

Bounds for the coefficients of powers of the Δ -function

Jeremy Rouse

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

4 June 2009

The Δ -function

- The function

$$\Delta(z) = q \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n)^{24}, \quad q = e^{2\pi iz}$$

is a cusp form of weight 12 on $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

The Δ -function

- The function

$$\Delta(z) = q \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n)^{24}, \quad q = e^{2\pi iz}$$

is a cusp form of weight 12 on $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

- This means that for any $\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, we have

$$\Delta\left(\frac{az + b}{cz + d}\right) = (cz + d)^{12} \Delta(z).$$

The Δ -function

- The function

$$\Delta(z) = q \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n)^{24}, \quad q = e^{2\pi iz}$$

is a cusp form of weight 12 on $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$.

- This means that for any $\begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$, we have

$$\Delta\left(\frac{az + b}{cz + d}\right) = (cz + d)^{12} \Delta(z).$$

- Its coefficients

$$\Delta(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau(n) q^n = q - 24q^2 + 252q^3 + \dots$$

satisfy remarkable properties.

- In particular, we have

Ramanujan's τ -function

- In particular, we have

$$\tau(mn) = \tau(m)\tau(n) \text{ if } \gcd(m, n) = 1$$

Ramanujan's τ -function

- In particular, we have

$$\tau(mn) = \tau(m)\tau(n) \text{ if } \gcd(m, n) = 1$$

$$\tau(p^k) = \tau(p)\tau(p^{k-1}) - p^{11}\tau(p^{k-2})$$

.

- In particular, we have

$$\tau(mn) = \tau(m)\tau(n) \text{ if } \gcd(m, n) = 1$$

$$\tau(p^k) = \tau(p)\tau(p^{k-1}) - p^{11}\tau(p^{k-2})$$

$$|\tau(p)| \leq 2p^{11/2}.$$

Ramanujan's τ -function

- In particular, we have

$$\tau(mn) = \tau(m)\tau(n) \text{ if } \gcd(m, n) = 1$$

$$\tau(p^k) = \tau(p)\tau(p^{k-1}) - p^{11}\tau(p^{k-2})$$

$$|\tau(p)| \leq 2p^{11/2}.$$

- The last inequality follows from Deligne's proof of the Weil conjectures, and implies that $|\tau(n)| \leq d(n)n^{11/2}$.

- Let S_k denote the \mathbb{C} -vector space of modular forms f of weight k with Fourier expansions

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)q^n.$$

- Let S_k denote the \mathbb{C} -vector space of modular forms f of weight k with Fourier expansions

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)q^n.$$

- This vector space is finite dimensional, and for each $n \geq 1$, there is a canonical linear operator T_n that acts on S_k .

Modular forms facts

- Let S_k denote the \mathbb{C} -vector space of modular forms f of weight k with Fourier expansions

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)q^n.$$

- This vector space is finite dimensional, and for each $n \geq 1$, there is a canonical linear operator T_n that acts on S_k .
- There is a basis for S_k consisting of forms that are simultaneous eigenfunctions for all these operators.

- Let S_k denote the \mathbb{C} -vector space of modular forms f of weight k with Fourier expansions

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)q^n.$$

- This vector space is finite dimensional, and for each $n \geq 1$, there is a canonical linear operator T_n that acts on S_k .
- There is a basis for S_k consisting of forms that are simultaneous eigenfunctions for all these operators.
- For these forms (normalized so $a(1) = 1$),
 $|a(n)| \leq d(n)n^{(k-1)/2}$.

- If $k \geq 1$, write

$$\Delta^k(z) = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \tau_k(n) q^n.$$

- If $k \geq 1$, write

$$\Delta^k(z) = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \tau_k(n) q^n.$$

- Q: How large is $\tau_k(n)$ as a function of k and n ?

- If $k \geq 1$, write

$$\Delta^k(z) = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \tau_k(n) q^n.$$

- Q: How large is $\tau_k(n)$ as a function of k and n ?
- A: There is a constant C_k so that

$$|\tau_k(n)| \leq C_k d(n) n^{(12k-1)/2}.$$

- This is because we can write

$$\Delta^k = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i f_i,$$

where the f_i are Hecke eigenforms.

- This is because we can write

$$\Delta^k = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i f_i,$$

where the f_i are Hecke eigenforms.

- If $C_k = \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|$, Deligne's bound gives the result we want.

- This is because we can write

$$\Delta^k = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i f_i,$$

where the f_i are Hecke eigenforms.

