DIVISIBILITY OF SOME BINOMIAL SUMS

HE-XIA NI AND HAO PAN

Abstract. With help of $q$-congruence, we prove the divisibility of some binomial sums. For example, for any integers $\rho, n \geq 2$,
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (4k+1) \left(\begin{array}{c} 2k \\ k \end{array}\right)^\rho \cdot (-4)^{\rho(n-1-k)} \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{\rho-2}n \left(\begin{array}{c} 2n \\ n \end{array}\right)}.
\]

1. Introduction

In [5], Ramanujan listed 17 curious convergent series concerning $1/\pi$. For example, Ramanujan found that
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{6k+1}{256^k} \cdot \left(\begin{array}{c} 2k \\ k \end{array}\right)^3 = \frac{4}{\pi}.
\]

(1.1)

Nowadays, the theory of Ramanujan-type series has been greatly developed. In [1], Guillera gave a summary for the methods to deal with Ramanujan-type series.

In the recent years, the arithmetic properties of truncated Ramanujan-type series also be investigated. In [3], van Hamme proposed 13 conjectured congruences concerning truncated Ramanujan-type series. For example,
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\rho-1} \frac{6k+1}{256^k} \cdot \left(\begin{array}{c} 2k \\ k \end{array}\right)^3 \equiv (-1)^{\frac{n-1}{2}}p \pmod{p^4},
\]

(1.2)

where $p > 3$ is a prime. Now all conjectures of van Hamme have been confirmed. The reader may refer to [7, 4] for the history of the proofs of van Hamme’s conjectures.

On the other hand, Sun [6] discovered that the convergent series concerning $\pi$ often corresponds to the divisibility of some binomial sums. For example, Sun conjectured that for each integer $n \geq 2$
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (5k+1) \left(\begin{array}{c} 2k \\ k \end{array}\right)^2 \left(\begin{array}{c} 3k \\ k \end{array}\right) \cdot (-192)^{n-1-k} \equiv 0 \pmod{n \left(\begin{array}{c} 2n \\ n \end{array}\right)},
\]

(1.3)
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which corresponds to the identity of Ramanujan
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{5k + 1}{(-192)^k} \cdot \left(\frac{2k}{k}\right)^2 \left(\frac{3k}{k}\right) = \frac{4\sqrt{3}}{\pi}.
\] (1.4)

In this paper, we shall consider the divisibility of some binomial sums similar as (1.3). For \(\alpha \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}\) and \(n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\), define
\[
N_{\alpha,n} := \text{the numerator of } n \cdot \left|\frac{(-\alpha)}{n}\right|.
\]
It is easy to see that \(N_{\frac{1}{2},n}\) coincides with the odd part of \(n\binom{2n}{n}\).

**Theorem 1.1.** Suppose that \(\rho\) is a positive integer and \(\alpha\) is a non-integral rational number. Then for each integer \(n \geq 1\),
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (2k + \alpha) \left(\frac{-\alpha}{k}\right)^\rho \equiv 0 \pmod{N_{\alpha,n}}. 
\] (1.5)

In particular, substituting \(\alpha = 1/2\) in (1.5), we may obtain that

**Corollary 1.1.** Suppose that \(\rho \geq 2\) is an integer. Then for each integer \(n \geq 2\),
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (4k + 1) \left(\frac{2k}{k}\right)^\rho \cdot (-4)^\rho(n-1-k) \equiv 0 \pmod{2^{\rho-2}n\binom{2n}{n}}. 
\] (1.6)

