i)) \pmod{p^k}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$X_{j+1,k'}(s, i) + X_{j+1,k'}(d_{n-k'}(s), i) = X_{j+1,k'+1}(s, i)$$

by (4.5). From this, we deduce that $(**)_{k'+1}$ holds.

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.7. Fix $1 \leq k \leq n$. Assume that $(*)_{k'}$ holds for all $0 \leq k' < k$. Then we have

$$X_{n-k,k}(r, i) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k}$$

for $0 \leq r \leq 2^{n-k} - 1$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.6, we have

$$X_{n-k,k}(r, i) \equiv y_{n-k}(d_n(r), i)X_{n-k+1,k}(r, i) \pmod{p^k}.$$

Since

$$X_{n-k+1,k}(r, i) = X_{n-k+1,k-1}(r, i) + X_{n-k+1,k-1}(d_{n-k+1}(r), i)$$

by (4.5), and $(*)_{k-1}$ holds by assumption, we have

$$X_{n-k+1,k}(r, i) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{k-1}}.$$

If $y_{n-k}(d_n(r), i) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$, then this implies that $X_{n-k,k}(r, i) \equiv 0 \pmod{p^k}$.

Now assume that $y_{n-k}(d_n(r), i) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ (so that $i \leq m(d_n(r))$). Then for any $s \in S_k(r)$ such that $i \leq m(s)$, we show that

$$(4.8) \quad y_{n-k}(s, i) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

by backward induction on s . By assumption, (4.8) holds for the base case $s = d_n(r)$ (which is the largest integer in $S_k(r)$). Fix $s_0 \in S_k(r)$ such that $s_0 < d_n(r)$ and $i \leq m(s_0)$, and assume that (4.8) holds for all $s \in S_k(r)$ such that $s_0 < s \leq d_n(r)$. Let k_0 be the largest integer such that $d_n(s_0) \leq 2^{n-k_0} - 1$ (so that $d_n(s_0) \in R_{k_0}(r)$ with the notation of the proof of Lemma 4.6). Since $s_0 < d_n(r)$, we have $k_0 < k$. By (4.7), we may write $d_n(s_0) = d_{n-k_0}(r_0)$ for some $r_0 \in R_{k_0+1}(r)$ (so that $r_0 \leq 2^{n-k_0-1} - 1$ and $s_0 = d_n(d_{n-k_0}(r_0)) < d_n(r_0)$). Then we have

$$y_{n-k}(s_0, i) \equiv y_{n-k}(d_n(r_0), i) \pmod{p}$$

by Lemma 4.5. Hence (4.8) holds for $s = s_0$ by the induction hypothesis.

By (4.8), we have

$$e_{n-k+1}(s, i) = v_p(y_{n-k}(s, i)) = 0$$

for $s \in S_k(r)$ such that $i \leq m(s)$. Since $e_{n-k+1}(s, i) = e' + e''$ with

$$e' = t_{n-k+1}(m(s)) - t_{n-k+1}(i) - t_{n-k+1}(m(s) - i) \geq 0,$$

$$e'' = t_{n-k+1}(m(2^a - 1) - i) - t_{n-k+1}(m(d_a(s)) - i) - t_{n-k+1}(m(s)) \geq 0$$

by (4.1) and (4.3), we have

$$(4.9) \quad t_{n-k+1}(m(s)) = t_{n-k+1}(i) + t_{n-k+1}(m(s) - i),$$

$$(4.10) \quad t_{n-k+1}(m(2^a - 1) - i) = t_{n-k+1}(m(d_a(s)) - i) + t_{n-k+1}(m(s))$$

for $s \in S_k(r)$ such that $i \leq m(s)$.

We will show that the assumption $y_{n-k}(d_n(r), i) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ forces $X_{n-k+1,k}(r, i) = 0$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} X_{n-k+1,k}(r, i) &= \sum_{s \in S'_k(r)} (-1)^s x_{n-k+1}(s, i) + \sum_{s \in S''_k(r)} (-1)^s x_{n-k+1}(s, i) \\ &= \sum_{s \in S'_k(r)} (-1)^s x_{n-k+1}(s, i) - \sum_{s \in S'_k(r)} (-1)^s x_{n-k+1}(d_n(s), i). \end{aligned}$$

