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Abstract. The 2-fold Bailey lemma is a special case of the $s$-fold Bailey lemma introduced by Andrews in 2000. We examine this special case and its applications to partitions and recently discovered $q$-series identities. Our work provides a general comparison of the utility of the 2-fold Bailey lemma and the more widely applied 1-fold Bailey lemma. We also offer a discussion of the $spt_M(n)$ function and related identities.
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1. Introduction

The Symmetric Bilateral Bailey transform [4], states that if

\begin{equation}
B_n = \sum_{j=-n}^{n} A_j u_n - j v_{n+j},
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
\gamma_n = \sum_{j=|n|}^{\infty} \delta_j u_{j-n} v_{n+j},
\end{equation}

then

\begin{equation}
\sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} A_n \gamma_n = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n \delta_n.
\end{equation}

Here we say that $(A_n, B_n)$ is a Bailey pair (in the symmetric sense), and $(\gamma_n, \delta_n)$ is a conjugate Bailey pair. If we break symmetry, we say a pair $(\alpha_n, \beta_n)$ is a Bailey pair if

\begin{equation}
\beta_n(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \alpha_j u_{n-j} v_{n+j}.
\end{equation}

Bailey [6] chose $v_n = (aq)_n^{-1}$, $u_n = (q)_n^{-1}$, (where we use standard notation [8] for $q$-shifted factorials) giving the conjugate pair $(\gamma_n, \delta_n)$

\begin{equation}
\delta_n = (\rho_1)_n (\rho_2)_n (aq/\rho_1 \rho_2)^n,
\end{equation}

Date:
Proposition 1. If $\gamma_n = \frac{(aq/\rho_1)_\infty (aq/\rho_2)_\infty}{(aq)_\infty (aq/\rho_1 \rho_2)_\infty} \gamma_n (\rho_1) \gamma_n (\rho_2) n (aq/\rho_1 \rho_2)^n$.

In [3] Andrews considered an $s$-fold extension of the Bailey lemma, and gave the definition of the $s$-fold Bailey pair $(A_{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_s}, B_{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_s})$ relative to $(a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_s)$,

$$B_{n_1, \ldots, n_s} = \sum_{r_1 = -n_1}^{n_1} \cdots \sum_{r_s = -n_s}^{n_s} (a_1 q)_{n_1 - r_1} (q)_{n_1 - r_1} \cdots (a_s q)_{n_s + r_s} (q)_{n_s - r_s}.$$

Here we focus on the $s = 2$ case, in which case Andrews' generalisation of (1.4) is given by

$$B_{n_1, n_2} = \sum_{r_1 = -n_1}^{n_1} \sum_{r_2 = -n_2}^{n_2} (a_1 q)_{n_1 + r_1} (q)_{n_1 - r_1} (a_2 q)_{n_2 + r_2} (q)_{n_2 - r_2}.$$

For this symmetric 2-fold Bailey pair relative to $(a_1, a_2)$ we have the identity

$$\sum_{n_1 = -\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{n_2 = -\infty}^{\infty} A_{n_1, n_2} \gamma_n (a_1) \gamma_n (a_2) = \sum_{n_1 = 0}^{\infty} \sum_{n_2 = 0}^{\infty} B_{n_1, n_2} \delta_n (a_1) \delta_n (a_2),$$

where both $(\gamma_n (a_1), \delta_n (a_1))$ and $(\gamma_n (a_2), \delta_n (a_2))$ are given by (1.5)–(1.6). In [3] Andrews' main focus is the application of the conjugate pair (1.5)–(1.6) for both $(\gamma_n (1), \delta_n (1))$ and $(\gamma_n (2), \delta_n (2))$ in (1.7) with $\rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty$. In [10] $q$-series were discovered related to both positive definite quadratic forms and indefinite ternary quadratic forms using only the 1-fold Bailey lemma. A nice consequence of [10] is that it is clear that identities that arise naturally from inserting 2-fold Bailey pairs into the 2-fold Bailey lemma may also be obtained using Bailey pairs with the 1-fold Bailey lemma. One particularly nice example from that study is the new expansion

$$(q)^3 = \sum_{N \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^N q^{N(N-1)/2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (-1)^n q^{n(n+1)/2 - j(3j-1)/2 + jN}.$$

In fact one may summarize the simple method from [10] in the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.** If $(\gamma_n, \delta_n)$ is a conjugate Bailey pair relative to $a = 1$, then $(\alpha_N, \beta_N)$ is a Bailey pair relative to $a = q$ where

$$\alpha_N = \frac{1 - q^{2N+1}}{1 - q} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \gamma_j (-1)^N q^{j(N+1)/2 + j},$$

$$\beta_N = \frac{\delta_N a^{-N}}{(q)_{2N}}.$$
Given [10], one might wonder if there is a direct relation between a 1-fold Bailey pair given a 2-fold Bailey pair. As it turns out, there are many such relations and, in general, we have the following relationship between the 1-fold and the \((s+1)\)-fold Bailey pair.