2. \(q\)-congruence

First, let us introduce the notion of \(q\)-congruence. For any \(x \in \mathbb{Q}\), define
\[
\left[ x \right]_q := \frac{1 - q^x}{1 - q}.
\]
Clearly if \(n \in \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}\), then \([n]_q = 1 + q + \cdots + q^{n-1}\) is a polynomial in \(q\). For \(a, b \in \mathbb{N}\) and \(n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\), if \(a \equiv b \pmod{n}\), then letting \(m = (a - b)/n\),
\[
[a]_q - [b]_q = q^b - q^a = q^b \cdot \frac{1 - q^m}{1 - q} = q^b [m]_q \cdot [n]_q \equiv 0 \pmod{[n]_q},
\]
where the above congruence is considered over the polynomial ring \(\mathbb{Z}[q]\). Furthermore, we also have
\[
\frac{[nm]_q}{[n]_q} = \frac{1 - q^{nm}}{1 - q^n} = 1 + q^n + q^{2n} + \cdots + q^{(m-1)n} \equiv 1 + 1 + \cdots + 1 = m \pmod{[n]_q}. 
\] (2.1)

Note that (2.1) is still valid when \(m\) is a negative integer, since \([nm]_q = -q^{nm}[-nm]_q\).

For \(d \geq 2\), let \(\Phi_d(q)\) denote the \(d\)-th cyclotomic polynomial, i.e.,
\[
\Phi_d(q) = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq d \atop (d,k)=1} (q - e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1} \frac{k}{d}}).
\]
It is well-known that \( \Phi_d(q) \) is an irreducible polynomial with integral coefficients. Also, we have

\[
[n]_q = \prod_{d \geq 2, d | n} \Phi_d(q).
\]

So \( \Phi_d(q) \) divides \([n]_q\) if and only if \( d \) divides \( n \). Furthermore,

\[
\Phi_d(1) = \begin{cases} 
p, & \text{if } d = p^k \text{ for some prime } p, \\
1, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\] (2.2)

For \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), define

\[
(x; q)_n := \begin{cases} 
(1 - x)(1 - xq) \cdots (1 - xq^{n-1}), & \text{if } n \geq 1, \\
1, & \text{if } n = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Also, define the \( q \)-binomial coefficient

\[
\begin{bmatrix} x \\ n \end{bmatrix}_q := \frac{(q^{x-n+1}; q)_n}{(q; q)_n}.
\]

Clearly

\[
\lim_{q \to 1} \begin{bmatrix} x \\ n \end{bmatrix}_q = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ n \end{bmatrix}.
\]

Furthermore, it is easy to see that

\[
\begin{bmatrix} -\frac{r}{m} \\ n \end{bmatrix}_q = (-1)^n q^{-nr-m \binom{n}{2}} \cdot \frac{(q^r; q^m)_n}{(q^m; q^m)_n}.
\]

Suppose that \( r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) and \( (r, m) = 1 \). For each positive integer \( d \) with \( (d, m) = 1 \), let \( \lambda_{r,m}(d) \) be the integer lying in \( \{0, 1, \ldots, d - 1\} \) such that

\[
r + \lambda_{r,m}(d) m \equiv 0 \pmod{d}.
\] (2.3)

Let

\[
S_{r,m}(n) = \left\{ d \geq 2 : \left\lfloor \frac{n - 1 - \lambda_{r,m}(d)}{d} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{n}{d} \right\rfloor \right\}.
\]

Evidently for each \( d > \max_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} |r + jm|, \) we must have \( \lambda_{r,m}(d) > n - 1 \), whence \( d \not\in S_{r,m}(n) \). So \( S_{r,m}(n) \) is always a finite set. Let

\[
A_{r,m,n}(q) = \prod_{d \in S_{r,m}(n)} \Phi_d(q)
\] (2.4)

and

\[
C_{m,n}(q) = \prod_{d | n, (d, m) = 1} \Phi_d(q).
\] (2.5)
Clearly, if \( d \mid n \), then we can’t have \( d \in S_{r,m}(n) \). So \( A_{r,m,n}(q) \) and \( C_{m,n}(q) \) are co-prime. Furthermore, as we shall see in the next section,

\[
A_{r,m,n}(1)C_{m,n}(1) = N_{\frac{r}{m},n}.
\]

(2.6)

The following theorem is the key ingredient of this paper.