- If $C_k = \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|$, Deligne's bound gives the result we want.
- How large is C_k as a function of k ?

k	$\log(C_k)$
1	0.000

k	$\log(C_k)$
1	0.000
2	-8.424

k	$\log(C_k)$
1	0.000
2	-8.424
3	-19.657

k	$\log(C_k)$
1	0.000
2	-8.424
3	-19.657
4	-33.072

k	$\log(C_k)$
1	0.000
2	-8.424
3	-19.657
4	-33.072
5	-47.874

k	$\log(C_k)$
1	0.000
2	-8.424
3	-19.657
4	-33.072
5	-47.874
6	-64.102

Theorem (R, 2008)

For $k > 1$, we have

$$\log(C_k) = -6k \log(k) + 6k \log\left(\frac{2\pi^3 e}{27\Gamma(2/3)^6}\right) + O(\log(k)).$$

Overview of proof (1/3)

- If f and g are two cusp forms of weight k , define the *Petersson inner product* of f and g to be

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{H}/\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})} f(x + iy) \overline{g(x + iy)} y^k \frac{dx dy}{y^2}.$$

Overview of proof (1/3)

- If f and g are two cusp forms of weight k , define the *Petersson inner product* of f and g to be

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{H}/\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})} f(x + iy) \overline{g(x + iy)} y^k \frac{dx dy}{y^2}.$$

- If f_i and f_j are two distinct Hecke eigenforms, then $\langle f_i, f_j \rangle = 0$.

- Suppose we have explicit bounds

$$B_1 \leq \langle f_i, f_i \rangle \leq B_2$$

on the Petersson norms of the Hecke eigenforms.

Overview of proof (2/3)

- Suppose we have explicit bounds

$$B_1 \leq \langle f_i, f_i \rangle \leq B_2$$

on the Petersson norms of the Hecke eigenforms.

- If we write

$$\Delta^k = \sum_{i=1}^k c_i f_i,$$

we get

$$\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|^2 \langle f_i, f_i \rangle.$$

- This gives

$$\frac{\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle}{B_2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|^2 \leq \frac{\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle}{B_1}.$$

- This gives

$$\frac{\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle}{B_2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|^2 \leq \frac{\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle}{B_1}.$$

- Applying the Schwarz inequality gives bounds on $C_k = \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|$.

- This gives

$$\frac{\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle}{B_2} \leq \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|^2 \leq \frac{\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle}{B_1}.$$

- Applying the Schwarz inequality gives bounds on $C_k = \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|$.
- It suffices to compute bounds on $\langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle$ and $\langle f_i, f_i \rangle$.

- Elementary arguments give that

$$\frac{0.08906B^k}{k} \leq \langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle \leq \frac{76.4B^k}{k}.$$

- Elementary arguments give that

$$\frac{0.08906B^k}{k} \leq \langle \Delta^k, \Delta^k \rangle \leq \frac{76.4B^k}{k}.$$

- Here $B = \left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{3\Gamma(2/3)^3} \right)^{24}$.

- If f_i is a Hecke eigenform of weight $12k$, then

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) = \frac{\pi^2}{6} \cdot \frac{(4\pi)^{12k} \langle f_i, f_i \rangle}{(12k - 1)!}.$$

- If f_i is a Hecke eigenform of weight $12k$, then

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) = \frac{\pi^2}{6} \cdot \frac{(4\pi)^{12k} \langle f_i, f_i \rangle}{(12k - 1)!}.$$

- Here if p is prime let α_p be a complex number so that

$$a(p) = p^{(12k-1)/2} \left(\alpha_p + \frac{1}{\alpha_p} \right).$$

- If f_i is a Hecke eigenform of weight $12k$, then

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) = \frac{\pi^2}{6} \cdot \frac{(4\pi)^{12k} \langle f_i, f_i \rangle}{(12k - 1)!}.$$

- Here if p is prime let α_p be a complex number so that

$$a(p) = p^{(12k-1)/2} \left(\alpha_p + \frac{1}{\alpha_p} \right).$$

- Then,

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s) = \prod_p (1 - \alpha_p^2 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^{-2} p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

- This L -function is known to have an analytic continuation and a functional equation of the usual type by work of Gelbart and Jacquet.

Values at $s = 1$

- This L -function is known to have an analytic continuation and a functional equation of the usual type by work of Gelbart and Jacquet.
- Lower bounds for L -functions at $s = 1$ are in general difficult and are equivalent to the problem of zeroes close to $s = 1$.

- This L -function is known to have an analytic continuation and a functional equation of the usual type by work of Gelbart and Jacquet.
- Lower bounds for L -functions at $s = 1$ are in general difficult and are equivalent to the problem of zeroes close to $s = 1$.
- In this case, work of Goldfeld, Hoffstein, and Lieman solves the problem.

Lemma

If f_i is a Hecke eigenform of weight $12k$, then

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s) \neq 0$$

for $s > 1 - \frac{5-2\sqrt{6}}{10 \log(12k)}$.

- Let

$$L(\mathrm{Sym}^4 f_i, s) = \prod_p (1 - \alpha_p^4 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^2 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - p^{-s})^{-1} \\ \cdot (1 - \alpha_p^{-2})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^{-4} p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

- Let

$$L(\mathrm{Sym}^4 f_i, s) = \prod_p (1 - \alpha_p^4 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^2 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - p^{-s})^{-1} \\ \cdot (1 - \alpha_p^{-2})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^{-4} p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

- Let

$$L(s) = \zeta(s)^2 L(\mathrm{Sym}^2 f_i, s)^3 L(\mathrm{Sym}^4 f_i, s).$$

- Let

$$L(\text{Sym}^4 f_i, s) = \prod_p (1 - \alpha_p^4 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^2 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - p^{-s})^{-1} \\ \cdot (1 - \alpha_p^{-2})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^{-4} p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

- Let

$$L(s) = \zeta(s)^2 L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s)^3 L(\text{Sym}^4 f_i, s).$$

- This function has a double pole at $s = 1$, a triple zero at any zero of $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s)$ and non-negative Dirichlet coefficients.

