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Abstract. We prove Zagier’s conjecture regarding the 2-adic valuation of the coefficients \( \{b_m\} \) that appear in Ewing and Schober’s series formula for the area of the Mandelbrot set in the case where \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \).

1. Introduction

The Mandelbrot set \( M \) is defined as the set of complex numbers \( c \in \mathbb{C} \) for which the sequence \( \{z_n\} \) defined by the recursion
\[
    z_n = z_{n-1}^2 + c
\]
with initial value \( z_0 = 0 \) remains bounded for all \( n \geq 0 \). Douady and Hubbard [3] proved that \( M \) is connected and Shishikura [11] proved that \( M \) has fractal boundary of Hausdorff dimension 2. However, it is unknown whether the boundary of \( M \) has positive Lebesgue measure, although Julia sets with positive area are known to exist (Buff and Chéritat [2]).

Ewing and Schober [5] derived a series formula for the area of \( M \) by considering its complement, \( \tilde{M} \), inside the Riemann sphere \( \hat{\mathbb{C}} = \mathbb{C} \cup \{\infty\} \), i.e. \( \tilde{M} = \hat{\mathbb{C}} - M \). It is known that \( \tilde{M} \) is simply connected with mapping radius 1 ([3]). In other words, there exists an analytic homeomorphism
\[
    \psi(z) = z + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b_m z^{-m}
\]
which maps the domain \( \Delta = \{z : 1 < |z| \leq \infty\} \subset \hat{\mathbb{C}} \) onto \( \tilde{M} \). It follows from the classic result of Gronwall [6] that the area of the Mandelbrot set \( M = \hat{\mathbb{C}} - \tilde{M} \) is given by
\[
    A = \pi \left[ 1 - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m |b_m|^2 \right].
\]

The arithmetic properties of the coefficients \( b_m \) have been studied in depth, first by Jungreis [7], then independently by Levin [8, 9], Bielefeld, Fisher, and Haeseler [1], Ewing and Schober [4, 5], and more recently by Shimauchi [10]. In particular, Ewing and Schober [5] proved the following formula for the coefficients \( b_m \).

**Theorem 1** (Ewing-Schober [5]). Suppose \( m \leq 2^n + 1 - 3 \). Define the set of \( n \)-tuples
\[
    J = \{j = (j_1, \ldots, j_n) : (2^n - 1)j_1 + \ldots + (2^2 - 1)j_{n-1} + (2 - 1)j_n = m + 1\}
\]
and given any \( j \in J \), set
\[
    \alpha_j(k) := \alpha(k) := \alpha = \frac{m}{2^{n-k+1}} - 2^{k-1}j_1 - 2^{k-2}j_2 - \ldots - 2j_{k-1}.
\]
Then
\[
    b_m = -\frac{1}{m} \sum_j \prod_{k=1}^{n} C_jk(\alpha(k))
\]
where \( C_jk(\alpha(k)) \) is the binomial coefficient
\[
    C_jk(\alpha(k)) = \frac{\alpha(\alpha - 1)(\alpha - 2) \cdots (\alpha - (j_k - 1))}{j_k!}.
\]
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Using formula (4) to compute \( b_m \) is impractical as it requires determining the set of tuples \( J \), which is computationally hard. However, since it is known that each \( b_m \) is rational and has denominator equal to a power of 2, it is then useful to find a formula for its 2-adic valuation. Towards this end, Levin [8] gave such a formula when \( m \) is odd, and Shimauchi [11] established an upper bound valid for all \( m \) with equality if and only if \( m \) is odd.

**Definition 2.** Let \( n \) be a non-negative integer. We define
(a) \( \nu(n) \) to be the 2-adic valuation of \( n \).
(b) \( s(n) \) (called the sum-of-digits function) to be the sum of the binary digits of \( n \).

**Theorem 3** (Levin [8], Shimauchi [11]). Let \( m \) be a non-negative integer. Then
\[
-\nu(b_m) \leq 2(m+1) - s(2(m+1))
\]
Moreover, equality holds precisely when \( m \) is odd.

In this paper we prove Zagier’s conjecture (see [1]) regarding a formula for the 2-adic valuation of \( b_m \) when \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \).