**Theorem 2.1.** Suppose that Let \( r \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \). Assume that \( \mu_0(q), \mu_1(q), \cdots \) is a sequence of rational functions in \( q \) such that for any \( d \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) with \( (m,d) = 1 \),

(i) \( \nu_k(q) \) is \( \Phi_d(q) \)-integral for each \( k \geq 0 \), i.e., the denominator of \( \nu_k(q) \) is not divisible by \( \Phi(q) \);

(ii) for any \( s, t \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( 0 \leq t \leq d - 1 \),

\[
\nu_{sd+t}(q) \equiv \mu_s(q)\nu_t(q) \pmod{\Phi_d(q)},
\]

where \( \mu_s(q) \) is a \( \Phi_d(q) \)-integral rational function only depending on \( s \);

(iii)

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m)_k}{(q^m; q^m)_k} \cdot \nu_k(q) \equiv 0 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]

Then

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m)_k}{(q^m; q^m)_k} \cdot \nu_k(q) \equiv 0 \pmod{A_{r,m,n}(q)C_{m,n}(q)}.
\]

(2.7)

Before we give the proof of Theorem 2.1, which will occupy the subsequent section, let us see an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1.

**Corollary 2.1.** Under the Proposition , additionally assume that for each positive integer \( n \), there exists a polynomial \( B_n(q) \) with integral coefficients such that

(i)

\[
B_n(q) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{(q^r; q^d)_k}{(q^d; q^d)_k} \cdot \nu_k(q)
\]

is a polynomial with integral coefficients.

(ii) \( B_n(1) \) is not divisible by any prime \( p \) with \( p \nmid m \);

Then for any \( n \geq 1 \), we have

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (-1)^k \left( \frac{r}{m} \right) \cdot \nu_k(1) \equiv 0 \pmod{N_{\frac{r}{m},n}}.
\]

(2.8)
Proof. By Theorem 2.1, we have

\[ B_n(q) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left( \frac{q^r; q^m}{q^m, q^m} \right)_k \cdot \nu_k(q) = A_{r,m,n}(q)C_{m,n}(q) \cdot H(q), \]

where \( H(q) \) is a polynomial in \( q \). Notice that the greatest common divisor of all coefficients of \( A_{r,m,n}(q)C_{m,n}(q) \) is just 1. According to a well-known result of Gauss, we know that the coefficients of \( H(q) \) must be all integers. Hence substituting \( q = 1 \) in (2.7), we get

\[ B_n(1) \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (-1)^k \left( \frac{-r}{m} \right)_k \cdot \nu_k(1) = N_{r,m,n} \cdot H(1) \equiv 0 \pmod{N_{r,m,n}}. \]

Since \( N_{r,m,n} \) is prime to \( B_n(1) \), (2.8) is concluded. \( \square \)

3. Proof of Theorem 2.1

In this section, we shall complete the proof of Theorem 2.1. First, we need several auxiliary lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. Let \( r \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( m, d \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \) with \( (m, d) = 1 \). Then

\[ \frac{(q^r; q^m)_d}{1 - q^d} \equiv r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}, \]

where \( \lambda_{r,m} \) is the one defined by (2.3).

Proof. Clearly

\[ \frac{(q^r; q^m)_d}{1 - q^d} = 1 - q^{r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m} \prod_{0 \leq j \leq d-1} (1 - q^{r + jm}) = 1 - q^{d - r - \lambda_{r,m}(d)m} \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} (1 - q^j) \equiv r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m \frac{m}{d} \cdot (q; q)_{d-1} \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}. \]

Now for every primitive \( d \)-th root of unity \( \xi \), we have

\[ (q; q)_{d-1} \bigg|_{q=\xi} = \prod_{j=1}^{d-1} (1 - \xi^j) = \lim_{x \to 1} \frac{d-1}{x-1} = d. \]

So

\[ (q; q)_{d-1} \equiv d \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}. \]

\( \square \)
Lemma 3.2. Under the assumptions of Lemma 3.1, for any \( s, t \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( 0 \leq t \leq d - 1 \),

\[
\left( \frac{q^r; q^m}{q^m; q^m} \right)_{s+t} = \left( \frac{r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m + jmd}{md + jmd} \right)_s \left( \frac{q^r; q^m}{q^m; q^m} \right)_t \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}. \tag{3.2}
\]

