arXiv:2203.12008v2 [math.CO] 21 Aug 2022

LOG-CONCAVITY IN POWERS OF INFINITE SERIES CLOSE TO $(1-z)^{-1}$

SHENGTONG ZHANG

Abstract. In this paper, we use the analytic method of Odlyzko and Richmond to study the log-concavity of power series. If $f(z) = \sum_n a_n z^n$ is an infinite series with $a_n \geq 1$ and $a_0 + \cdots + a_n = O(n+1)$ for all n, we prove that a super-polynomially long initial segment of $f^k(z)$ is log-concave. Furthermore, if there exists constants $C > 1$ and $\alpha < 1$ such that $a_0 + \cdots + a_n = C(n+1) - R_n$ where $0 \leq R_n \leq O((n+1)^\alpha)$, we show that an exponentially long initial segment of $f^k(z)$ is log-concave. This resolves a conjecture proposed by Letong Hong and the author, which implies another conjecture of Heim and Neuhauser that the Nekrasov-Okounkov polynomials $Q_n(z)$ are unimodal for sufficiently large n.

1. Introduction

A polynomial or infinite series $p(z)$ is said to be unimodal / log-concave if the sequence of its coefficients is unimodal / log-concave. More explicitly, let a_k denote the coefficient of z^k in $p(z)$. We say $p(z)$ is **unimodal** if there exists an index m such that $a_0 \leq a_1 \leq \cdots \leq a_m$ and $a_m \geq a_{m+1} \geq \cdots$. We say $p(z)$ is **log-concave** if $a_k \geq 0$ for all $k \geq 0$, and $a_k^2 \geq a_{k-1}a_{k+1}$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Many methods have been developed to show the unimodality and log-concavity of various combinatorial polynomials. We refer to the excellent surveys of Brenti [3] and Stanley [10, 11] for a collection of these methods, which encompass algebra, combinatorics, and geometry. For example, breakthrough works by Adiprasito, Braden, Huh, Katz, Matherne, Proudfoot, Wang, and many others [1, 2, 7] use methods in algebraic geometry to settle the Mason and Heron–Rota–Welsh conjecture on the log-concavity of the chromatic polynomial of graphs and the characteristic polynomial of matroids.

This paper settles the unimodality of the Nekrasov-Okounkov polynomials, an important family of polynomials in combinatorics and representation theory. The Nekrasov-Okounkov polynomials are defined by

$$Q_n(z) := \sum_{|\lambda|=n} \prod_{h \in \mathcal{H}(\lambda)} \left(1 + \frac{z}{h^2}\right)$$

where λ runs over all Young tableaux of size n, and $\mathcal{H}(\lambda)$ denotes the multiset of hook lengths associated with λ. They are central in the groundbreaking Nekrasov-Okounkov identity [8]

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} Q_n(z) q^n = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1-q^m)^{-z-1}.$$

All data generated or analysed during this study are included in this published article.

In [4], Heim and Neuhauser posed the conjecture that $Q_n(z)$ are unimodal polynomials. In [6], the author and Letong Hong showed that for sufficiently large n, the unimodality of $Q_n(z)$ is implied by the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1.1. *Let $f(x)$ be the infinity series defined by*

$$f(z) := \sum_{n \geq 1} \sigma_{-1}(n) z^n \tag{1}$$

where $\sigma_{-1}(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^{-1}$. Let $a_{n,k}$ be the coefficient of z^n in $f^k(z)$. There exists a constant $C > 1$ such that for all $k \geq 2$ and $n \leq C^k$, we have

$$a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k} a_{n+1,k}.$$

In other words, an exponentially long initial segment of $f^k(z)$ is log-concave as k goes to infinity. See [5] for more comments on this conjecture.

