NEW ANALOGUES OF RAMANUJAN’S PARTITION IDENTITIES

HENG HUAT CHAN AND PEE CHOON TOH

Abstract. We establish several new analogues of Ramanujan’s exact partition identities using the theory of modular functions.

1. Introduction

Let \( p(n) \) denote the number of unrestricted partitions of the non-negative integer \( n \), then

\[
\begin{align*}
(1.1) \quad p(5^j n + \delta_{5,j}) & \equiv 0 \pmod{5^j}, \\
(1.2) \quad p(7^j n + \delta_{7,j}) & \equiv 0 \pmod{7^{(j/2)+1}}, \\
(1.3) \quad p(11^j n + \delta_{11,j}) & \equiv 0 \pmod{11^j},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \delta_{\ell,j} = 1/24 \pmod{\ell^j} \). These are commonly known as the Ramanujan congruences. The congruence (1.3) was proved by A.O.L. Atkin [1] while the proofs of (1.1) and (1.2) have traditionally been attributed to G.N. Watson [18], although Ramanujan had already outlined the proofs in an unpublished manuscript [4]. More details about this and other results concerning \( p(n) \) can be found in [13, Chap. 5].

In [15], Ramanujan proved (1.1) and (1.2) for \( j = 1 \) and 2 using the following two identities

\[
\begin{align*}
(1.4) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p(5n+4)q^n &= 5 \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{5n})^5}{(1-q^n)^6}, \\
(1.5) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p(7n+5)q^n &= 7 \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{7n})^3}{(1-q^n)^4} + 49q \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{7n})^7}{(1-q^n)^8}.
\end{align*}
\]

Identity (1.4) was described by G.H. Hardy as Ramanujan’s most beautiful identity [16, p. xxxv] and Ramanujan [15] provided an elegant proof using the following identity,

\[
(1.6) \quad q^{-1/5} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(1-q^{n/5})}{(1-q^{5n})} = \frac{1}{R(q)} - 1 - R(q),
\]
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where $R(q)$ is the Rogers-Ramanujan continued fraction given by

$$R(q) = \frac{q^{1/5}}{1 + \frac{q}{1 + \frac{q^2}{1 + \cdots}}}.$$ 

Recently, H.-C. Chan [5, Th. 2] proved an analogue of (1.6) involving Ramanujan’s cubic continued fraction and obtained an analogue of (1.4). He showed that if

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty a(n)q^n = \prod_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{(1-q^n)(1-q^{2n})},$$

then

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty a(3n+2)q^n = 3 \prod_{n=1}^\infty \frac{(1-q^{3n})^3(1-q^{6n})^3}{(1-q^n)^4(1-q^{2n})^4}. \quad (1.7)$$

H.-C. Chan and S. Cooper [7] subsequently obtained another analogue of (1.4), namely,

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty c(2n+1)q^n = 2 \prod_{n=1}^\infty \frac{(1-q^{2n})^4(1-q^{6n})^4}{(1-q^n)^6(1-q^{3n})^6}, \quad (1.8)$$

where the generating function of $c(n)$ is given by

$$\sum_{n=0}^\infty c(n)q^n = \prod_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{(1-q^n)^2(1-q^{3n})^2}. \quad (1.10)$$

Again (1.8) was derived via an identity analogous to (1.6). (See also [10].)

The existence of identities (1.4), (1.5), (1.7) and (1.8) can all be explained by the theory of modular functions. Furthermore, they can be established without first proving identities similar to (1.6). The first author and R.P. Lewis [9] used Hecke operators to provide a uniform proof of (1.4), (1.5), as well as an identity due to H.S. Zuckerman [19] involving the coefficients $p(13n + 6)$. In the next section, we extend their technique to prove (1.7), (1.8) and several new identities.

To state these identities, let $t$ be a positive integer and define the infinite product

$$E(t) = \prod_{n=1}^\infty (1-q^{tn}). \quad (1.9)$$

A generalized partition $\pi$ is an expression of the form

$$\pi = \left[ \prod_t q^{r_t} \right], \quad (1.10)$$

where $r_t$ are integers and only finitely many $r_t$ are nonzero. For a fixed partition $\pi$, we define the associated infinite product

$$A_\pi(j) = \prod_t \prod_{n=1}^\infty (1-q^{jn})^{r_t} = \prod_t E(jt)^{r_t}, \quad (1.11)$$
and the coefficients $p_\pi(n)$ by

\begin{equation}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_\pi(n)q^n = \frac{1}{E_\pi(1)}.
\end{equation}

In this notation, $a(n) = p_{[1^{1}23]}(n)$ and $c(n) = p_{[1^{2}3]}(n)$. We also adopt the convention that $p_\pi(n) = 0$ whenever $n$ is negative.