**Theorem 4** (Zagier’s Conjecture [1]). Suppose \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \). Then
\[
-\nu(b_m) = \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m+1) \right\rfloor - s\left( \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m+1) \right\rfloor \right) + \epsilon(m),
\]
where
\[
\epsilon(m) = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } m \equiv 22 \mod 24; \\
1, & \text{otherwise}. 
\end{cases}
\]

Our proof relies on determining those tuples \( j_{\max} \in J \) that maximize \( V(j) := -\nu(\prod_{k=1}^{n} C_j(\alpha(k))) \), i.e., \( V(j) < V(j_{\max}) \) for all \( j \in J \). In particular, we show for \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \) that this largest 2-adic valuation \( V(j_{\max}) \) is achieved by exactly one tuple \( j_{\max} \) or else by exactly three tuples \( j_{\max}, j'_{\max}, j''_{\max} \) in the special case where \( m \equiv 22 \mod 24 \). To prove that \( V(j) < V(j_{\max}) \) for all \( j \in J \), we derive lemmas to compare the values of \( V(j) \) for different types of tuples. For example, if \( m = 38 \), then it holds that
\[
V((2, 1, 0, 2)) < V((0, 5, 1, 1)) < V((0, 0, 13, 0)),
\]
where \( j_{\max} = (0, 0, 13, 0) \). We refer to the chain of tuples
\[
(2, 1, 0, 2) \rightarrow (0, 5, 1, 1) \rightarrow j_{\max}
\]
as a set of tuple transformations.

As a result of our comparison lemmas (derived in Sections 2 and 3), we have the result
\[
-\nu(b_m) = 1 + V(j_{\max}).
\]
This follows from the fact that the 2-adic valuation of the sum of any number of fractions (whose denominators are powers of 2 and whose numerators are odd) is equal to the largest 2-adic valuation of all the fractions, assuming that there are an odd number of fractions with the same largest 2-adic valuation. It remains to calculate \( V(j_{\max}) \) in each case, which then establishes Zagier’s conjecture.

2. **Tuple Transformations**

We begin with preliminary definitions.

**Definition 5.** Given \( j \in J \), define
\[
\beta_j(k) := \beta(k) := \beta = 2^{n-k+1} \alpha(k) = m - 2^n j_1 - 2^{n-1} j_2 - \cdots - 2^{n-k+2} j_{k-1}
\]
and
\[
B(k) = \beta(\beta - 2^{n-k+1})(\beta - 2 \cdot 2^{n-k+1}) \cdots (\beta - (j_k - 1) \cdot 2^{n-k+1}).
\]

**Lemma 6.** We have
\[
\nu(B(k)) = j_k
\]
for \( 1 \leq k \leq n - \nu(m) \).
Proof. First, we establish that \( \nu(\beta(k)) = \nu(m) \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq n - \nu(m) \). This follows from
\[
\nu(\beta) = \nu(m - 2^n j_1 - 2^{n-1} j_2 - \cdots - 2^{n-k+2} j_{k-1}) \\
= \nu(m - (2^n j_1 - 2^{n-1} j_2 - \cdots - 2^{n-k+2} j_{k-1})) \\
= \nu(m),
\]
which holds since \( \nu(2^n j_1 - 2^{n-1} j_2 - \cdots - 2^{n-k+2} j_{k-1}) \geq n - k + 2 > \nu(m) \). Then by definition we have
\[
B(k) = \beta(\beta - d^{n-k+1})(\beta - 2d^{n-k+1}) \cdots (\beta - (j_k - 1)d^{n-k+1})
\]
Taking the 2-adic valuation of both sides and expanding the right-hand side gives
\[
\nu(B(k)) = \nu(\beta(\beta - 2^{n-k+1})(\beta - 2 \cdot 2^{n-k+1}) \cdots (\beta - (j_k - 1)2^{n-k+1})) \\
= \nu(\beta) + \nu(\beta - 2^{n-k+1}) \cdot \nu(\beta - 2 \cdot 2^{n-k+1}) + \cdots + \nu(\beta - (j_k - 1)2^{n-k+1})
\]
Since \( n - k + 1 > \nu(m) \), \( \nu(\beta - p \cdot 2^{n-k+1}) = 1 \) for all integers \( p \). Thus
\[
\nu(\beta) + \nu(\beta - 2^{n-k+1}) + \nu(\beta - 2(2^{n-k+1})) + \cdots + \nu(\beta - (j_k - 1)2^{n-k+1}) = 1 + 1 + \cdots + 1
\]
where there are \( j_k \) 1's. Thus, \( \nu(B(k)) = j_k \) as desired. \( \square \)

Lemma 7. We have
\[
- \nu(C_{j_k}(\alpha(k))) = (n - k + 1)j_k - s(j_k)
\]
for \( 1 \leq k \leq n - \nu(m) \)

Proof. It is clear from Definition 5 that
\[
C_{j_k}(\alpha(k)) = \frac{\alpha(\alpha - 1) \cdots (\alpha - (j_k - 1))}{j_k!} \\
= \frac{\beta(\beta - 2^{n-k+1})(\beta - 2 \cdot 2^{n-k+1}) \cdots (\beta - (j_k - 1)2^{n-k+1})}{2^{j_k(n-k+1)}j_k!} \\
= \frac{B(k)}{2^{j_k(n-k+1)}j_k!}
\]
and thus
\[
- \nu(C_{j_k}(\alpha(k))) = - \nu\left( \frac{B(k)}{2^{j_k(n-k+1)}j_k!} \right) \\
= -(\nu(B(k)) - \nu(2^{j_k(n-k+1)}j_k!)) \\
= (n - k + 1)j_k + j_k - s(j_k) - \nu(B(k)) \\
= (n - k + 1)j_k - s(j_k)
\]
since we have from Lemma 7 that \( \nu(B(k)) = j_k \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq n - \nu(m) \). \( \square \)