**Lemma 2.** Let \((A_{n_1}, \ldots, n_s, a), B_{n_1}, \ldots, n_s, n)\) form an \((s+1)\)-fold Bailey pair relative to \((a_{n_1}, a_{n_2}, \ldots, a_{n_s}, a)\), and let \((\gamma^{(k)}, \delta^{(k)})\) for \(k = 1, \ldots, s\) be \(s\) conjugate Bailey pairs relative to \(a_n\). Then \((A_n, B_n)\) defined by

\[
A_n := \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_s, n} \gamma^{(1)}_{n_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \gamma^{(s)}_{n_s} A_{n_1}, \ldots, n_s, n
\]

\[
B_n := \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_s, n} \delta^{(1)}_{n_1} \cdot \ldots \cdot \delta^{(s)}_{n_s} B_{n_1}, \ldots, n_s, n
\]

forms a 1-fold Bailey pair relative to \(a\).

**Proof.** We write out the \(s = 1\) case. We have,

\[
\sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \delta^{(1)}_{n_1}(a_1) B_{n_1,n}(a_1, a) = \sum_{n_1=0}^{\infty} \delta^{(1)}_{n_1}(a_1) \sum_{n_1} \frac{A_{r_1,r_2}}{(a_1 q)^{n_1+r_1}(q)^{n_1-r_1} (aq)^{n_2+r_2}(q)^{n_2-r_2}}
\]

\[
= \sum_{r_2=-n}^{n} \frac{1}{(aq)^{n+r_2}(q)^{n-r_2}} \sum_{r_1=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta^{(1)}_{n_1}(a_1) \sum_{n_1} \frac{A_{r_1,r_2}}{(a_1 q)^{n_1+r_1}(q)^{n_1-r_1}}
\]

\[
= \sum_{r_2=-n}^{n} \frac{1}{(aq)^{n+r_2}(q)^{n-r_2}} \sum_{r_1=-\infty}^{\infty} A_{r_1,r_2} \frac{\delta^{(1)}_{n_1}(a_1)}{(a_1 q)^{n_1+r_1}(q)^{n_1-r_1}}
\]

\[
= \sum_{r_2=-n}^{n} \frac{A_{r_2}(a)}{(aq)^{n+r_2}(q)^{n-r_2}} = B_n(a).
\]

Since these steps can be repeated separately for each \(k\), the more general case follows. \(\square\)

Lemma 2 appears to be new, and allows one to prove all of Andrews’ pentagonal number theorem identities in [3] using only the 1-fold Bailey lemma, by choosing \(\gamma^{(k)}_{n_k} = q^{n_k^2}/(q)_{\infty}\), and \(\delta^{(k)}_{n_k} = q^{n_k^2}\), for every \(k\) between 1 and \(s\).
As an application of Lemma 2 we will show that Slater’s well known Bailey pair (A5), see [13, p. 463], follows from the “diagonal” 2-fold Bailey pair [3, Eqs. (4.1) and (4.4)]

\[
A_{n_1, n_2} = (-1)^{n_1 + n_2} q^\left(\frac{n_1 + n_2}{2}\right)
\]

(1.13)

\[
B_{n_1, n_2} = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{(q)_{2n_1}} & \text{if } n_1 = n_2 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]

relative to 1. First we obtain Slater’s \(B_n\):

\[
B_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} B_{k,n} q^{k^2}
\]

(1.14)

\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \chi(k = n) \frac{q^{k^2}}{(q)_{2n}}
\]

\[
= \frac{q^{n^2}}{(q)_{2n}}.
\]

For \(A_n\) we have to work a little bit harder:

\[
A_n = \frac{1}{(q; q)_\infty} \sum_{k = -\infty}^{\infty} A_{k,n} q^{k^2}
\]

(1.15)

\[
= \frac{(-1)^n q^{n(n-1)/2}}{(q; q)_\infty} \sum_{k = -\infty}^{\infty} (-1)^k q^{k(3k-1)/2 + nj}.
\]

By the Jacobi triple product identity [8, Eq. (1.6.1)]

\[
\sum_{j = -\infty}^{\infty} (-a)^j q^{\left(j\right)} = (q)_{\infty} (a)_{\infty} (q/a)_{\infty}
\]

this yields

\[
A_n = \frac{(-1)^n q^{n(n-1)/2} (q^3; q^3)_\infty (q^{n+1}; q^3)_\infty (q^{2-n}; q^3)_\infty}{(q; q)_\infty}.
\]

considering the three congruence classes of \(n\) modulo 3 this finally simplifies to

\[
\alpha_n = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } n = 0 \\
q^{3k^2 + k} + q^{3k^2 - k} & \text{if } n = 3k \\
-q^{3k^2 \pm k} & \text{if } n = 3k \pm 1.
\end{cases}
\]