**Theorem 1.** The following identities hold.

\begin{align}
(1.13) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{1}7]}(2n - 1)q^n &= \frac{E(2)^2 E(14)^2}{E(1)^3 E(7)^3}. \\
(1.14) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{5}4]}(2n - 3)q^n &= 4q^2 \frac{E(2)^4 E(10)^4}{E(1)^8 E(5)^8} + 8q^3 \frac{E(2)^8 E(10)^8}{E(1)^{12} E(5)^{12}}. \\
(1.15) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{2}11]}(2n - 3)q^n &= 2q^2 \frac{E(2)^2 E(22)^2}{E(1)^4 E(11)^4} + 2q^3 \frac{E(2)^4 E(22)^4}{E(1)^6 E(11)^6}. \\
(1.16) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{5}1]}(3n - 2)q^n &= q \frac{E(3) E(15)}{E(1)^2 E(5)^2} + 3q^2 \frac{E(3)^3 E(15)^3}{E(1)^4 E(5)^4}. \\
(1.17) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{2}3]}(2n - 3)q^n &= q^2 \frac{E(2) E(46)}{E(1)^2 E(23)^2} + q^3 \frac{E(2)^2 E(46)^2}{E(1)^3 E(23)^3}. \\
(1.18) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{2}1]}(5n - 3)q^n &= 3q \frac{E(5) E(10)}{E(1)^2 E(2)^2} + 25q^2 \frac{E(5)^3 E(10)^3}{E(1)^4 E(2)^4} + 125q^3 \frac{E(5)^5 E(10)^5}{E(1)^6 E(2)^6}. \\
(1.19) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{1}11]}(3n - 4)q^n &= 2q^2 \frac{E(3) E(33)}{E(1)^2 E(11)^2} + 3q^3 \frac{E(3)^2 E(33)^2}{E(1)^3 E(11)^3} + 3q^4 \frac{E(3)^3 E(33)^3}{E(1)^4 E(11)^4}. \\
(1.20) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^{3}]}(7n - 8)q^n &= 16q^2 \frac{E(7) E(21)}{E(1)^2 E(3)^2} + 161q^3 \frac{E(7)^2 E(21)^2}{E(1)^3 E(3)^3} + 980q^4 \frac{E(7)^3 E(21)^3}{E(1)^4 E(3)^4} + 3773q^5 \frac{E(7)^4 E(21)^4}{E(1)^5 E(3)^5} + 9604q^6 \frac{E(7)^5 E(21)^5}{E(1)^6 E(3)^6} + 16807q^7 \frac{E(7)^6 E(21)^6}{E(1)^7 E(3)^7} + 16807q^8 \frac{E(7)^7 E(21)^7}{E(1)^8 E(3)^8}. 
\end{align}
Besides proving (1.7) Chan [6] proved a higher power analogue of the Ramanujan congruence for \( a(n) \). The corresponding analogue for \( c(n) \) was subsequently established by Chan and Cooper [7]. The result for \( a(n) \) is

**Corollary 2** (H.-C. Chan [6]).

\[
a(3^j n + c_j) \equiv 0 \pmod{3^{2\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1}},
\]

where \( c_j = 1/8 \pmod{3^j} \).

In Section 3, we shall prove a different higher power congruence for \( a(n) \), involving the prime 5, which leads to the following.

**Corollary 3.**

\[
a(5^j n + d_j) \equiv 0 \pmod{5^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor}},
\]

where \( d_j = 1/8 \pmod{5^j} \).

Both Corollaries 2 and 3 were first discovered implicitly by P.C. Eggan [11].

### 2. Proof of Theorem 1 and Consequences

In this section, we shall illustrate how the identities in Theorem 1 may be constructed via the theory of modular functions. Most of the results that we need can be found in [2].

Let \( \mathbb{H} = \{ \tau \in \mathbb{C} : \Im \tau > 0 \} \) be the complex upper half plane and \( \Gamma \) be any subgroup of \( SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \). Elements of \( \Gamma \) act on \( \mathbb{H} \) as linear fractional transformations and \( \Gamma \) has a connected fundamental domain. The points of compactification of the fundamental domain on the boundary of \( \mathbb{H} \) are called cusps. Fix an integer \( k \) for a function \( f(\tau) \) on \( \mathbb{H} \). \( k \) is usually called the weight of \( f(\tau) \), although in our treatment we are mainly interested in the case \( k = 0 \). For any matrix \( L = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in GL_2^+(\mathbb{R}) \), we define the slash operator by

\[
(2.1) \quad f | L = (ad - bc)^{k/2} (ct + d)^{-k} f \left( \frac{a\tau + b}{ct + d} \right).
\]

We say that \( f(\tau) \) is a modular function (of weight 0) on \( \Gamma \), if \( f(\tau) \) is analytic in the interior of \( \mathbb{H} \), meromorphic at each cusp of \( \Gamma \) and satisfies

\[
f | V = f, \text{ for every } V \in \Gamma.
\]

We define

\[
\Gamma_0(m) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) : c \equiv 0 \pmod{m} \right\},
\]

and

\[
A_n = \begin{pmatrix} n & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, W_e = \begin{pmatrix} ex & y \\ mz & ew \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( W_e \) is known as an Atkin-Lehner involution and satisfies \( \det W_e = e, e \parallel m \). The action of \( W_e \) is independent of \( x, y, z \) and \( w \) in the definition and \( W_e^2 = I \).

\[\text{We thank F.G. Garvan for this reference.}\]
modulo $\Gamma_0(m)$. $W_e$ is in the normalizer of $\Gamma_0(m)$ and we denote the group generated by $\Gamma_0(m)$ and $W_e$ by $\Gamma_0(m) + W_e$. Finally, we define the Hecke operator $U_\ell^*$ for some prime $\ell$ by

\[
(2.2) \quad f \mid U_\ell^* = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} f \mid A_\ell^{-1} S_j.
\]

Lemma 4. Let $\ell$ be prime, $\ell \mid m$. If $f(\tau)$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m)$ then $f \mid U_\ell^*$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m)$. Furthermore, if $\ell^2 \mid m$ then $f \mid U_\ell^*$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m/\ell)$.