This conjecture is closely related to a theorem of Odlyzko and Richmond in 1985. In [9], they showed the following remarkable result: if $p(z)$ is a degree d polynomial with non-negative coefficients such that the coefficients a_0, a_1, a_{d-1}, a_d are all strictly positive, then there exists an n_0 such that $p^n(z)$ is log-concave for all $n > n_0$. However, Odlyzko and Richmond pointed out that this result does not trivially generalize to infinite series.

In this paper, we prove Conjecture 1.1. Our main theorem generalizes Conjecture 1.1 to all infinite series $f(z)$ that "behave like $(1-z)^{-1}$".

We call an infinite series $f(z)$ **1-lower bounded** if for any $n \geq 0$, the coefficient of z^n in $f(z)$ is at least 1.

Theorem 1.2. *Let*

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$$

be a 1-lower bounded infinite series. Suppose there exist constants $c, C > 0$ such that for any $r \in (0,1)$ and $i \in \{0,1,2,3\}$, we have

$$\frac{c}{(1-r)^{i+1}} \leq f^{(i)}(r) \leq \frac{C}{(1-r)^{i+1}}.$$

Let $a_{n,k}$ denote the coefficient of z^n in the infinite series $f^k(z)$. Then there exists a constant $A > 1$ depending on c and C only such that

$$a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k} a_{n+1,k}$$

for all $n \leq A^{k^{1/3}}$.

To rephrase the conditions in the main theorem, we have

Corollary 1.3. *Let*

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$$

be a 1-lower bounded infinite series. Suppose there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any n, we have

$$\frac{1}{n+1}(a_0 + \cdots + a_n) \leq C$$

Let $a_{n,k}$ denote the coefficient of z^n in the infinite series $f^k(z)$. Then there exists a constant $A > 1$ depending only on C such that

$$a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k}a_{n+1,k}$$

for all $n \leq A^{k^{1/3}}$.

We use an ad-hoc argument to strengthen Theorem 1.2 for infinite series that satisfy a stronger condition.

Theorem 1.4. *Let*

$$f(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n z^n$$

be a 1-lower bounded infinite series. Suppose there exists constants $C > 1$, $D > 0$ and $\alpha \in [0, 1)$ such that for all n, we have

$$0 \leq C(n+1) - (a_0 + \cdots + a_n) \leq D(n+1)^{\alpha}.$$

Let $a_{n,k}$ be the coefficient of z^n in the infinite series $f^k(z)$. Then for sufficiently large k and any $n \leq A^k/k^2$, we have $a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k}a_{n+1,k}$. Here A is the constant

$$A := \sqrt[2+\alpha]{\frac{C}{C-1}}.$$

As a corollary, we establish Conjecture 1.1.

Corollary 1.5. *Let f, a be as defined in Conjecture 1.1. Then for any fixed $\eta < \eta_0$, for all sufficiently large k and $n \leq \eta^k$, we have*

$$a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k}a_{n+1,k}.$$

Here η_0 is the constant

$$\eta_0 := \sqrt{\frac{\pi^2}{\pi^2 - 6}} > 1.59.$$

Combining with Theorem 1.3 of [6], we have shown that

Theorem 1.6. *The Nekrasov-Okounkov polynomial $Q_n(z)$ is unimodal for all sufficiently large n.*

Acknowledgement

The author thanks Prof. Ken Ono and Letong Hong for their long support and helpful advice throughout this project. The author thanks the anonymous referees for their detailed suggestions.

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2 and Corollary 1.3

In this section, we show Theorem 1.2. We use essentially the same method as Odlyzko-Richmond [9], with some modifications to accommodate the different behavior of our infinite series $f(z)$. We also note that our notation of k, n is reversed from the convention in [9].

Throughout the proof, for every positive integer i, let c_i denote a small positive constant that depends on c, C only, and let C_i denote a large positive constant that depends on c, C only. We denote $c_0 = c$ and $C_0 = C$. To ensure acyclic constant choice, any c_i, C_i is determined by c_j and C_j for $j < i$. We also assume k is sufficiently large relative to all the constants. If $n \leq k^{1/4}$, the proof in [9] can be applied verbatim to prove Theorem 1.2. We now prove Theorem 1.2 when $n \geq k^{1/4}$.