(1.16)
Now given our computations, we can exploit the uniqueness of Bailey pairs to obtain a 2-fold Bailey pair from Slater’s $A(3)$ Bailey pair. We show this by first observing that the $\alpha_n$ corresponding to Slaters [13, A(3)] is the same as $\alpha_n$ in (1.16) but with $q$ replaced by $q^2$,

\[
\alpha_n = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } n = 0 \\
q^{6k^2+2k} + q^{6k^2-2k} & \text{if } n = 3k \\
-q^{6k^2\pm 2k} & \text{if } n = 3k \pm 1.
\end{cases}
\]

That is, suppose

\[
B_n = \frac{q^n}{(q)_{2n}},
\]

and in Lemma 2, set $s = 1$, and $\gamma_n^{(1)} = q^{n^2}/(q)_{\infty}$, and $\delta_n^{(1)} = q^{n^2}$. The uniqueness of Bailey pairs with (1.17) and (1.15) tells us we must have

\[
A_n = \frac{(-1)^n q^n}{(q^2;q^2)_{\infty}} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^j q^{j(3j+1) + 2nj} = \frac{1}{(q)_{\infty}} \sum_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} q^{-2} A_{r,n},
\]

and

\[
B_n = \frac{q^n}{(q)_{2n}} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} q^{r^2} B_{r,n}.
\]

Therefore, the $A_{r,n}$ and $B_{r,n}$ are forced once $(\gamma_n^{(1)}, \delta_n^{(1)})$ is chosen, and we have proven that we must have the symmetric 2-fold Bailey pair

\[
A_{n_1,n_2} = \frac{(-1)^{n_1+n_2} q^{(n_1^2)_{\infty}}}{(-q)_{\infty}} q^{4(n_1^2+n_1+2(n_2^2)+2n_1n_2)},
\]

\[
B_{n_1,n_2} = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } n_2 \neq n_1, \\
q^{n_1-n_1^2}, & \text{if } n_1 = n_2.
\end{cases}
\]
This pair gives us the identity due to L.J. Rogers [12, pg. 332, Eq. (13)] (from the $\rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty$ case of (1.5)–(1.6))

\[
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{q^{n^2+n}}{(q)_{2n}} = \frac{1}{(q)_{\infty}(q^2; q^2)_{\infty}} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^n q^{n(2n-1)} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^j q^{(3j-1)+2nj} = \frac{1}{(q^3, q^4, q^5, q^6, q^7; q^{10})_{\infty}(q^2, q^{18}; q^{20})_{\infty}}.
\]

It is important to note that the literature has a large volume of 1-fold Bailey pairs, and so our argument in obtaining (1.18)–(1.19) is a more natural and potent strategy in obtaining further 2-dimensional identities.

Andrews used (1.13) to obtain a nice two-dimensional pentagonal number theorem identity [3, Theorem 2]. For more 2-fold and 3-fold Bailey pairs see Berkovich [7]. Tactically speaking, the pair (1.14)–(1.15) presently has more utility, as there are more known conjugate Bailey pairs for the 1-fold Bailey lemma (e.g. [4]). However, (1.13) would appear to encompass a larger pool of identities overall, as (1.14)–(1.15) is obtained from the limiting case $\rho_1, \rho_2 \to \infty$ of (1.5)–(1.6) with (1.13).

2. The spt($n$) Function of Andrews

In [11], we encountered the double sum

\[
\sum_{n_1, n_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{q^{n_1+n_2}}{(1 - q^{n_1})^2(q^{n_1+1})_{\infty}(1 - q^{n_2})^2 \ldots (1 - q^{n_1+n_2})}.
\]

and asked if the sum over $n_2$ had any origin from the 1-fold Bailey lemma. The proof relied on a 2-fold Bailey pair from [9]. It was also suggested there was a new generalized form of Andrews’ relation [5] $\text{spt}(n) = np(n) - \frac{1}{2}N_2(n)$. Here spt($n$) is the total number of appearances of the smallest parts of all the partitions of $n$, $p(n)$ is the classical unrestricted partition function, and $N_2(n)$ is the second Atkin-Garvan moment (see (2.6) and [5] for the generating function).