Proof. [2, Lemma 7].

Lemma 5. Let $e \mid m$. If $f(\tau)$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m)$ then $f \mid W_e$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m)$.

Proof. [2, Lemma 10].

Lemma 6. Let $\ell$ be prime, $\ell \mid m$, $e \mid m$ and $(\ell, e) = 1$. If $f(\tau)$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m)$ then

\[
(f \mid U_\ell^*) \mid W_e = (f \mid W_e) \mid U_\ell^*.
\]

Proof. Following the proof of [2, Lemma 11], since $(\ell, e) = 1$, we can choose

\[
W_e \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{\ell} \quad \text{and} \quad M_j = \begin{pmatrix} \ell & -j \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

By the definition (2.2), we have

\[
f \mid U_\ell^* = \sum f \mid M_j^{-1},
\]

thus it suffices to prove that each $M_j^{-1}$ commutes with $W_e$. A straightforward computation reveals that $M_j^{-1}W_eM_j$ is a matrix with integral entries and is equal to some $W'_e$. Since these are involutions, $f \mid M_j^{-1}W_eM_jW'_e = f$, hence $f \mid M_j^{-1}W_e = f \mid W_eM_j^{-1}$.

Lemma 7. Let $\ell$ be prime, $\ell^2 \mid m$, $e \mid m$ and $(\ell, e) = 1$. If $f(\tau)$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m) + W_e$ then $f \mid U_\ell^*$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m/\ell) + W_e$.

Proof. By the hypothesis, $f$ is also a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m)$, hence $f(\tau) \mid U_\ell^*$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(m/\ell)$. Thus it suffices to show that $f(\tau) \mid U_\ell^*$ is invariant under $W_e$ which follows directly from Lemma 6.

From this point onwards, we only consider modular functions that vanish at all cusps. If we let $q = e^{2\pi i \tau}$, the Fourier expansion of the modular function $f(\tau)$ is given by

\[
f(\tau) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a(n)q^n.
\]
For a prime $\ell$, the Hecke operator $U_\ell$ is defined by

\[(2.3) \quad f \mid U_\ell = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(\ell n)q^n.\]

**Lemma 8.** Let $\ell$ be prime, $\ell \mid m$. If $f(\tau)$ is a modular function (of weight 0) on $\Gamma_0(m)$ that vanishes at all cusps, then $\ell f \mid U_\ell = f \mid U_\ell^*$.

*Proof.* [2, Lemma 14]. \qed

**Lemma 9.** For a product of two Fourier expansions, we have

\[
\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)q^{\alpha n}\right)\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b(n)q^n\right) \mid U_\ell = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)q^n\right)\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b(\ell n)q^n\right).
\]

This result was known to Atkin and J.N. O’Brien [3, Eq (28)], [12, p. 126] and plays a crucial role in our proof of the identities in Theorem 1. We have seen that the $U_\ell$ operator maps a modular function to another modular function on some $\Gamma$. Let $\mathbb{H}^*$ be the union of $\mathbb{H}$ and the set of cusps of $\Gamma$, if the genus of $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^*$ is zero, then we know the function field of $\Gamma \setminus \mathbb{H}^*$ over $\mathbb{C}$ is generated by a certain modular function $h$, known also as a hauptmodul. For brevity we simply say $\Gamma$ has genus zero.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** Fix a prime $\ell$ and a partition $\pi$ and define $A(j) = A_\pi(j)$ according to (1.11). $\ell$ and $\pi$ are chosen such that

\[(2.4) \quad \phi = \phi(\tau) = q^\alpha \frac{A(\ell^2)}{A(1)} \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha = \frac{\ell^2 - 1}{24} \sum_t tr_t,
\]

is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(\ell^2 e)+W_\ell$, where $(\ell, e) = 1$. In addition, $\Gamma_0(\ell e)+W_\ell$ should have genus zero, with hauptmodul defined by

\[(2.5) \quad h = h(\tau) = q^\beta \frac{A(\ell)^\gamma}{A(1)^\gamma} \quad \text{where} \quad \beta = \frac{(\ell - 1)^\gamma}{24} \sum_t tr_t.
\]

In the above, $\alpha$, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ are all positive integers.

From Lemma 9,

\[(2.6) \quad \phi \mid U_\ell = \left(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_\pi(n)q^n\right) \mid U_\ell = A(\ell) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_\pi(\ell n - \alpha)q^n.
\]

On the other hand, by Lemma 7, $\phi \mid U_\ell$ is a modular function on $\Gamma_0(\ell e)+W_\ell$ which has genus zero. Thus, it must be generated by the hauptmodul $h$. For each of the identities in Theorem 1, as well as (1.7) and (1.8), a computation reveals that $\phi \mid U_\ell$ are all polynomials in $h$ with integral coefficients, i.e.

\[(2.7) \quad \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_\pi(\ell n - \alpha)q^n = \frac{1}{A(\ell)} \sum_{j=1}^{N} a_j h^j, \quad a_j \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]