The function $f(z)$ is holomorphic for $|z| < 1$. For any $r \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n,k} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=r} f^k(z) z^{-n-1} dz \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi} r^{-n} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f^k(re^{i\theta}) e^{-in\theta} d\theta. \end{aligned}$$

So it suffices to show that for any $n \in [k^{1/4}, A^{k^{1/3}}]$, there exists an $r \in (0, 1)$ such that for $\alpha \in [n-1, n+1]$, the real-valued function

$$F(\alpha) = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f^k(re^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta$$

is positive and log-concave. We will show the stronger conclusion that F is concave, that is

$$F''(\alpha) < 0$$

or

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \theta^2 f^k(re^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta > 0.$$

The crucial idea is to study the argument of $f(re^{i\theta})$. We first note that f is nonzero in a neighborhood of $z = 1 - r$.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $r \in (0, 1)$ and θ, we have*

$$\left| f(re^{i\theta}) \right| \geq \left(1 - \frac{C_1 |\theta|}{1 - r} \right) f(r).$$

In particular, if $|\theta| < c_1(1 - r)$, then $f(re^{i\theta}) \neq 0$.

Proof. By assumption, we have $f(r) \geq c(1 - r)$ and $f'(r) \leq \frac{C}{(1-r)^2}$. Therefore, $|f'(z)| \leq \frac{C_1}{(1-|z|)} f(r)$ if $|z| \leq r$. By the intermediate value theorem, we conclude that

$$\left| f(re^{i\theta}) \right| \geq f(r) - \left| r - re^{i\theta} \right| \cdot \frac{C_1}{(1 - r)} f(r) \geq \left(1 - \frac{C_1 |\theta|}{1 - r} \right) f(r)$$

as desired. □

Therefore, we can define a smooth function $\psi_r(\theta)$ with domain $(-c_1(1 - r), c_1(1 - r))$ such that

$$\psi_r(0) = 0, \psi_r(\theta) \in \arg(f(re^{i\theta})).$$

As $f(\bar{z}) = \overline{f(z)}$, $\psi_r(\theta)$ is an odd function. A crucial component of the proof is the following estimate of $\psi_r(\theta)$.

Lemma 2.2. *If $|\theta| \le c_2(1-r)$, then we have*

$$|\psi_r(\theta) - A(r)\theta| \le C_2 \frac{r\,|\theta|^3}{(1-r)^3}$$

where $A(r) = \frac{rf'(r)}{f(r)}$.

Proof. We can write

$$\psi_r(\theta) = \Im \ln(f(re^{i\theta})).$$

So we have

$$\psi_r'(\theta) = \Im rie^{i\theta}\frac{f'(re^{i\theta})}{f(re^{i\theta})}.$$

In particular,

$$\psi_r'(0) = r\frac{f'(r)}{f(r)} = A(r).$$

Furthermore, ψ is odd. By Taylor's formula, there exists some $\xi \in (0,\theta)$ such that

$$\psi_r(\theta) = A(r)\theta + \frac{1}{6}\psi_r^{(3)}(\xi)\theta^3.$$

We compute that

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_r^{(3)}(\xi) = \Im\left(-ir^3e^{3i\xi}\frac{f^{(3)}f^3 - 4f'f''f^2 + 2f(f')^3}{f^4}(re^{i\xi})\right)\\ + \Im\left(-3ir^2e^{2i\xi}\frac{f''f - (f')^2}{f^2}(re^{i\xi}) - ire^{i\xi}\frac{f'}{f}(re^{i\xi})\right).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.1, we have $\left|f(re^{i\xi})\right| > c(1-r)/2$, and by assumption,

$$\left|f^{(j)}(re^{i\xi})\right| \le \left|f^{(j)}(r)\right| \le \frac{C}{(1-r)^{j+1}}, j \in \{0,1,2,3\}.$$