We now consider the case where \( k > n - \nu(m) \). Define \( c(x, y) \) to be the number of carries performed when summing two non-negative integers \( x \) and \( y \) in binary. It is a well known result that
\[
c(x, y) = s(x) + s(y) - s(x + y).
\]

Lemma 8. Let \( j \in J \). Then for \( k > n - \nu(m) \), we have
\[
- \nu(C_{j_k}(\alpha(k)))) = \begin{cases} 
- c(j_k, -\alpha(k) - 1), & \alpha(k) < 0; \\
- \infty, & 0 \leq \alpha(k) \leq j_k; \\
c(j_k, \alpha(k) - j_k), & \alpha(k) > j_k.
\end{cases}
\]

Proof. First, we demonstrate that \( \alpha(k) \) is an integer when \( k > n - \nu(m) \). By definition, we have
\[
\alpha(k) = \frac{m}{2^{n-k+1}} - 2^{k-1}j_1 - 2^{k-2}j_2 - \cdots - 2j_{k-1}.
\]
Since \( \nu(m) \geq n - k + 1 \), it follows that \( m \) is divisible by \( 2^{n-k+1} \). Thus, \( \frac{m}{2^{n-k+1}} \) is an integer, and since the remaining terms are all integers, \( \alpha(k) \) must be an integer as well.
If \( \alpha(k) < 0 \), we have
\[
-\nu(C_{j_k}(\alpha(k))) = -\nu\left(\frac{\alpha(\alpha - 1) \ldots (\alpha - j_k + 1)}{j_k!}\right)
\]
\[
= j_k - s(j_k) - \nu((\alpha - j_k + 1) \ldots (\alpha - 1)\alpha)
\]
\[
= j_k - s(j_k) - (\nu((-\alpha - j - k + 1)!)) - \nu(-\alpha - 1)
\]
\[
= -s(j_k) - s(-\alpha - 1) + s(-\alpha - 1 + j_k)
\]
\[
= -c(j_k, -\alpha - 1).
\]
On the other hand, if \( 0 \leq \alpha(k) \), then \( C_{j_k}(\alpha(k)) = 0 \), and therefore \( \nu(C_{j_k}) = \infty \). Lastly, if \( \alpha(k) > j_k \), then we have
\[
-\nu(C_{j_k}(\alpha)) = -\nu\left(\frac{\alpha!}{(\alpha - j_k)!j_k!}\right)
\]
\[
= \alpha - s(\alpha) - (\alpha - j_k) + s(\alpha - j_k) - j_k + s(j_k)
\]
\[
= s(j_k) + s(\alpha - j_k) - s(\alpha)
\]
\[
= c(j_k, \alpha(k) - j_k)
\]
as desired. \( \square \)

**Definition 9.** For convenience, define
\[
\gamma(m, k) := \gamma(k) = \begin{cases} 
-c(j_k, -\alpha(k) - 1), & \alpha(k) < 0; \\
\infty, & 0 \leq \alpha(k) \leq j_k; \\
c(j_k, \alpha(k) - j_k), & \alpha(k) > j_k,
\end{cases}
\]
and for any tuple \( j \in J \), define
\[
v(m, j) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-\nu(m)} [(n - k + 1)j_k - s(j_k)]
\]
and
\[
V(m, j) := V(j) = -\nu\left(\prod_{k=1}^{n} C_{j_k}(\alpha(k))\right).
\]
In the case where \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \) so that \( \nu(m) = 1 \), we shall simply write
\[
v(j) := v(m, j) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n - k + 1)j_k - s(j_k)].
\]

The next lemma follows immediately from Definition 9 and Lemmas 7 and 8.

**Lemma 10.** We have
\[
V(j) = v(m, j) + \sum_{k=n-\nu(m)+1}^{n} \gamma(k)
\]
and in particular if \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \), then
\[
V(j) = v(j) + \gamma(n).
\]

We now consider tuple transformations that allow us to compare \( v(m, j) \) for different types of tuples.