\qed
We shall illustrate by proving identity (1.20) in detail. The Dedekind eta function is defined as

\[(2.8) \quad \eta(\tau) = q^{1/24} \prod_{n=1}^\infty (1 - q^n) = q^{1/24}E(1), \quad \text{where} \quad q = e^{2\pi i \tau}.\]

For a generalized partition \(\pi\), we define the eta-quotient associated with \(\pi\) by

\[(2.9) \quad \eta_\pi(\tau) = \prod_h \eta(t \tau)^r.\]

Many examples of modular functions of weight 0 on \(\Gamma_0(m) + W_e\) can be given in terms of eta-quotients. In particular, \(\Gamma_0(21) + W_3\) has genus zero, and is generated by the hauptmodul

\[h = \frac{\eta(7\tau)\eta(21\tau)}{\eta(\tau)\eta(3\tau)} = \frac{A(7)}{A(1)},\]

where \(A(j) = E(j)E(3j)\) and \(\pi = [1^13^1]\). Now using the results in [8], we can check that

\[\phi = \frac{\eta(49\tau)\eta(147\tau)}{\eta(\tau)\eta(3\tau)} = q^8 \frac{A(7^2)}{A(1)} = \frac{A(7^2)}{A(1)} \sum_{n=0}^\infty p_{[1^13^1]}(n - 8)q^n\]

is a modular function on \(\Gamma_0(147) + W_3\). Thus

\[\phi | U_7 = A(7) \sum_{n=0}^\infty p_{[1^13^1]}(7n - 8)q^n\]

is a modular function on \(\Gamma_0(21) + W_3\). A direct calculation shows that it is equal to the following polynomial

\[(2.10) \quad p(h) = 16h^2 + 161h^3 + 980h^4 + 3773h^5 + 9604h^6 + 16807h^7 + 16807h^8,\]

which proves identity (1.20). The proofs of the other identities are similar, and can be deduced from the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>(\Gamma_0(\ell^2e) + W_\ell)</th>
<th>(\ell)</th>
<th>(\phi(\tau) = \eta_\pi)</th>
<th>(\pi)</th>
<th>(h = \eta_\pi)</th>
<th>(P(h))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1.7)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(18) + W_2)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>([9^{18}, 1^{12}])</td>
<td>([1^12^1])</td>
<td>([3^6, 1^{12}])</td>
<td>(3h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.8)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(12) + W_3)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>([4^{12}, 1^{18}])</td>
<td>([1^23^2])</td>
<td>([6^2, 1^{18}])</td>
<td>(2h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(28) + W_7)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>([4^{28}, 1^{21}])</td>
<td>([1^17^1])</td>
<td>([2^{14}, 1^9])</td>
<td>(h)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(20) + W_5)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>([9^{20}, 1^{12}])</td>
<td>([1^45^4])</td>
<td>([6^4, 1^{12}])</td>
<td>(4h^2 + 8h^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(44) + W_{11})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>([4^{44}, 1^{21}])</td>
<td>([2^{11}1^2])</td>
<td>([2^{22}, 1^2])</td>
<td>(2h^2 + 2h^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.16)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(45) + W_5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>([9^{45}, 1^{15}])</td>
<td>([1^15^1])</td>
<td>([3^2, 1^{15}])</td>
<td>(h + 3h^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(92) + W_{23})</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>([4^{92}, 1^{23}])</td>
<td>([1^23^1])</td>
<td>([2^{26}, 1^2])</td>
<td>(h^2 + h^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(50) + W_2)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>([2^{50}, 1^{12}])</td>
<td>([1^12^1])</td>
<td>([5^2, 1^2])</td>
<td>(3h + 25h^2 + 125h^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(99) + W_{11})</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>([9^{99}, 1^{21}])</td>
<td>([1^11^1])</td>
<td>([3^3, 1^{21}])</td>
<td>(2h^2 + 3h^3 + 3h^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.20)</td>
<td>(\Gamma_0(147) + W_3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>([9^{147}, 1^{34}])</td>
<td>([1^3^1])</td>
<td>([7^{21}, 1^3])</td>
<td>(p(h)) defined in (2.10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The list of identities given in Theorem 1 is by no means exhaustive. In theory, there should be many modular functions where one can apply the $U_\ell$ operator to lower the level by $\ell$. If the resulting congruence subgroup has genus zero, an identity in terms of the hauptmodul exists and can be easily calculated. But having genus zero is not a necessary condition. M.L. Lang has classified all congruence subgroups of level less than 300 that have genus zero and a list of these groups is given as an appendix in [8]. There are a total of 15 groups that explicitly meet the conditions set out in the proof of Theorem 1. The remaining 5 groups share the property that $e$ in $\Gamma_0(m) + W_e$ is composite. Their associated identities can be deduced from the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\Gamma_0(\ell^2e) + W_e$</th>
<th>$\ell$</th>
<th>$\phi(\tau) = \eta_\pi$</th>
<th>$\pi$</th>
<th>$\eta_\pi$</th>
<th>$P(h)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_0(36) + W_4$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^9 \cdot 3^6 \ 3^3 \cdot 18^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$[1^2 \cdot 2^{-1} 4^1]$</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^3 \cdot 3^2 12^2 \ 1^2 \cdot 2^2 6^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$h$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_0(36) + W_9$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 1^2 \cdot 2^3 \cdot 18^2 \ 3^3 \cdot 36^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$[1^3 \cdot 3^{-2} 9^3]$</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^3 \cdot 3^2 18^3 \ 2^3 \cdot 3^2 18^3 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$3h^2 + 2h^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_0(60) + W_{15}$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 1^2 \cdot 2^2 \cdot 90^2 \ 3^3 \cdot 18^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$[1^2 \cdot 3^{-1} 5^{-1} 15^2]$</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^3 \cdot 3^2 18^3 \ 2^3 \cdot 3^2 18^3 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$2h^2 + h^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_0(72) + W_8$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^2 \cdot 9^2 \cdot 72^2 \ 1^2 \cdot 2^2 \cdot 100^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$[1^2 \cdot 2^{-1} 2^{-1} 18^2]$</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^3 \cdot 3^2 4^2 24^2 \ 2^3 \cdot 3^2 4^2 24^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$4h^2 + 6h^3 + 3h^4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Gamma_0(100) + W_4$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^2 \cdot 25^2 \cdot 100^2 \ 1^2 \cdot 2^2 \cdot 50^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$[1^2 \cdot 2^{-2} 4^2]$</td>
<td>$\left[ \begin{array}{c} 2^3 \cdot 5^2 20^2 \ 2^3 \cdot 5^2 20^2 \end{array} \right]$</td>
<td>$11h^2 + 60h^3 + 175h^4 + 250h^5 + 125h^6$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above identities, we see that only $a(n), c(n), p_{[1^35^4]}(n)$ and $p_{[1^211^2]}(n)$ satisfy