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we have

\[
\frac{(q^r; q^m)_{s+t}}{(1 - q^{d})^s} = (q^{r + smd}; q^m) t \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} (q^{r + jmd}; q^m)_d
\]

\[
\equiv (q^r; q^m) t \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} (r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m + jmd) \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]

Similarly,

\[
\frac{(q^m; q^m)_{s+t}}{(1 - q^{d})^s} \equiv (q^m; q^m) t \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} (m + (d - 1)m + jmd) \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]

Clearly

\[
\prod_{j=0}^{s-1} \frac{r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m + jmd}{md + jmd} = \left( \frac{r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m}{md} \right)_s \pmod{1}.
\]

Thus we get (3.2), since \((q^m; q^m)_t\) is prime to \(\Phi_d(q)\) for each \(0 \leq t \leq d - 1\). \(\square\)

Let \(\lfloor \cdot \rfloor\) denote the floor function, i.e., \(\lfloor x \rfloor = \max\{k \in \mathbb{N} : k \leq x\}\) for every \(x \in \mathbb{R}\).

Lemma 3.3. Suppose that \(r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}\) and \((r, m) = 1\). Then

\[
\left( \frac{q^r; q^m}{q^m; q^m} \right)_n = \prod_{(d,m) > 1} \Phi_d(q)^{\lfloor \frac{n(d,m)}{d} \rfloor} = (-1)^\delta q^\Delta \prod_{d \in S \cap \{n\}} \Phi_d(q), \tag{3.3}
\]

where \(\delta = |\{0 \leq j \leq n - 1 : r + jm < 0\}|\) and

\[
\Delta = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n - 1} (r + jm).
\]

Proof. Note that for any \(h \in \mathbb{N}\)

\[
1 - q^h = \prod_{d \mid h} \Phi_d(q).
\]

So

\[
(q^r; q^m)_n = (-1)^\delta q^\Delta \prod_{(d,m) = 1} \Phi_d(q)^{\lfloor 0 \leq j \leq n - 1 : r + jm \equiv 0 \pmod{d} \rfloor}.
\]
It is easy to check that
\[ |\{0 \leq j \leq n - 1 : r + jm \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}| = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{n - 1 - \lambda_{r,m}(d)}{d} \right\rfloor. \]
Similarly,
\[ (q^m;q^m)_n = \prod_{d \geq 1} \Phi_d(q)^{|\{1 \leq j \leq n : jm \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}|}, \]
and
\[ |\{1 \leq j \leq n : jm \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}| = \left\lfloor \frac{n(m,d)}{d} \right\rfloor. \]
Hence \(d \in S_{r,m}(n)\) if and only if \((d, m) = 1\) and
\[ |\{0 \leq j \leq n - 1 : r + jm \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}| = |\{1 \leq j \leq n : jm \equiv 0 \pmod{d}\}| + 1. \]
We immediately get (3.3).

Let
\[ B_{r,m,n}(q) = \prod_{l|n, l \geq 2, (d,m)=l} \Phi_d(q)^{\frac{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{l} \right\rfloor}{d}}, \tag{3.4} \]
Then (3.3) is equivalent to
\[ \frac{(q^r;q^m)_n}{(q^m;q^m)_n} = \frac{(-1)^\delta q^\Delta \cdot A_{r,m,n}(q)}{B_{r,m,n}(q)}. \]
According to the definitions, clearly \(B_{r,m,n}(q)\) is prime to \(A_{r,m,n}(q)C_{m,n}(q)\). Also, \(A_{r,m,n}(1)C_{m,n}(1)\) and \(B_{r,m,n}(1)\) are co-prime integers. Moreover, \(B_{r,m,n}(q)\) is divisible by
\[ \frac{[n]_q}{C_{m,n}(q)} = \prod_{d|n, (d,m) > 1} \Phi_d(q). \]
So we must have \(A_{r,m,n}(1)C_{m,n}(1)\) coincides with the numerator of \(n \cdot \left|\left(-\frac{r}{m}\right)\right|\), i.e., (2.6) is valid.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. It suffices to show that the left side of (2.7) is divisible by \(\Phi_d(q)\) for those \(d \in S_{r,m}(n)\) and \(d \mid n\) with \((m,d) = 1\).