We conclude that

$$\left|\psi_r^{(3)}(\xi)\right| \le \frac{C_2 r}{(1-r)^3}.$$

Substituting in, we get the desired estimate. □

As $A(0) = 0$ and $\lim_{r\to 1} A(r) = \infty$, there exists an $r_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $A(r_0) = \frac{n}{k}$. We have $r_0 = \Theta(\min(1, n/k))$. As $n \ge k^{1/4}$, for k sufficiently large we have

$$kr_0 \ge 1.$$

For any $\alpha \in [n-1, n+1]$, we now show that

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \theta^2 f^k(r_0e^{i\theta})e^{-i\alpha\theta}d\theta > 0.$$

We take

$$\theta_0 = c_3(1-r_0)(kr_0)^{-1/3}$$

for a $c_3 < c_2$ to be determined later, and split the integral

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta = \int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta + \int_{|\theta|\in(\theta_0,\pi)} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta.$$

We now estimate the two summands. By Lemma 2.2, for any θ with $|\theta| < \theta_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\arg f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta}\right| &= |k\psi_{r_0}(\theta) - \alpha\theta| \\ &\le k\,|\psi_{r_0}(\theta) - A(r_0)\theta| + |(n-\alpha)\theta| \\ &\le \frac{C_2 r_0 k}{(1-r_0)^3}\,|\theta|^3 + |\theta| \le 2c_3 C_2.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, if we take the c_3 in the definition of θ_0 to be $\min(c_2, \pi/(8C_2))$, then

$$\left|\arg f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta}\right| < \frac{\pi}{4}.$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta \ge \frac{1}{2}\int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 \left|f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta}\right| d\theta = \frac{1}{2}\int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 \left|f(r_0 e^{i\theta})\right|^k d\theta.$$

We apply Lemma 2.1 to obtain

$$\int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 \left|f(r_0 e^{i\theta})\right|^k d\theta \ge \int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 \left(1 - C_1\frac{|\theta|}{1-r_0}\right)^k f^k(r_0) d\theta.$$

We can extract the constant $f^k(r_0)$ and apply a change of variable $t = \theta/(1-r_0)$

$$\int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 \left(1 - C_1\frac{|\theta|}{1-r_0}\right)^k d\theta = 2(1-r_0)^3 \int_0^{\theta_0/(1-r_0)} t^2(1-t)^k dt.$$

As $\theta_0/(1-r_0) = c_3(kr_0)^{-1/3} > 2k^{-1}$, we conclude that

$$\int_0^{\theta_0/(1-r)} t^3(1-t)^k dt \ge \int_{k^{-1}}^{2k^{-1}} t^3(1-t)^k dt \ge c_4 k^{-4}.$$

So we obtain the estimate

$$\int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta \ge c_4(1-r_0)^3 k^{-4} f^k(r_0).$$

By assumption we have

$$A(r) = \frac{r f'(r)}{f(r)} \ge \frac{rc(1-r)^{-2}}{C(1-r)^{-1}} = \frac{c_5 r}{1-r}$$

and as $A(r_0) = n/k$, we get

$$1 - r_0 \ge \frac{c_6 k}{\max(n,k)}.$$

So we conclude that

$$\int_{|\theta|<\theta_0} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta \ge c_7 \max(n,k)^{-4} f^k(r_0). \tag{2}$$

To estimate the second summand, which is the integral over $|\theta| \in (\theta_0, \pi)$, we need a lemma about the upper bound of f away from the positive real axis.