\[(2.11) \quad p_\pi(\ell n - \alpha) \equiv 0 \quad (\text{mod } \ell).\]

J. Sinick [17] has obtained some necessary conditions for such congruences.

We further note that identities (1.13), (1.16), (1.18), (1.19) and (1.20) can be written as the following congruences:

\[(2.12) \quad E(2)E(14) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^27]}(2n - 1)q^n \equiv \eta^3(\tau)\eta^3(7\tau) \quad (\text{mod } 2).\]

\[(2.13) \quad E(3)E(15) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^25]}(3n - 2)q^n \equiv \eta^2(\tau)\eta^4(5\tau) \quad (\text{mod } 3).\]

\[(2.14) \quad E(5)E(10) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^221]}(5n - 3)q^n \equiv 3\eta^8(\tau)\eta^8(2\tau) \quad (\text{mod } 5).\]

\[(2.15) \quad E(3)E(33) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^211^2]}(3n - 4)q^n \equiv 2\eta^4(\tau)\eta^4(11\tau) \quad (\text{mod } 3).\]

\[(2.16) \quad E(7)E(21) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_{[1^23]}(7n - 8)q^n \equiv 2\eta^{12}(\tau)\eta^{12}(3\tau) \quad (\text{mod } 7).\]
Recall that in each of the above, the expression on the left hand side is a modular function on \( \Gamma_0(\ell e) + W_e \), which is now congruent (modulo \( \ell \)) to a modular form on \( \Gamma_0(e) \), where the weight of this modular form is divisible by \( \ell - 1 \).

To state our results involving higher powers of the prime \( \ell \), we fix a partition \( \pi = \prod t_t r_t \), the associated infinite product \( A_\pi(j) \), and the modular functions \( \phi(\tau) \) and \( h(\tau) \). (See (1.11), (2.4) and (2.5) for the respective definitions.) For positive integers \( j \), define

\[
L_{2j-1} = A_\pi(\ell) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_\pi(\ell^{2j-1}n - \delta_{2j-1})q^n, \\
L_{2j} = A_\pi(1) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p_\pi(\ell^{2j}n - \delta_{2j})q^n,
\]

where

\[
\delta_{2j-1} = \delta_{2j} = \frac{1 - \ell^{2j}}{1 - \ell^{2\alpha}}.
\]

(See (2.4) for a definition of \( \alpha \).)

**Theorem 10.** In each of the fifteen cases listed in Tables 1 and 2, \( L_j \) is a polynomial in \( h \), the hauptmodul, with integral coefficients.

In terms of \( L_j \), we can reformulate the results of [6] and [7] as the next two theorems.

**Theorem 11.** Let \( \pi = [1^1 2^1] \), \( \ell = 3 \) and \( \alpha = 1 \), then for each \( j \),

\[
L_j \equiv c_j 3^{2\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1} \eta^8(\tau) \eta^8(2\tau) \pmod{3^{2\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 2}},
\]

where \( c_j \) is some integer relatively prime to 3.

**Theorem 12.** Let \( \pi = [1^2 3^2] \), \( \ell = 2 \) and \( \alpha = 1 \), then for each \( j \),

\[
L_j \equiv d_j 2^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1} \eta^6(\tau) \eta^6(3\tau) \pmod{2^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 2}},
\]

where \( d_j \) is some integer relatively prime to 2.

We also have the following result.

**Theorem 13.** Let \( \pi = [1^1 2^1] \), \( \ell = 5 \) and \( \alpha = 1 \), then for each \( j \),

\[
L_j \equiv e_j 5^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor} \eta^8(\tau) \eta^8(2\tau) \pmod{5^{\lfloor j/2 \rfloor + 1}},
\]

where \( e_j \) is some integer relatively prime to 5.