Suppose that \(d \in S_{r,m}(n)\). Write \(n = ud + v\) where \(0 \leq v \leq d - 1\). Let \(h = \lambda_{r,m}(d), w = \frac{r + \lambda_{r,m}(d)m}{d}\)
Note that \(d \in S_{r,m}(n)\) implies that \(v \geq 1 + h\). Hence for any \(v \leq t \leq d - 1\), we have
\[ (q^r;q^m)_t = (1 - q^{r+hm}) \prod_{0 \leq j \leq t-1 \atop j \neq h} (1 - q^{r+jm}) \equiv 0 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}. \]
In view of (3.2),
\[
\frac{(q^r; q^m)_{ud+t}}{(q^m; q^m)_{ud+t}} \equiv 0 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]
Thus applying Lemma 3.2, we get
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} \cdot \nu_k(q) \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{ud+d-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} \cdot \nu_k(q) \equiv \sum_{s=0}^{u} \sum_{t=0}^{d-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} \cdot \nu_{s,t}(q)
\]
\[
\equiv \sum_{s=0}^{u} \left( \frac{w}{m} \right) s \cdot \mu_s(q) \sum_{t=0}^{d-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} \cdot \nu_{s,t}(q) \equiv 0 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]
Furthermore, assume that \(d \mid n\) and \((m, d) = 1\). Let \(u = n/d\). Then in view of (3.2), we also have
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} \cdot \nu_k(q) \equiv \sum_{s=0}^{u-1} \left( \frac{w}{m} \right) s \cdot \mu_s(q) \sum_{t=0}^{d-1} \frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} \cdot \nu_{s,t}(q) \equiv 0 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]
(3.6)

4. PROOFS OF THEOREM 1.1 AND COROLLARY 1.1

Proof Theorem 1.1. Write \(\alpha = r/m\), where \(r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+\) and \((r, m) = 1\). Assume that \(d \geq 1\) and \((m, d) = 1\). Let \(h = \lambda_{r,m}(d)\). Clearly \(r \equiv -hm \pmod{d}\). Then
\[
\frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} \equiv \frac{(q^{-hm}; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)} = (-1)^k q^{m(k^2 - mhk)} \frac{h}{k} q^m \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]
Note that
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} q^{mk[2mk - hm]_q} \cdot \frac{h}{k} q^m = \sum_{k=0}^{h} q^{m(h-k)[2m(h-k) - hm]_q} \cdot \frac{h}{k} q^m
\]
\[
= - \sum_{k=0}^{h} q^{mk[2mk - hm]_q} \cdot \frac{h}{k} q^m.
\]
We must have
\[
\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} q^{mk[2mk + r]_q} \cdot (-1)^k q^{\rho^k(mhk - m)} \cdot \frac{(q^r; q^m_k)}{(q^m; q^m_k)}
\]
\[
\equiv \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} q^{mk[2mk - hm]_q} \cdot \frac{h}{k} q^m = 0 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]
(4.1)
Thus the requirement (iii) of Theorem 2.1 is satisfied.
We still need to verify the requirement (ii) of Theorem 2.1. By Lemma 3.2, for each \( s, t \in \mathbb{N} \) with \( 0 \leq t \leq d - 1 \),

\[
q^{m(sd+t)}(2m(sd+t) + r)q \cdot \frac{(q^r; q^m)_{sd+t}^{\rho-1}}{(q^m; q^m)_{sd+t}^{\rho-1}} \\
\equiv \frac{rq + \lambda_{-m}(d)m^{\rho-1}}{md} \cdot q^{mt}(2mt + r)q \cdot \frac{(q^r; q^m)_{t}^{\rho-1}}{(q^m; q^m)_{t}^{\rho-1}} \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]