**Lemma 11.** Suppose \( \nu(m) \geq 1 \). Let \( j \) be a \( J \)-tuple and \( i < n - \nu(m) \) be such that \( j_i \neq 0 \). Define the tuple
\[
j'_k = \begin{cases} 
  j_k, & k \neq i, i + 1, n \\
  j_i - r, & k = i \\
  j_{i+1} + p, & k = i + 1 \\
  j_n + q, & k = n
\end{cases}
\]
where \( r \) is the largest power of 2 less than \( j_i \), and \( p \) and \( q \) satisfy
\[
(2^{n-i} - 1)p + q = (2^{n-i+1} - 1)r
\]
with \( q < 2^{n-i} - 1 \). Then
\[
v(m, j) < v(m, j').
\]

**Proof.** It is clear that \( p \) and \( q \) exist by Euclid’s Division Theorem. Then since \( j_k = j'_k \) for all \( k \neq i, i+1, n \), the corresponding terms will cancel when we compute the difference \( v(j') - v(j) \). If \( i < n - 2 \), then
\[
v(m, j') - v(m, j) = (n - i)p - (n - i + 1)r + s(j_i) - s(j_i) + s(j_{i+1}) - s(j_{i+1} + p)
\]
\[
\geq (n - i)p - (n - i + 1)r + 1 - s(p)
\]
\[
> \frac{n - i - 1}{2}p - \frac{n - i + 1}{2} - \lfloor \log_2(p) \rfloor
\]
\[
\geq 0
\]
since \( r < (p+1)/2 \) and \( p \geq 2 \). The remaining case, \( i = n - 2 \), can be easily proven by similar means. \( \square \)

Observe that we can apply Lemma 11 repeatedly to transform any tuple \( j \in J \) containing a non-zero element \( j_i \), \( 1 \leq i \leq n - \nu(m) \), to a tuple \( j' \in J \) with \( j'_i = 0 \). Thus, any tuple \( j \in J \) can be transformed to a tuple \( j' \), where all elements \( j'_i = 0 \) except for \( i \geq n - \nu(m) \), with \( v(j) < v(j') \). We will make use of this fact later on.

**Lemma 12.** Let \( j \) be a \( J \)-tuple where \( j_n > 2 \), and \( j' \) be the tuple such that
\[
j'_k = \begin{cases} j_k, & 1 \leq k \leq n - \nu(m) - 1; \\
j_{n-\nu(m)} + p, & k = n - \nu(m); \\
0, & n - \nu(m) < k < n; \\
\sum_{k=n-\nu(m)+1}^{n} (2^{n-k+1} - 1)j_k - (2^{\nu(m)+1} - 1)p, & k = n,
\end{cases}
\]
where \( p \) is chosen to be as largest as possible so that \( j'_n < 2^{\nu(m)+1} - 1 \). Then
\[
v(m, j) < v(m, j').
\]

**Proof.** We have that
\[
v(m, j') - v(m, j) = (n - \nu(m) + 1)(j_{n-\nu(m)} + p) - s(j_{n-\nu(m)} + p)
\]
\[
- (n - \nu(m) + 1)j_{n-\nu(m)} + s(j_{n-\nu(m)})
\]
\[
= (n - \nu(m) + 1)p + s(j_{n-\nu(m)}) - s(j_{n-\nu(m)} + p)
\]
\[
= (n - \nu(m) + 1)p + c(j_{n-\nu(m)}, p) - s(p)
\]
\[
\geq (n - \nu(m) + 1)p - s(p)
\]
\[
> 0.
\]
\( \square \)

In particular, when \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \), Lemma 12 allows us to transform a tuple \( j \in J \), whose elements are all zero except for \( j_{n-1} \) and \( j_n > 2 \), to a tuple \( j' \in J \), whose elements are also all zero but with \( j'_n \leq 2 \), so that \( v(j) < v(j') \).

### 3. ZAGIER’S CONJECTURE

In this section we prove Zagier’s conjecture for the case where \( m \equiv 2 \mod 4 \), which we assume throughout this section. In order to do this, we first derive additional lemmas that allow us to compare \( V(j) \) for the tuple transformations described in the previous section.

**Lemma 13.** If \( m + 1 \equiv 0 \mod 3 \), then \( V(j) < V(j') \) for all \( j \neq j' \), where \( j' = (0, 0, \ldots, \frac{m+1}{3}, 0) \).
Proof. By Lemmas 11 and 12, we can transform \( j \) to a tuple \( j' \) so that \( j'_i = 0 \) for all \( i < n - 1 \) since \( \nu(m) = 1 \). Moreover, \( j'_{n-1} = (m+1)/3 \) and \( j'_n = 0 \) since \( m+1 \equiv 0 \mod 3 \). It follows that

\[
V(j) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j_k - s(j_k)] - c(j_n, -\alpha(n) - 1) \\
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j_k - s(j_k))] = v(j) \\
< v(j') = V(j')
\]

since \( c(j'_n, -\alpha'(n) - 1) = 0 \) due to Lemma 10.