Corollaries 2 and 3 in Section 1 are immediate consequences of Theorems 11 and 13.

**Remark 1.** Theorems 11-13 are motivated by an observation of the first author. He found that for prime numbers \( \ell \), if \( l_n \) is the smallest positive integral solution to

\[
24x \equiv 1 \pmod{\ell^n}
\]
and

\[
L_{n, \ell} = \begin{cases} 
\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^{\ell k}) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p(\ell^n k + l_n) q^{k+1}, & \text{if } n \text{ is odd,} \\
\prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^k) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} p(\ell^n k + l_n) q^{k+1}, & \text{if } n \text{ is even,}
\end{cases}
\]

then

\begin{align*}
L_{n, 5} &\equiv 5^n a_n \Delta \pmod{5^{n+1}}, \\
L_{n, 7} &\equiv 7^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1} b_n \Delta \pmod{7^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 2}}
\end{align*}

and

\begin{align*}
L_{n, 11} &\equiv 11^n c_n \Delta E_8 \pmod{11^{n+1}},
\end{align*}

where \((5, a_n) = (7, b_n) = (11, c_n) = 1,

\Delta = q \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^k)^{24}

and

\[E_8 = 1 + 480 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^7 q^k}{1 - q^k}.
\]

Note that (2.18) and (2.19) follow immediately from Watson’s work (see [12]). The congruence (2.20), on the other hand, does not follow immediately from existing methods. Y.F. Yang, at the request of the first author, verified (2.20) for the first few values of \(n\). It is very likely that one can obtain a rigorous proof of (2.20) using Atkin’s method given in [1]. It is our hope that by writing the congruences in the form as in (2.18)–(2.20), new proofs which are independent of Atkin’s identities and explicit use of modular equations such as (3.6) can be found.

3. Identities involving higher prime powers

We shall illustrate how Theorem 10 may be proved by induction on \(j\), with the identities of Theorem 1 forming the respective base cases, \(L_1\). This method is due to Atkin [1], [12, Chap. 7 and 8]. We first establish the following general lemmas.

**Lemma 14.** For a positive integer \(j\), we have

\[
L_{2j-1} \mid U_\ell = L_{2j},
\]

\[
(\phi L_{2j}) \mid U_\ell = L_{2j+1}.
\]
Proof. We shall only prove the second equation.

\[
\phi L_{2j} = q^\alpha \frac{A(\ell^2)}{A(1)} \cdot A(1) \sum_{n=0}^\infty p_\tau (\ell^{2j} n - \delta_{2j}) q^n
\]

\[
= A(\ell^2) \sum_{n=0}^\infty p_\tau (\ell^{2j} n - \delta_{2j+1}) q^n.
\]

The result then follows from Lemma 9.

We need to study the effect of applying the Hecke operator \( U_\ell \), on the modular functions \( \phi \) and \( h \). For a positive integer \( r \), define

\[
S_r = \ell^{-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \phi^r (\tau + j) \cdot \frac{\ell}{\ell}
\]

\[
= \sum_{j=0}^{\ell-1} \phi^r (\tau) | A_\ell^{-1} S^j
\]

\[
= \phi^r (\tau) | U_\ell^* S^j
\]

\[
= \ell \phi^r (\tau) | U_\ell.
\]

Lemma 15. For a positive integer \( p \), we have

\[
h^p | U_\ell = \frac{S_{p\gamma}}{\ell h^p},
\]

\[
(\phi h^p) | U_\ell = \frac{S_{p\gamma+1}}{\ell h^p}.
\]

Proof.

\[
h^p = q^{p\alpha} \frac{A(\ell)^{p\gamma}}{A(1)^{p\gamma}}
\]

\[
= q^{p\alpha} \frac{A(\ell)^{p\gamma}}{q^{p\beta} (\ell+1)} \cdot A(\ell + 1)^{p\gamma} \cdot q^{p\gamma} \frac{A(\ell^2)^{p\gamma}}{A(1)^{p\gamma}}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{q^{p\beta}} \frac{A(\ell)^{p\gamma}}{A(\ell^2)^{p\gamma}} \phi^{p\gamma}.
\]

In the above, we used the fact that \( \alpha \gamma = \beta (\ell + 1) \). By applying \( U_\ell \) and Lemma 9,

\[
h^p | U_\ell = \frac{1}{h^p} \frac{A(1)^{p\gamma}}{A(\ell)^{p\gamma}} \phi^{p\gamma} | U_\ell
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{h^p} \cdot \frac{1}{\ell} S_{p\gamma}.
\]

The proof of the second equation is similar. \( \Box \)
Next, we have to show that \( \phi \left( \tau + \frac{j}{\ell} \right) \) are distinct roots of a polynomial with coefficients in terms of \( h \). By Newton’s formula for symmetric power sum of roots [12, p. 118], each \( S_r \) satisfies a recurrence relation and can be written as a polynomial in terms of \( h \). Thus if \( L_j \) is a polynomial in \( h \), multiplying \( L_j \) by \( \phi \) if necessary and applying \( U_{\ell} \), we see that \( L_{j+1} \) can be written in terms of a sum of \( S_r \) which in turn can be written as a polynomial in \( h \).