And

\[
(-1)^{sd+t}q^{mh(sd+t)-m\binom{s+1}{2}} = (-1)^{sd+t}q^{mh(sd+t)-msd-m\binom{s}{2}-m\binom{t}{2}} \\
\equiv (-1)^s q^{-m\binom{t}{2}} \cdot (-1)^t q^{mht-m\binom{t}{2}} \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]

If \( d \) is odd, then clearly

\[
(-1)^{sd} q^{-m\binom{t}{2}} = (-1)^s q^{-md\binom{t}{2}} \equiv (-1)^s \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]

If \( d \) is even, then

\[
1 + q^\frac{d}{2} = \frac{1 - q^d}{1 - q^\frac{d}{2}} \equiv 0 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)},
\]

i.e., \( q^\frac{d}{2} \equiv -1 \pmod{\Phi_d(q)} \). So

\[
(-1)^{sd} q^{-m\binom{t}{2}} \equiv (q^\frac{d}{2})^{-msd-m\binom{t}{2}} \equiv (-1)^s \pmod{\Phi_d(q)},
\]

by noting that \( m \) is odd since \((m,d) = 1\). That is, we always have

\[
(-1)^{sd+t}q^{mh(sd+t)-m\binom{s+1}{2}} \equiv (-1)^s \cdot (-1)^t q^{mht-m\binom{t}{2}} \pmod{\Phi_d(q)}.
\]

Thus applying Theorem 2.1 we obtain that

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} q^{mk}[2mk + r]q \cdot (q^r; q^m)_k^{\rho} \cdot \frac{(q^r; q^m)_k^{\rho}}{(q^m; q^m)_k^{\rho}} \equiv 0 \pmod{A_{r,m,n}(q)C_{m,n}(q)}.
\]

(4.2)

On the other hand, clearly \( B_{r,m,n}(q) \) is divisible by \( B_{r,m,k}(q) \) provided \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \). It follows from Lemma 3.3 that

\[
B_{r,m,n}(q)^\rho \sum_{k=0}^{n} q^{mk}[2mk + r]q \cdot \frac{(q^r; q^m)_k^{\rho}}{(q^m; q^m)_k^{\rho}}
\]

is a polynomial with integral coefficients. And by (4.2), each prime factor of \( B_{r,m,n}(1) \) must divide \( m \). In view of Corollary 2.1 we have

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (2mk + r) \cdot \left( -\frac{r}{m} \right)^k \equiv 0 \pmod{N_{r,m,n}}.
\]

So (1.5) is valid since \( N_{r,m,n} \) and \( m \) are co-prime. \( \square \)
Proof of Corollary 1.1. As we have mentioned, \( N_{\frac{1}{2}, n} \) coincides with the odd part of \( n\binom{2n}{n} \). So by substituting \( \alpha = \frac{1}{2} \) in Theorem 1.1, we only need to compute the 2-adic of the left side of (1.6). For a positive integer \( a \), let \( \text{ord}_2(a) \) denote the 2-adic order of \( a \), i.e., \( 2^{\text{ord}_2(a)} | a \) but \( 2^{\text{ord}_2(a)+1} \nmid a \). For each \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \), since

\[
\binom{2n}{n} = \binom{2k}{k} \cdot \frac{2^{n-k} \cdot (2n-1)(2n-3) \cdots (2k+1)}{(n-1)(n-2) \cdots (k+1)},
\]

we have

\[
\text{ord}_2 \left( \binom{2n}{n} \right) \leq n - k + \text{ord}_2 \left( \binom{2k}{k} \right).
\]

Also, \( \binom{2k}{k} \) is even for each \( k \geq 1 \), since

\[
\binom{2k}{k} + 2 \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \binom{2k}{j} = 2^{2k}.
\]

Hence for each \( 0 \leq k \leq n - 1 \),

\[
\text{ord}_2 \left( \binom{2k}{k}^\rho \cdot 4^{\rho(n-1-k)} \right) \geq (\rho - 1) + 2(n-1-k) + \text{ord}_2 \left( \binom{2k}{k} \right)
\]

\[
\geq (\rho - 2) + \text{ord}_2 \left( \binom{2n}{n} \right).
\]

□
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