Lemma 2.3. *For any $r \in (0,1)$ and $\theta \in [-\pi, \pi)$, we have*

$$\left|f(re^{i\theta})\right| \le \left(1 - c_8 r\frac{\min(|\theta|, 1-r)^2}{(1-r)^2}\right) f(r).$$

Proof. As we assumed that $a_n \geq 1$ for every n, we have

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{1-z} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(a_n - 1)z^n.$$

In particular, we get

$$f(r) = \frac{1}{1-r} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(a_n - 1)r^n,$$

$$\left|f(re^{i\theta})\right| \leq \left|\frac{1}{1-re^{i\theta}}\right| + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(a_n - 1)r^n.$$

Thus we have

$$f(r) - \left|f(re^{i\theta})\right| \geq \frac{1}{1-r} - \left|\frac{1}{1-re^{i\theta}}\right| \geq \frac{c_8 r \min(|\theta|, 1-r)^2}{(1-r)^3}$$

where the second inequality follows from

$$\frac{1}{1-r} - \left|\frac{1}{1-re^{i\theta}}\right| = \frac{\sqrt{(1-r)^2 + 4\sin^2\frac{\theta}{2}} - (1-r)}{(1-r)\left|1-re^{i\theta}\right|}.$$

As $f(r) \leq C(1-r)^{-1}$, we conclude that

$$f(r) - \left|f(re^{i\theta})\right| \geq \frac{1}{1-r} - \left|\frac{1}{1-re^{i\theta}}\right| \geq c_8 r \frac{\min(|\theta|, 1-r)^2}{(1-r)^2} f(r)$$

as desired. □

By the lemma, for every θ with $|\theta| > \theta_0 = c_3(1-r_0)(kr_0)^{-1/3}$, we have

$$\left|f(r_0 e^{i\theta})\right| \leq \left(1 - \frac{c_8 r_0 |\theta_0|^2}{(1-r_0)^2}\right) f(r_0).$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\left|\int_{|\theta|\in(\theta_0,\pi)} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta\right| &\leq \pi^3 \left(1 - \frac{c_8 r_0 |\theta_0|^2}{(1-r_0)^2}\right)^k f^k(r_0) \\ &\leq \pi^3 e^{-c_8 k r_0 \frac{c r_0 |\theta_0|^2}{(1-r_0)^2}} f^k(r_0).\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the value of θ_0, we get

$$\left|\int_{|\theta|\in(\theta_0,\pi)} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta\right| \leq \pi^3 e^{-c_9 (kr_0)^{1/3}} f^k(r_0). \tag{3}$$

Finally, we combine the estimates (2) and (3) to conclude that

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta \geq c_7 \max(n,k)^{-4} f^k(r_0) - \pi^3 e^{-c_9 (kr_0)^{1/3}} f^k(r_0).$$

We note that

$$\frac{n}{k} = A(r_0) = \frac{r_0 f'(r_0)}{f(r_0)} \leq \frac{r_0 C(1-r_0)^{-2}}{c(1-r_0)^{-1}} = \frac{C_{10} r_0}{(1-r_0)}$$

which implies

$$r_0 \geq \frac{n}{n + C_{10} k}.$$

If $C_{10}k < n$, then for sufficiently large k, we have

$$c_7 \max(n,k)^{-4} - \pi^3 e^{-c_9(kr_0)^{1/3}} \geq c_7 n^{-4} - C_{11} e^{-c_{10}k^{1/3}}.$$

So there exists a $c_{11} > 0$ such that if $C_{10}k < n \leq e^{c_{11}k^{1/3}}$, then

$$c_7 \max(n,k)^{-4} - \pi^3 e^{-c_9(kr_0)^{1/3}} > 0.$$

If $k^{1/4} \leq n \leq C_{10}k$, then for sufficiently large k, we have

$$c_7 \max(n,k)^{-4} - \pi^3 e^{-c_9(kr_0)^{1/3}} \geq c_{12}k^{-4} - \pi^3 e^{-c_{10}(k\cdot n/k)^{1/3}} \geq c_{12}k^{-4} - C_{12}e^{-c_{10}k^{1/12}} > 0.$$

In both cases we have

$$\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \theta^2 f^k(r_0 e^{i\theta}) e^{-i\alpha\theta} d\theta > 0.$$