Lemma 3. For $n$ and $M$ non-negative integers, $(\alpha_n, \beta_n)$ forms a Bailey pair relative to $\alpha = 1$, where

\[
\alpha_n = \frac{(q)_M}{(q)_{M-n}(q)_{M+n}}(-1)^n(1 + q^n)q^{n(3n-1)/2},
\]

for $1 \leq n \leq M$, $\alpha_n = 0$ if $n > M$, $\alpha_0 = 1$. 
and

\begin{equation}
\beta_n = \frac{(q)_M}{(q)_n (q)_{n+M}}.
\end{equation}

**Proof.** Using the inverse relation of a Bailey pair [2] (or [15, Eq. (2.4)]),

\begin{equation}
\alpha_n = \frac{(1-aq^{2n})(a)_n (-1)^n q^{n(n-1)/2}}{(1-a)(q)_n} \sum_{k=0}^{n} (q^{-n})_k (aq^n)_k q^k \beta_k,
\end{equation}

we choose our \( \beta_n \) to be (2.2), insert into (2.3), and write

\begin{equation}
(-1)^N (1 + q^N) q^{N/2} \sum_{j=0}^{N} \frac{(q^N)_j (q^{-N})_j q^j}{(q)_j (q)_{j+M}} = \frac{(q)_M (-1)^N (1 + q^N) q^{N(3N-1)/2}}{(q)_{M-N} (q)_{M+N}} = \alpha_N,
\end{equation}

for \( N > 0 \), and

\[ \alpha_0 = \frac{1}{(q)_M}. \]

This follows from the \( q \)-Chu–Vandermonde theorem [8, Eq. (II.6)] with \((a, c, n) \mapsto (q^N, q^{M+1}, N)\), because

\[ \frac{(q)_M \sum_{j=0}^{N} \frac{(q^N)_j (q^{-N})_j q^j}{(q)_j (q)_{j+M}}}{(q)_{j+M}} = \frac{(q)_{M-N} q^{N^2}}{(q)_{M+N}} = \frac{(q)_M (q)_M q^{N^2}}{(q)_{M-N} (q)_{M+N}}. \]

Finally, to respect the convention that \( \alpha_0 = 1 \), we multiply through by \( (q)_M \). \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.** We have, for each natural number \( M \),

\begin{equation}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{q^n}{(1-q^n)^2 (1-q^{n+1}) \cdots (1-q^{n+M})} = \frac{1}{(q)_M} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n q^n}{1-q^n} + (q)_M \sum_{n=1}^{M} \frac{(-1)^n (1+q^n) q^{n(3n+1)/2}}{(q)_{M-n} (q)_{M+n} (1-q^n)^2}.
\end{equation}

**Proof.** Using the conjugate pair (1.5)–(1.6), differentiating with respect to \( \rho_1, \rho_2 \)

and then putting \( \rho_1, \rho_2 = 1 \), we obtain

\begin{equation}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(q; q)_{n-1}^2 \beta_n q^n}{(q)_n} = \alpha_0 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n q^n}{1-q^n} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n q^n}{(1-q^n)^2}.
\end{equation}

Applying the Bailey pair contained in Lemma 3 to (2.5) now gives the theorem. \( \square \)

The \( q \)-series on the left side of (2.4) appeared in [11], and is the generating function

for \( \text{spt}_M(n) \), the total number of appearances of the smallest parts of the number of partitions of \( n \) where parts greater than the smallest plus \( M \) do not occur. The first sum on the right side of (2.4) may be interpreted as \( \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sigma_1(k) p_M(n-k) \), where \( \sigma_1(n) = \sum_{d|n} d \), and \( p_M(n) \) is the number of partitions of \( n \) into parts \( \leq M \). The limiting case \( M \to \infty \) is Euler’s well known formula \( np(n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \sigma_1(k) p(n-k) \),
which is also an observation used by Andrews to obtain his spt(n) identity [5]. By Tannery’s theorem [14, pg. 292] and [5, Eq. (3.4)], it can be seen that the limit of the second sum on the right side of Corollary 4 is

\[ \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} N_2(n) q^n = -\frac{1}{(q)^\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n q^{(3n+1)/2}(1 + q^n)}{(1 - q^n)^2}. \]

The second sum on the right hand side of Corollary 4 is more complicated, and is worthy of a separate study, as any information on spt^*_M(n) is important to better understand spt(n). The case \( M \to \infty \) of Corollary 4 can now be seen as spt(n) = \( np(n) - \frac{1}{2} N_2(n) \). While Corollary 4 is important in its own right, it also implies the following Bailey pair.

**Lemma 5.** For \( n \) and \( M \) non-negative integers, \((\alpha_M, \beta_M)\) forms a Bailey pair relative to \( a = 1 \), where

\[ \alpha_M = \frac{(-1)^M (1 + q^M) q^{M(3M+1)/2}}{(1 - q^M)^2}, \]

for \( M > 0 \), and

\[ \alpha_0 = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{n q^n}{1 - q^n}, \]

\[ \beta_M = \frac{1}{(q)_M} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{q^n}{(1 - q^n)^2(1 - q^{n+1}) \cdots (1 - q^{n+M})}. \]

The point of this section is that no discussion of spt^*_M(n) (or Corollary 4) arose until studying some identities using the 2-fold Bailey lemma.
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