

ON THE p -POTENCY OF $G(n, r)$.

BY HANSRAJ GUPTA,
Government College, Hoshiarpur.

Received January 22, 1935.

(Communicated by Dr. A. S. Ganesan, M.A., Ph.D.)

§1. If $m \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$ but $\not\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{a+1}}$, p being a prime ≥ 2 , then we say that the p -potency of m is a , or that m is a -potent in p . We write $\text{Pot}_p m = a$ when m is a -potent in p ; and $\text{Pot}_p \binom{1}{n} = -\beta$, when $\text{Pot}_p(n) = \beta$.

Evidently then

$$\text{Pot}_p(mn) = \text{Pot}_p(m) + \text{Pot}_p(n); \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Pot}_p\left(\frac{m}{n}\right) = \text{Pot}_p(m) - \text{Pot}_p(n); \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Pot}_p(m)^n = n \cdot \text{Pot}_p(m). \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad (3)$$

Furthermore, I shall write

$$\{A_i A_{i-1} \dots A_2 A_1 A_0\}_k \text{ for } A_i K^i + A_{i-1} K^{i-1} + \dots + A_2 K^2 + A_1 K + A_0, \text{ when } 0 \leq A < K. \quad \dots \quad (4)$$

§2. p -Potency of $\binom{n}{r}$, $1 \leq r \leq n$.

Let $n = \{a_i a_{i-1} \dots a_2 a_1 a_0\}_p$, and $r = \{b_j b_{j-1} \dots b_2 b_1 b_0\}_p$, $j \leq i$.

Then since $\binom{n}{r} = \frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!}$;

$$\begin{aligned} \text{therefore } \text{Pot}_p \binom{n}{r} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^i \left\{ \left[\frac{n}{p^\alpha} \right] - \left[\frac{r}{p^\alpha} \right] - \left[\frac{n-r}{p^\alpha} \right] \right\}, \\ &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^i \lambda_\alpha; \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda_\alpha = 0$ or 1 according as $\{a_{\alpha-1} a_{\alpha-2} \dots a_0\}_p - \{b_{\alpha-1} b_{\alpha-2} \dots b_0\}_p$ is positive or negative $\dots \dots \dots \dots \dots \dots (5)$

Let $n' = \{a'_i a'_{i-1} \dots a'_2 a'_1 a'_0\}_p$ and $r' = \{b'_j b'_{j-1} \dots b'_2 b'_1 b'_0\}_p$

where $a'_h = 1, b'_h = 0$, if $a_h > b_h$; $0 \leq h \leq i$.

$a'_h = 0, b'_h = 0$, if $a_h = b_h$;

and $a'_h = 0, b'_h = 1$, if $a_h < b_h$.

Then $\text{Pot}_p \binom{n}{r} = \text{Pot}_p \binom{n'}{r'}$ (6)

= the total number of eights and nines in
 $\{a'_i a'_{i-1} \dots a'_2 a'_1 a'_0\}_{10} - \{b'_j b'_{j-1} \dots b'_2 b'_1 b'_0\}_{10}$. (7)

In particular¹ $\text{Pot}_p \binom{p^\mu}{r} = \mu - \text{Pot}_p(r)$; $1 \leq r \leq p^\mu$. *(8)

Moreover $\text{Pot}_p \binom{p^\mu-1}{r} = 0$. $1 \leq r \leq p^\mu-1$. (9)

In view of (7), it is easily proved that

if $\binom{n}{r}$, $r = 1, 2, 3, \dots, n-1$, have a common factor $g > 1$, then g is a prime ≥ 2 , and $n = g^\mu$, $\mu \geq 1$.

In fact if $n = \{a_i a_{i-1} \dots a_2 a_1 a_0\}_p$,
 and $r = \{b_i a_{i-1} a_{i-2} \dots a_2 a_1 a_0\}_p$; $b_i \leq a_i$; then $\text{Pot}_p \binom{n}{r} = 0$.

§3. If $(x+1)(x+2)(x+3) \dots (x+n) \equiv \sum_{r=0}^n G(n, r) x^{n-r}$, . . . (10)

then Professor Ward² has shown that

$$G(n, r) = \sum_{m=1}^r \{ (-1)^{r-m} H(r, r-m) \binom{n+m}{r+m} \}, \quad \dots (11)$$

where the H's are positive integers. Professor Ward has not however been able to find the exact form of his H's.

In a recent paper,³ I have shown that

$$H(r, r-m) = \sum_{k=1}^m \{ (-1)^{m-k} \binom{r+m}{r+k} G(-k-1, r) \}, \quad \dots (12)$$

where $(k-1)! G(-k-1, r) = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \{ (-1)^j \binom{k-1}{j} (k-j)^{r+k-1} \}$. (13)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hence } G(n, r) &= \sum_{m=1}^r \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^m (-1)^{r-k} \binom{r+m}{r+k} \binom{n+m}{r+m} G(-k-1, r) \right\}, \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^r \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^r (-1)^{r-k} \binom{r+m}{r+k} \binom{n+m}{r+m} G(-k-1, r) \right\}, \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^r \left\{ (-1)^{r-k} \binom{n+k}{r+k} G(-k-1, r) \cdot \sum_{m=1}^r \binom{n+m}{n+k} \right\}, \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^r \left\{ (-1)^{r-k} \binom{n+k}{r+k} \binom{n+r+1}{n+k+1} G(-k-1, r) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

* When $r = p^t$, $t \leq \mu$, (8) is a very special case of formula I of Obláth in his paper in *Proc. Ind. Acad. Sci. (A)*, 1934, 1, 383-386 [Ref.] (383).

$$= \sum_{k=1}^r \left\{ (-1)^{r-k} \binom{n+k}{r+k} \binom{n+r+1}{r-k} G(-k-1, r) \right\}; \dots \quad (14)$$

$$= (n+r+1) \binom{n+r}{2r} \sum_{k=1}^r \left\{ (-1)^{r-k} \binom{2r}{r-k} \frac{G(-k-1, r)}{n+k+1} \right\}. \quad (15)$$

If from the terms on the right hand side of (14) or (15), we can single out a term which is less potent in p than any and every other, and if β denote the p -potency of this term,

$$\text{then } \underset{p}{\text{Pot}} G(n, r) = \beta. \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad (16)$$

If however a term cannot be so singled out, then

$$\underset{p}{\text{Pot}} G(n, r) \geq \gamma, \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad \dots \quad (17)$$

where no term in (14) or (15) has a p -potency $< \gamma$.

The case when $n = p^\mu - 1$, $\mu \geq 1$, is of special interest, and has been considered by me separately elsewhere.⁴

REFERENCES.

1. This is Lemma 1 in my paper on "A Theorem of Gauss", to be published in the *Proc. of the Edin. Math. Soc.*

2. Morgan Ward... *Amer. Jour. of Math.*, 1934, 56, 87-95.

3. Not yet published.

4. In my paper on "A Theorem of Gauss", among other results, I prove that $\underset{p}{\text{Pot}} G \{p^\mu - 1, \phi(p^\alpha)\} = \mu - \alpha$, $\alpha \leq \mu$.