For $s = r + 2^{n-k+1}r' \in S'_k(r)$ with $0 \leq r' \leq 2^{k-1} - 1$, put $s' = r + 2^{n-k+1}d_{k-1}(r') \in S'_k(r)$. Note that $d_n(s') = d_{n-k+1}(r) + 2^{n-k+1}r'$, so that $d_n(s') > s$ and

$$(4.11) \quad t_{n-k+1}(m(d_n(s'))) = t_{n-k+1}(m(s)).$$

Since the map $s \mapsto s'$ is an involution on $S'_k(r)$, it suffices to show that

$$(4.12) \quad x_{n-k+1}(d_n(s'), i) = x_{n-k+1}(s, i).$$

First assume that $i \leq m(s)$. By (4.9), (4.10), and (4.11), we have

$$t_{n-k+1}(m(d_n(s')) - i) = t_{n-k+1}(m(s) - i),$$

$$t_{n-k+1}(m(d_a(d_n(s'))) - i) = t_{n-k+1}(m(d_a(s)) - i).$$

Hence (4.12) follows from the definition.

Next assume that $m(s) < i \leq m(d_n(s'))$. Write $i = u + p^{n-k+1}u'$ with $0 \leq u \leq p^{n-k+1} - 1$ and $u' \geq 0$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} m(s) &= m(r) + p^{n-k+1}m(r'), \\ m(d_n(s')) &= m(d_{n-k+1}(r)) + p^{n-k+1}m(r'), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$m(r) < u \leq m(d_{n-k+1}(r)), \quad u' = m(r'),$$

and

$$t_{n-k+1}(m(d_n(s'))) = m(r').$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m(2^a - 1) - i &= m(2^{n-k+1} - 1) + m(2^a - 2^{n-k+1}) - i \\ &= m(2^{n-k+1} - 1) - u + p^{n-k+1}(m(2^{a-n+k-1} - 1) - u'), \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$t_{n-k+1}(m(2^a - 1) - i) = m(2^{a-n+k-1} - 1) - u'.$$

Moreover, we have $d_a(d_n(s')) = r + 2^{n-k+1}(d_{a-n+k-1}(r'))$ and

$$m(d_a(d_n(s'))) - i = m(r) - u + p^{n-k+1}(m(d_{a-n+k-1}(r')) - u'),$$

so that

$$t_{n-k+1}(m(d_a(d_n(s'))) - i) < m(d_{a-n+k-1}(r')) - u'$$

since $m(r) - u < 0$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_{n-k+1}(m(d_n(s'))) + t_{n-k+1}(m(d_a(d_n(s'))) - i) &< m(r') + m(d_{a-n+k-1}(r')) - u' \\ &= m(2^{a-n+k-1} - 1) - u' \\ &= t_{n-k+1}(m(2^a - 1) - i). \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts (4.10) (with s replaced by $d_n(s')$), which implies that the case $m(s) < i \leq m(d_n(s'))$ cannot occur under the assumption $y_{n-k}(d_n(r), i) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$.

Finally, if $i > m(d_n(s'))$, then both sides of (4.12) are equal to 0. This completes the proof. \square

Fix $1 \leq k \leq n$. Assume that $(*)_{k'}$ holds for all $0 \leq k' < k$. Then $(*)_{n-k,k}$ holds by Lemma 4.7. Hence we deduce from Lemma 4.6 and backward induction on j that $(*)_{j,k}$ holds for all $0 \leq j \leq n - k$. Namely, $(*)_k$ holds. This completes the proof of Theorem 4.4.

This also completes the proof of Theorem 2.1.

Acknowledgments. A.I. was partially supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19H01781. K.P. was partially supported by NSF grant DMS 2001293.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Dwork, *p-adic cycles*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. No. 37 (1969), 27–115.
- [2] D. J. Glover, *A study of certain modular representations*, J. Algebra **51** (1978), no. 2, 425–475.
- [3] H. W. Gould, *Combinatorial identities. A standardized set of tables listing 500 binomial coefficient summations*, Morgantown, WV, 1972.
- [4] A. Granville, *Arithmetic properties of binomial coefficients. I. Binomial coefficients modulo prime powers*, CMS Conf. Proc. **20**, Published by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1997, 253–276.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KITASHIRAKAWA OIWAKE-CHO, SAKYO-KU, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: `ichino@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, 2074 EAST HALL, 530 CHURCH STREET, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109-1043, USA

Email address: `kartikp@umich.edu`