Lemma 14. If \( m + 1 \equiv 1 \mod 3 \), then \( V(j) < V(j') \) for all \( j \neq j' \), where \( j' = (0, 0, \ldots, 3, 1) \).

Proof. We have \( V(j) < V(j') \) by the same reasoning as in the previous lemma.

Lemma 15. If \( m + 1 \equiv 2 \mod 3 \) and \( m \equiv 2 \mod 8 \), then \( V(j) < V(j') \) for all \( j \neq j' \), where \( j' = (0, 0, \ldots, 2, 3) \).

Proof. Again, such a tuple \( j' \) exists because of Lemmas 11 and 12. We first determine the binary representation of \(-\alpha(n) - 1\). Since

\[
-\alpha(n) - 1 = \frac{j_n - (1 + j_1 + \cdots + j_{n-1})}{2} - 1 \\
= \frac{1 - \frac{m-1}{3}}{2} - 1 \\
= \frac{m-1}{3} - 1 \\
= \frac{m-1}{3} - 3 \\
= \frac{m-1}{6} - 10
\]

and \( m \equiv 2 \mod 8 \) by assumption, it follows that \(-\alpha(n) - 1\) has binary representation \( b_n \cdots b_3 100 \). It follows that \( c(2, -\alpha(n) - 1) = 0 \) and thus \( V(j') = v(j') \) by Lemma 10. Moreover, we have

\[
V(j') = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j_k - s(j_k)] - c(j_n, -\alpha(n) - 1) \\
= 2(m-1) - 3 s \left( \frac{m-1}{3} \right) - c(2, -\alpha(n) - 1) \\
= 2(m-1) - 3 s \left( \frac{2m-1}{3} \right).
\]

It remains to be shown that \( V(j) < V(j') \) for all \( j \neq j' \). This follows from

\[
V(j) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j_k - s(j_k)] - c(j_n, -\alpha(n) - 1) \\
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j_k - s(j_k)] = v(j) \\
< v(j') = V(j').
\]

This proves the lemma.
In order to handle the case \( m+1 \equiv 2 \mod 3 \) and \( m \equiv 6 \mod 8 \) (or equivalently \( m \equiv 22 \mod 24 \)), we will need the following lemma. First, we define the following three special tuples, which exist for this case:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbf{j}' &= (0, 0, \ldots, \frac{m-1}{3}, 2) \\
\mathbf{j}'' &= (0, 0, \ldots, \frac{m-1}{3} - 1, 5) \\
\mathbf{j}''' &= (0, 0, \ldots, 1, \frac{m-1}{3} - 2, 1).
\end{align*}
\]

**Lemma 16.** Suppose \( m+1 \equiv 2 \mod 3 \) and \( m \equiv 6 \mod 8 \). Then for all \( \mathbf{j} \notin \{\mathbf{j}', \mathbf{j}'', \mathbf{j}''\} \), we have

\[
V(\mathbf{j}) < V(\mathbf{j'''})
\]

*Proof.* Since \( \alpha_{j'''}(n) \) is odd and \( j''''_n = 1 \), we have \( c(j''', -\alpha(n) - 1) = 0 \) and thus \( V(\mathbf{j}) = v(\mathbf{j}) \). Moreover, we have

\[
V(\mathbf{j''}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [\alpha_{(j''')_k} - s_{(j''')_k}] - c(j''', -\alpha(n) - 1)
\]

\[
= 3 \cdot 1 - s(1) + 2\left(\frac{m-7}{3}\right) - s\left(\frac{m-7}{3}\right)
\]

\[
= 2(\frac{m-1}{3}) - 2 - s\left(\frac{m-1}{3}\right) - 1.
\]

Thus, it suffices to show that \( v(\mathbf{j}) < v(\mathbf{j'''}) \) since this will imply \( V(\mathbf{j}) \leq v(\mathbf{j}) < v(\mathbf{j'}) = V(\mathbf{j'}) \). Note that for any tuple \( \mathbf{j} \) containing an element \( j_i \neq 0 \) such that \( 1 \leq i \leq n-3 \), we have \( v(\mathbf{j}) < v(\mathbf{g}) \) for some tuple \( \mathbf{g} \) with \( g_i = 0 \) for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n-3 \) and \( g_{n-2} = 2^k \) for some \( k \). To construct such a tuple \( \mathbf{g} \), we simply apply the tuple transformation in Lemma 11 repeatedly.