At this stage, the proof depends crucially on a modular equation satisfied by the corresponding \( \phi \) and \( h \) and we shall provide the details for \( \ell = 5 \) and the partition \( \pi = [1^1 2^1] \). Hence \( A_\pi(j) = A(j) = E(j)E(2j) \) and \( p_\pi(n) = a(n) \). We have

\begin{equation}
(3.4) \quad \phi(\tau) = \frac{\eta(25\tau)\eta(50\tau)}{\eta(\tau)\eta(2\tau)} = q^3 \frac{A(25)}{A(1)},
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
(3.5) \quad h(\tau) = \frac{\eta^2(5\tau)\eta^2(10\tau)}{\eta^2(\tau)\eta^2(2\tau)} = q \frac{A(5)^2}{A(1)^2}.
\end{equation}

\( \phi(\tau) \) is a modular function on \( \Gamma_0(50) + W_2 \) and \( h(\tau) \) is the hauptmodul of \( \Gamma_0(10) + W_2 \). Furthermore \( h(5\tau) \) is also a modular function on \( \Gamma_0(50) + W_2 \) and thus \( \phi(\tau) \) and \( h_5(\tau) = h(5\tau) \) belong to the same congruence subgroup and as a result, satisfy a polynomial equation of degree 5 and degree 3 respectively [14, p. 110], i.e.

\begin{equation}
(3.6) \quad \phi^5(\tau) = (15h_5(\tau) + 5^3h_5^2(\tau) + 5^4h_5^3(\tau))\phi(\tau) - (5^2h_5^2(\tau) + 5^3h_5^3(\tau))\phi(\tau) + (5h_5^2(\tau) + 5^2h_5^3(\tau))\phi(\tau) - 5h_5^3(\tau)\phi(\tau) + h_5^3(\tau).
\end{equation}

The above equation holds with \( h_5(\tau) = h(5\tau) \) invariant when we replace \( \tau \) by \( \tau + j/5 \) for \( j \) from 1 to 4, thus we conclude that the following polynomial

\begin{equation}
(3.7) \quad Q(u) = u^5 - (15h + 5^3h^2 + 5^4h^3)u^4 + (5^2h^2 + 5^3h^3)u^3 - (5^2h^2 + 5^3h^3)u^2 + 5h^3u - h^3
\end{equation}

has five distinct roots \( \phi(\tau + j/5) \), for \( j \) from 0 to 4. Now by Newton’s theorem, \( S_r \) for \( r \geq 5 \), satisfies

\begin{equation}
(3.8) \quad S_r = (15h + 5^3h^2 + 5^4h^3)S_{r-1} - (5^2h^2 + 5^3h^3)S_{r-2} + (5^2h^2 + 5^3h^3)S_{r-3} - 5h^3S_{r-4} + h^3S_{r-5}.
\end{equation}
We also have
\begin{align*}
S_1 &= 15h + 125h^2 + 625h^3, \\
S_2 &= 175h^2 + 3500h^3 + 34375h^4 + 156250h^5 + 390625h^6, \\
S_3 &= 15h^2 + 2325h^3 + 69375h^4 + 1031250h^5 + 8750000h^6 \\
&
+ 46875000h^7 + 146484375h^8 + 244140625h^9, \\
S_4 &= 280h^3 + 33375h^4 + 1237500h^5 + 24312500h^6 \\
&
+ 295312500h^7 + 2412109375h^8 + 13476562500h^9 \\
&
+ 51269531250h^{10} + 122070312500h^{11} + 152587890625h^{12}. \\
\end{align*}

Hence if we write
\begin{equation}
S_r = \sum a_{r,p}h^p, \\
\end{equation}
we obtain the recurrence relation
\begin{align*}
a_{r,p} &= 15a_{r-1,p-1} + 125a_{r-1,p-2} + 625a_{r-1,p-3} \\
&
- 25a_{r-2,p-2} - 125a_{r-2,p-3} + 5a_{r-3,p-2} \\
&
+ 25a_{r-3,p-3} - 5a_{r-4,p-3} + a_{r-5,p-3},
\end{align*}
for \( r \geq 5 \). Moreover, an induction argument shows that
\begin{equation}
a_{r,p} \neq 0 \text{ if and only if } \left[ \frac{3r + 4}{5} \right] \leq p \leq 3r. \\
\end{equation}
If we now define \( \nu(a_{r,p}) \) as the highest power of 5 that divides \( a_{r,p} \) and \( \nu(0) = \infty \), we can show by induction that
\begin{equation}
\nu(a_{r,p}) \geq \left[ \frac{5p - 3r + 4}{4} \right]. \\
\end{equation}
We are now ready to prove Theorem 10 for \( \phi \) and \( h \) defined in (3.4) and (3.5). Equation (1.18) is our base case and can be rewritten as \( L_1 = 3h + 25h^2 + 125h^3 \). Suppose that we have
\begin{equation}
L_{2j-1} = \sum b_{2j-1,r}h^r, \\
\end{equation}
where only finitely many \( b_{2j-1,r} \) are non-zero and each is an integer. Applying \( U_5 \),
\begin{equation}
L_{2j-1} \mid U_5 = L_{2j} = \sum b_{2j-1,r}h^r \mid U_5 = \sum b_{2j-1,r} \sum_{p=\mu}^{6r} \frac{a_{2r,p}h^p}{5^r}. \\
\end{equation}
It follows from (3.12) that for every \( p \) in the second sum,
\begin{equation}
p \geq \mu = \left\lfloor \frac{6r + 4}{5} \right\rfloor \geq r + \left\lfloor \frac{r + 4}{5} \right\rfloor \geq r + 1.
\end{equation}
Furthermore,
\[(3.17) \quad \nu(a_{2r,p}) \geq \left\lfloor \frac{5p - 6r + 4}{4} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor \frac{6r + 4 - 1 - 6r + 4}{4} \right\rfloor \geq 1.\]

Thus $L_{2j}$ is also a polynomial in $h$ with integral coefficients. The inductive case from $L_{2j}$ to $L_{2j+1}$ is similar. The other fourteen cases for Theorem 10 can be dealt with in the same way.