- Let

$$L(\text{Sym}^4 f_i, s) = \prod_p (1 - \alpha_p^4 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^2 p^{-s})^{-1} (1 - p^{-s})^{-1} \\ \cdot (1 - \alpha_p^{-2})^{-1} (1 - \alpha_p^{-4} p^{-s})^{-1}.$$

- Let

$$L(s) = \zeta(s)^2 L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s)^3 L(\text{Sym}^4 f_i, s).$$

- This function has a double pole at $s = 1$, a triple zero at any zero of $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s)$ and non-negative Dirichlet coefficients.
- A standard argument shows that $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s)$ cannot have a zero too close to $s = 1$.

Lemma

If f_i is a Hecke eigenform of weight $12k$, then

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) > \frac{1}{64 \log(12k)}.$$

Proof of Lemma (1/3)

- Let

$$L(f_i \otimes f_i, s) = \zeta(s)L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a(n)}{n^s}.$$

Proof of Lemma (1/3)

- Let

$$L(f_i \otimes f_i, s) = \zeta(s)L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a(n)}{n^s}.$$

- Let β be a real zero of $L(\text{Sym}^2 f, s)$ and define

$$I = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{2-i\infty}^{2+i\infty} \frac{L(f_i \otimes f_i, s + \beta) x^s ds}{s \prod_{r=2}^{10} (s + r)}.$$

Proof of Lemma (1/3)

- Let

$$L(f_i \otimes f_i, s) = \zeta(s)L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a(n)}{n^s}.$$

- Let β be a real zero of $L(\text{Sym}^2 f, s)$ and define

$$I = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{2-i\infty}^{2+i\infty} \frac{L(f_i \otimes f_i, s + \beta) x^s ds}{s \prod_{r=2}^{10} (s + r)}.$$

- The bounds $a(n) \geq 0$ and $a(n^2) \geq 1$ give

$$I \geq 4.53 \cdot 10^{-7}.$$

Proof of Lemma (2/3)

- Shift the contour to $\operatorname{Re}(s) = \alpha := -3/2 - \beta$. We pick up three poles.

Proof of Lemma (2/3)

- Shift the contour to $\operatorname{Re}(s) = \alpha := -3/2 - \beta$. We pick up three poles.
- The residue of the pole at $s = 1 - \beta$ is

$$\frac{L(\operatorname{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) x^{1-\beta}}{(1-\beta) \prod_{r=2}^{10} (1-\beta+r)}.$$

Proof of Lemma (2/3)

- Shift the contour to $\operatorname{Re}(s) = \alpha := -3/2 - \beta$. We pick up three poles.
- The residue of the pole at $s = 1 - \beta$ is

$$\frac{L(\operatorname{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) x^{1-\beta}}{(1-\beta) \prod_{r=2}^{10} (1-\beta+r)}.$$

- The other two residues are negative. This gives

$$I - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\alpha-i\infty}^{\alpha+i\infty} \frac{L(f_i \otimes f_i, s + \beta) x^s ds}{s \prod_{r=2}^{10} (s+r)} \leq \frac{L(\operatorname{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) x^{1-\beta}}{(1-\beta) \prod_{r=2}^{10} (1-\beta+r)}.$$

- Solving for $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1)$ and bounding the remaining term gives

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) \gg (1 - \beta).$$

Proof of Lemma (3/3)

- Solving for $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1)$ and bounding the remaining term gives

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) \gg (1 - \beta).$$

- Plugging in the result of the previous lemma gives the desired result.

Proof of Lemma (3/3)

- Solving for $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1)$ and bounding the remaining term gives

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) \gg (1 - \beta).$$

- Plugging in the result of the previous lemma gives the desired result.
- Relating $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1)$ with $\langle f_i, f_i \rangle$ gives explicit lower bounds on the Petersson norm.

Proof of Lemma (3/3)

- Solving for $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1)$ and bounding the remaining term gives

$$L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1) \gg (1 - \beta).$$

- Plugging in the result of the previous lemma gives the desired result.
- Relating $L(\text{Sym}^2 f_i, 1)$ with $\langle f_i, f_i \rangle$ gives explicit lower bounds on the Petersson norm.
- Upper bounds on $\langle f_i, f_i \rangle$ can be derived using standard arguments.

Is the constant $C_k = \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|$ optimal in the inequality

$$|\tau_k(n)| \leq C_k d(n) n^{(12k-1)/2}?$$

Is the constant $C_k = \sum_{i=1}^k |c_i|$ optimal in the inequality

$$|\tau_k(n)| \leq C_k d(n) n^{(12k-1)/2}?$$

Conjecture

We have

$$C_k = \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{|\tau_k(n)|}{d(n) n^{(12k-1)/2}}.$$