We now consider 3 cases. First, if \( \mathbf{g} = \mathbf{j'''}, \) then the theorem holds trivially. If \( g_{n-2} > 1 \), we proceed in two steps. Let \( g_{n-2} - 1 = 3p + q \) where \( q < 3 \), and let \( \mathbf{g}' \) be such that

\[
\begin{align*}
g'_i &= 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-3 \\
g'_{n-2} &= 1 \\
g'_{n-1} &= g_{n-1} + p \\
g'_n &= g_n + q.
\end{align*}
\]

Then we have

\[
v(\mathbf{g'}) - v(\mathbf{g}) = 2 + 2(g_{n-1} + p) - s(g_{n-1} + p) - 3g_{n-2} - 1 - 2g_{n-1} + s(g_{n-1})
\]

\[
\geq 2p - 3g_{n-2} - \lfloor \log_2(p) \rfloor + 3
\]

\[
\geq \frac{11p}{7} - \lfloor \log_2(p) \rfloor + \frac{12}{7}
\]

\[
> 0.
\]

Then applying Lemma 12 to \( \mathbf{g}' \) completes the proof for this case. If \( g_{n-2} = 0 \), then we proceed as follows. Let \( \frac{m-1}{3} = g_{n-1} + p \). Note that because \( \mathbf{g} \notin \{\mathbf{j}', \mathbf{j}'', \mathbf{j}''\} \), we have \( p \geq 2 \). Thus,

\[
v(\mathbf{j''''}) - v(\mathbf{g}) = 2(g_{n-1} + p) - s(g_{n-1} + p) - 1 - 2g_{n-1} + s(g_{n-1})
\]

\[
\geq 2p - 1 - s(p)
\]

\[
> 0.
\]

This completes the proof.

**Lemma 17.** If \( m+1 \equiv 2 \mod 3 \) and \( m \equiv 46 \mod 48 \), then \( V(\mathbf{j}) < V(\mathbf{j'''}) \) for all \( \mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{j}' \) where \( \mathbf{j}'''' = (0, 0, \ldots, 1, \frac{m-1}{3}, 1) \).
Proof. In light of Lemma 16, it suffices to prove that \( V(j') < V(j'') \) and \( V(j') < V(j''') \). We first consider \( j' \). We have

\[
\alpha_{j'}(n) = m/2 - 2^{n-1}j_1 - 2^{n-2}j_2 - \cdots - 2j_{n-1}
\]

\[
= m/2 - 2(m-1)/3 = (4-m)/6,
\]

which implies \(-\alpha(n) - 1 = (m-10)/6\) has binary expansion \( b_n \ldots b_3110 \). Thus, \( c(j'_n, -\alpha(n) - 1) > 0 \) since \( j'_n = 2 \). It follows that

\[
V(j') = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j'_k - s(j'_k)] - c(j'_n, -\alpha(n) - 1)
\]

\[
< \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j'_k - s(j'_k)]
\]

\[
= \frac{2(m-1)}{3} - s \left( \frac{m-1}{3} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{2(m-1)}{3} - 2 - s \left( \frac{m-1}{3} - 1 \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{2(m-1)}{3} - s \left( \frac{m-1}{3} - 1 \right) - 1
\]

\[
= V(j'').
\]

As for \( j'' \), we have \( c(j''_n, -\alpha(n) - 1) > 0 \) since \( j''_n = 5 \) and

\[
\alpha_{j''}(n) = m/2 - 2^{n-1}j_1 - 2^{n-2}j_2 - \cdots - 2j_{n-1}
\]

\[
= m/2 - 2(m-4)/3 = (16-m)/6,
\]

which implies \(-\alpha(n) - 1 = (m-22)/6\) has binary expansion \( b_n \ldots b_3110 \). It follows that

\[
V(j') = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j''_k - s(j''_k)] - c(j''_n, -\alpha(n) - 1)
\]

\[
< \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j''_k - s(j''_k)]
\]

\[
= \frac{2(m-4)}{3} - s \left( \frac{m-1}{3} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{2(m-1)}{3} - 2 - s \left( \frac{m-1}{3} - 1 \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{2(m-1)}{3} - s \left( \frac{m-1}{3} - 1 \right) - 1
\]

\[
= V(j'').
\]

This completes the proof. \( \square \)

**Lemma 18.** If \( m + 1 \equiv 2 \mod 3 \) and \( m \equiv 22 \mod 48 \), then

\[
V(j) < V(j')
\]

for all \( j \not\in \{j', j'', j'''\} \). Moreover,

\[
V(j') = V(j'') = V(j''') = \frac{2(m-1)}{3} - s \left( \frac{2(m-1)}{3} \right) - 1.
\]
Proof. Again, in light of Lemma 16, it suffices to prove that \( V(j') = V(j'') = V(j''') \). Write \( m = 48q + 22 \) for \( q \in \mathbb{N} \) and so that the elements of \( j', j'', \) and \( j''' \) take the form

\[
j'_i = \begin{cases} 
0, & 1 \leq i \leq n - 3 \\
1, & i = n - 2 \\
16q + 5 & i = n - 1 \\
1 & i = n,
\end{cases}
\]

(18)

\[
j''_i = \begin{cases} 
0, & 1 \leq i \leq n - 3 \\
0, & i = n - 2 \\
16q + 7 & i = n - 1 \\
2 & i = n,
\end{cases}
\]