We will proceed to prove Theorem 13. We first note that
\[(3.18) \quad h(\tau) = \eta^2(5\tau)\eta^2(10\tau) \equiv \eta^8(\tau)\eta^8(2\tau) \pmod{5}.\]

If we set
\[(3.19) \quad L_j = \sum b_{j,r}h^r,\]
then Theorem 13 follows from the next lemma.

**Lemma 16.**
\[
\nu(b_{2j-1,1}) = j - 1.
\]
\[
\nu(b_{2j-1,r}) \geq j - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 4}{4} \right\rfloor, \text{ if } r > 1.
\]
\[
\nu(b_{2j,1}) = j.
\]
\[
\nu(b_{2j,r}) \geq j + \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 5}{4} \right\rfloor, \text{ if } r > 1.
\]

**Proof.** We shall prove this by induction. Since $L_1 = 3h + 25h^2 + 125h^3$, $\nu(b_{1,1}) = 0$, $\nu(b_{1,2}) = 2$ and $\nu(b_{1,3}) = 3$.

Now from (3.15),
\[(3.20) \quad L_{2j} = \sum_{s \geq 1} b_{2j,s}h^s = \sum_{r \geq 1} b_{2j-1,r} \left( \sum_{p=\mu}^{6r} a_{2r,p}h^{p-r} \right).\]

Equating coefficients, we have
\[(3.21) \quad b_{2j,s} = \sum_{r \geq 1} b_{2j-1,r} \left( \frac{a_{2r,s+r}}{5} \right).\]

Hence, for $s > 1$, we have
\[
\nu(b_{2j,s}) \geq -1 + \min_{r \geq 1} \left\{ j - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 4}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{5(s + r) - 3(2r) + 4}{4} \right\rfloor \right\} \\
\geq j - 1 + \min_{r \geq 1} \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 4}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{5s - r}{4} \right\rfloor \right\} \\
\geq j - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{5s - 1}{4} \right\rfloor \\
\geq j + \left\lfloor \frac{5s - 5}{4} \right\rfloor.
\]
We made use of the fact that the minimum occurs at $r = 1$. Next for the case $s = 1$, we have

\begin{equation}
5b_{2j,1} = \sum_{r \geq 1} b_{2j-1,r} (a_{2r,1+r})
\end{equation}

\begin{align*}
&= b_{2j-1,1}(a_{2,2}) + \sum_{r \geq 2} b_{2j-1,r} (a_{2r,1+r}) \\
&= 175b_{2j-1,1} + \sum_{r \geq 2} b_{2j-1,r} (a_{2r,1+r}).
\end{align*}

Thus,

\[\nu(b_{2j,1}) = -1 + \min \left\{ 2 + j - 1, \min_{r \geq 2} \left\{ j - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 4}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lceil \frac{5 - r + 4}{4} \right\rceil \right\} \right\} = -1 + (j + 1) = j.\]

Next, we have

\begin{equation}
L_{2j+1} = \sum b_{2j+1,s} h^s = (\phi L_{2j}) \mid U_5
\end{equation}

\[= \sum b_{2j,r} \sum_p \frac{a_{2r+1,p} h^{p-r}}{5}.\]

Equating coefficients, we have

\begin{equation}
b_{2j+1,s} = \sum_{r \geq 1} b_{2j,r} \left( \frac{a_{2r+1,s+r}}{5} \right).
\end{equation}

Thus, for $s > 1$, we have

\[
\nu(b_{2j+1,s}) \geq -1 + \min_{r \geq 1} \left\{ j + \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 5}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lceil \frac{5(s + r) - 3(2r + 1) + 4}{4} \right\rceil \right\} \\
\geq j - 1 + \min_{r \geq 1} \left\{ \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 5}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lceil \frac{5s - r + 1}{4} \right\rceil \right\} \\
\geq j - 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{5s}{4} \right\rfloor \\
\geq j + \left\lfloor \frac{5s - 4}{4} \right\rfloor.
\]

When $s = 1$,

\[
5b_{2j+1,1} = b_{2j,1}(a_{3,2}) + \sum_{r \geq 2} b_{2j,r} (a_{2r+1,1+r})
\]

\[= 15b_{2j,1} + \sum_{r \geq 2} b_{2j,r} (a_{2r+1,1+r}).\]
Finally,
\[
\nu(b_{2j+1,1}) = -1 + \min\left\{ 1 + j, \min_{r \geq 2} \left\{ j + \left\lfloor \frac{5r - 5}{4} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{5 - r + 1}{4} \right\rfloor \right\} \right\}
\]
\[
= -1 + (1 + j) = j,
\]
which completes the proof of Lemma 16. \hfill \Box
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