Thus, we have shown Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 1.3 is an easy corollary of Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Corollary 1.3. For each non-negative integer i and $r \in (0,1)$, we note that

$$f^{(i)}(r) = i! \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+i}{i} a_{n+i} r^n.$$

On one hand, we have

$$f^{(i)}(r) \geq i! \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+i}{i} r^n = \frac{i!}{(1-r)^{i+1}}.$$

On the other hand, by Abel summation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(i)}(r) &= i! \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (r^n - r^{n+1}) \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{k+i}{i} a_{k+i} \\ &\leq i! \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (r^n - r^{n+1}) \cdot C(n+i+1) \cdot \binom{n+i}{i} \\ &= C(i+1)! \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{n+i+1}{i+1} (r^n - r^{n+1}) = \frac{C(i+1)!}{(1-r)^{i+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for any $i \geq 0$ and $r \in (0,1)$ we have

$$\frac{i!}{(1-r)^{i+1}} \leq f^{(i)}(r) \leq \frac{C(i+1)!}{(1-r)^{i+1}}.$$

The corollary follows by applying Theorem 1.2. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1.4 and Corollary 1.5

In this section, we assume that $f(z) = \sum_n a_n z^n$ satisfies the condition of Theorem 1.4: For all n, we have $a_n \geq 1$ and

$$0 \leq C(n+1) - (a_0 + \cdots + a_n) \leq D(n+1)^{\alpha}. \tag{4}$$

We observe that $f(z)$ also satisfies the condition in Corollary 1.3, so there exists a $B > 1$ such that $a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k}a_{n+1,k}$ for all $n \leq B^{k^{1/3}}$. We now use a different method to show that $a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k}a_{n+1,k}$ for all $B^{k^{1/3}} \leq n \leq A^k/k^2$ and k sufficiently large.

The inequality $a_{n,k}^2 \geq a_{n-1,k}a_{n+1,k}$ is equivalent to the inequality

$$(a_{n,k} - a_{n-1,k})^2 \geq a_{n-1,k}(a_{n+1,k} - 2a_{n,k} + a_{n-1,k}).$$

The key observation is that the second order difference $a_{n+1,k} - 2a_{n,k} + a_{n-1,k}$ can be bounded.

We introduce a notation: for any $n \geq 0$, define $a_n^{(0)} = 1$ and $a_n^{(1)} = a_n - 1$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n,k} &= \sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n} a_{x_1}a_{x_2}\cdots a_{x_k} \\ &= \sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left(a_{x_i}^{(0)} + a_{x_i}^{(1)}\right) \\ &= \sum_{(i_1,i_2,\cdots,i_k)\in\{0,1\}^k} \sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n} a_{x_1}^{(i_1)}\cdots a_{x_k}^{(i_k)}. \end{aligned}$$

For a tuple $I = (i_1, i_2, \cdots, i_k) \in \{0,1\}^k$, we let

$$a_n^I = \sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n} a_{x_1}^{(i_1)}\cdots a_{x_k}^{(i_k)}.$$

Then we have

$$a_{n,k} = \sum_{I\in\{0,1\}^k} a_n^I.$$

Let $\mathbf{1}_{k-1}$ denote the length $k-1$ tuple $(1,1,\cdots,1)$ and $(\mathbf{1}_{k-1},0)$ denote the length k tuple $(1,1,\cdots,1,0)$.

We prove a series of lemmas that gives the desired control over the second-order difference.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that for any n and $k \geq 2$, we have*

$$a_n^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-1},0)} = \binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k-1}\left(1 - R_{n,k}\right)$$

where

$$0 \leq R_{n,k} \leq \frac{C_1 k(k-1)}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Proof. We take $C_1 = D/\min(C-1, 1)$, and argue by induction on k. For $k = 2$, the statement is clear as

$$a_n^{(\mathbf{1}_1,0)} = a_0 + \cdots + a_n - (n+1).$$

So (4) implies

$$0 \leq R_{n,2} \leq \frac{D}{(n+1)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Now suppose the lemma holds for $k' = k-1$. To prove the lemma for k, we observe

$$a_n^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-1},0)} = \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} a_{x_1}^{(1)} a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} = \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} (a_0^{(1)} + \cdots + a_{x_1}^{(1)})(a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} - a_{x_2-1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)}).$$