(19)

\[
j'''_i = \begin{cases} 
0, & 1 \leq i \leq n - 3 \\
0, & i = n - 2 \\
16q + 6 & i = n - 1 \\
5 & i = n,
\end{cases}
\]

(20)

and

It is straightforward to show that

\[
\alpha_{j}(n) = -(8q + 3) < 0 \\
\alpha_{j'}(n) = -(8q + 3) < 0 \\
\alpha_{j''}(n) = -(8q + 1) < 0.
\]

Then

\[
V(j') = 3j'_{n-2} - s(j'_{n-2}) + 2j'_{n-1} - s(j'_{n-1}) - c(j_{n-1}, -\alpha_{j'}(n) - 1) \\
= 3(1) - s(1) + 2(16q + 5) - s(16q + 5) - c(1, 8q + 2) \\
= 32q + 12 - s(q) - s(5) \\
= 32q + 10 - s(q).
\]

Similarly,

\[
V(j'') = 3j''_{n-2} - s(j''_{n-2}) + 2j''_{n-1} - s(j''_{n-1}) - c(j''_{n-1}, -\alpha_{j''}(n) - 1) \\
= 3(0) - s(0) + 2(16q + 7) - s(16q + 7) - c(2, 8q + 2) \\
= 32q + 14 - s(q) - s(7) - c(2, 8q + 2) \\
= 32q + 10 - s(q)
\]

and

\[
V(j''') = 3j'''_{n-2} - s(j'''_{n-2}) + 2j'''_{n-1} - s(j'''_{n-1}) - c(j'''_{n-1}, -\alpha_{j'''}(n) - 1) \\
= 3(0) - s(0) + 2(16q + 6) - s(16q + 6) - c(5, 8q) \\
= 32q + 12 - s(q) - s(6) - c(5, 8q) \\
= 32q + 10 - s(q).
\]

Thus, \( V(j') = V(j'') = V(j''') \). \( \square \)

The following theorem summarizes the form of the maximum tuple \( j_{max} \) for the case \( m \equiv 2 \) mod 4.

**Theorem 19.** Suppose \( m \equiv 2 \) mod 4. The maximum tuple \( j_{max} \) occurs in the following form:

1. If \( m + 1 \equiv 0 \) mod 3, then \( j_{max} = (0, \ldots, 0, p, 0) \) where \( p = (m + 1)/3 \).
2. If \( m + 1 \equiv 1 \) mod 3, then \( j_{max} = (0, \ldots, 0, p, 1) \) where \( p = m/3 \).
3. If \( m + 1 \equiv 2 \) mod 3 and
   - (a) If \( m \equiv 2 \) mod 8, then \( j_{max} = (0, \ldots, 0, p, 2) \) where \( p = (m - 1)/3 \).
   - (b) If \( m \equiv 46 \) mod 48, then \( j_{max} = (0, \ldots, 1, p - 2, 1) \) where \( p = (m - 1)/3 \).
(c) If \( m \equiv 22 \) mod 48, then 
\[ j_{\text{max}} = (0, \ldots, 1, (m - 7)/3, 1), (0, \ldots, 0, (m - 1)/3, 2), (0, \ldots, 0, (m - 4)/3, 5). \]

We now have all the necessary ingredients to prove Zagier’s conjecture.

Proof of Theorem 4 (Zagier’s Conjecture): We divide the proof into the following cases:

(1) \( m + 1 \equiv 0 \) mod 3.
(2) \( m + 1 \equiv 1 \) mod 3.
(3) \( m + 1 \equiv 2 \) mod 3 and
   (a) \( m \equiv 2 \) mod 8.
   (b) \( m \equiv 46 \) mod 48.
   (c) \( m \equiv 22 \) mod 48.

Case (1): Write \( m + 1 = 3p \) for some positive integer \( p \). Since \( m \equiv 2 \) mod 4, it follows that \( 3p - 1 \equiv 2 \) mod 4 and so \( p \equiv 1 \) mod 4. Now, recall that \( j_{\text{max}} = (j_{n-1}, j_n) = (p, 0) \), we have \( \alpha(n) = -(1 + p)/2 \). Then using the relation

\[ c(j_n, -\alpha(n) - 1) = s(j_n) + s(-\alpha(n) - 1) - s(j_n - \alpha(n) - 1), \]

we have

\[ -\nu(b_{2,m}) = \nu(m) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n - k + 1)j_k - s(j_k)] - s(j_n) - s(-\alpha(n) - 1) + s(j_n - \alpha(n) - 1) \]
\[ = 1 + 2j_{n-1} - s(j_{n-1}) \]
\[ = 1 + 2p - s(p) \]
\[ = 1 + 2p - s(2p) \]
\[ = 1 + [2p] - s([2p]) \]
\[ = \epsilon(m) + \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor - s \left( \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor \right). \]

Case (2): Write \( m + 1 = 3p + 1 \) for some positive integer \( p \). Since \( m \equiv 2 \) mod 4, it follows that \( 3p \equiv 2 \) mod 4 and so \( p \equiv 2 \) mod 4. Since in this case \( j_{\text{max}} = (j_{n-1}, j_n) = (p, 1) \), we have \( \alpha(n) = -p/2 \). It follows that

\[ -\nu(b_{2,m}) = \nu(m) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} [(n - k + 1)j_k - s(j_k)] - s(j_n) - s(-\alpha(n) - 1) + s(j_n - \alpha(n) - 1) \]
\[ = 1 + 2j_{n-1} - s(j_n) - s(p/2 - 1) + s(j_n + p/2 - 1) \]
\[ = 1 + 2p - s(p) - 1 - s((p - 2)/2) + s(p/2) \]
\[ = 2p - s(p - 2) \]
\[ = 1 + 2p - s(p) \]
\[ = 1 + 2p - s(2p) \]
\[ = 1 + [2p + 2/3] - s([2p + 2/3]) \]
\[ = \epsilon(m) + \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor - s \left( \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor \right). \]

Case (3)-(a): Write \( m + 1 = 3p + 2 \) for some positive integer \( p \). Since \( m \equiv 2 \) mod 8, it follows that \( 3p + 1 \equiv 2 \) mod 8 and so \( p \equiv 3 \) mod 8. Thus, \( p \) has binary representation \( b_r \ldots b_3011 \). Since \( j_{\text{max}} = (j_{n-1}, j_n) = (p, 2), \)
we have \( \alpha(n) = (1-p)/2 \). It follows that
\[
-\nu(b_{2,m}) = \nu(m) + \sum_{k=n-1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j_k - s(j_k)] - s(j_n) - s(-\alpha(n) - 1) + s(j_n - \alpha(n) - 1)
\]
\[
= 1 + 2j_{n-1} - s(j_{n-1}) - s(j_n) - s((p-1)/2 - 1) + s(j_n + (p-1)/2 - 1)
\]
\[
= 1 + 2p - s(p) - s(2) - s((p-3)/2) + s((p+1)/2)
\]
\[
= 2p - s(p) - s(p-3) + s(p+1)
\]
\[
= 2p - s(p) + s(4)
\]
\[
= 1 + (2p + 1) - s(2p + 1)
\]
\[
= 1 + [2p + 4/3] - s([2p + 4/3])
\]
\[
= \epsilon(m) + \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor - s\left(\left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor \right).
\]

Case (3)-(b): Write \( m + 1 = 3p + 2 \) for some positive integer \( p \). Since \( m \equiv 46 \) mod 48, it follows that \( 3p + 1 \equiv 46 \) mod 48 and so \( p \equiv 15 \) mod 48. Thus, \( p \) has binary representation \( b_r \ldots b_1 \). Since
\[
\text{If } j_{\text{max}} = (j_{n-1}, j_n) = (1, p-2, 1), \text{ we have } \alpha(n) = (1-p)/2. \text{ It follows that}
\]
\[
-\nu(b_{2,m}) = \nu(m) + \sum_{k=n-1}^{n-1} [(n-k+1)j_k - s(j_k)] - s(j_n) - s(-\alpha(n) - 1) + s(j_n - \alpha(n) - 1)
\]
\[
= 1 + 3j_{n-2} - s(j_{n-2}) + 2j_{n-1} - s(j_{n-1}) - s(j_n) - s((p-1)/2 - 1) + s(j_n + (p-1)/2 - 1)
\]
\[
= 1 + 3 - s(1) + 2p - s(p) - s(1) - s((p-3)/2) + s((p-1)/2)
\]
\[
= 2p - 2 - s(p) - s(p-3) + s(p-1)
\]
\[
= 2p - s(p)
\]
\[
= 2p - s(p) + s(4)
\]
\[
= \epsilon(m) + \left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor - s\left(\left\lfloor \frac{2}{3}(m + 1) \right\rfloor \right).
\]

Here, \( \epsilon(m) = 0 \) since \( m = 2m_0 \), where \( m_0 \equiv -1 \) mod 12.

Case (3)-(c): Write \( m + 1 = 3p + 2 \) for some positive integer \( p \). Since \( m \equiv 22 \) mod 48, it follows that \( 3p + 1 \equiv 22 \) mod 48 and so \( p \equiv 7 \) mod 48. In this case \( j_{\text{max}} = (j_{n-2}, j_{n-1}, j_n) = (1, p-2, 1) \) and thus the same argument applies as in Case (3)-(b). This completes the proof of Zagier’s conjecture.

\[\square\]
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