Using (4), we have

$$a_n^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-1},0)} = (C-1)\sum_{x_1+x_2=n} (x_1+1)\left(a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} - a_{x_2-1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)}\right) - S_{n,k}.$$

where

$$S_{n,k} = \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} ((C-1)(x_1+1) - a_0^{(1)} - \cdots - a_{x_1}^{(1)}) \left(a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} - a_{x_2-1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} \right).$$

We first continue estimating the main term. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(C-1) \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} (x_1+1) \left(a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} - a_{x_2-1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} \right) \\
=&(C-1) \sum_{x_2=0}^{n} a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} \\
=&(C-1)^{k-1} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{n} \binom{m+k-2}{k-2} - \binom{m+k-2}{k-2} R_{m,k-1} \right) \\
=&(C-1)^{k-1} \left(\binom{n+k-1}{k-1} - \sum_{m=0}^{n} \binom{m+k-2}{k-2} R_{m,k-1} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, the subtracted term is positive. Again by the induction hypothesis, we estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}
&(C-1)^{k-1} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \binom{m+k-2}{k-2} R_{m,k-1} \\
\leq&(C-1)^{k-1} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \binom{m+k-2}{k-2} \frac{C_1(k-1)(k-2)}{(m+k-2)^{1-\alpha}} \\
=&(C-1)^{k-1} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \binom{m+k-3}{k-3} C_1(k-1)(m+k-2)^{\alpha} \\
\leq&(C-1)^{k-1} \sum_{m=0}^{n} \binom{m+k-3}{k-3} C_1(k-1)(n+k-2)^{\alpha} \\
=&(C-1)^{k-1} \binom{n+k-2}{k-2} C_1(k-1)(m+k-2)^{\alpha} \\
\leq&\binom{n+k-1}{k-1} (C-1)^{k-1} \frac{C_1(k-1)^2}{(m+k-2)^{1-\alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

To estimate error term $S_{n,k}$, we first note that

$$a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} = \sum_{x=0}^{x_2} a_x^{\mathbf{1}_{k-2}}$$

so $a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} \geq a_{x_2-1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)}$ for any x_2. By (4), we conclude that $S_{n,k}$ is non-negative. On the other hand, by (4) and the induction hypothesis we have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{n,k} &\leq \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} D(x_1+1)^{\alpha} (a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} - a_{x_2-1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)}) \\
&= \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} D((x_1+1)^{\alpha} - x_1^{\alpha}) a_{x_2}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-2},0)} \\
&\leq \sum_{x_2=0}^{n} D((n+1-x_2)^{\alpha} - (n-x_2)^{\alpha}) \binom{x_2+k-2}{k-2} C^{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

We estimate that

$$\begin{aligned}
S_{n,k} &\le \sum_{x_2=0}^{n} D((n+1-x_2)^\alpha - (n-x_2)^\alpha)\binom{n+k-2}{k-2}(C-1)^{k-2} \\
&= D(n+1)^\alpha \binom{n+k-2}{k-2}(C-1)^{k-2} \\
&\le D\binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k-2}\frac{k-1}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}} \\
&\le \binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k-1}\frac{C_1(k-1)}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining all the estimates, we conclude that

$$a_n^{(\mathbf{1}_{k-1},0)} = \binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k-1}\left(1-R_{n,k}\right)$$

where

$$0 \le R_{n,k} \le \frac{C_1(k-1)^2}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}} + \frac{C_1(k-1)}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}} = \frac{C_1 k(k-1)}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}}$$

as desired. □

Lemma 3.2. *For any n and $k \ge 2$, if a tuple $I \in \{0,1\}^k$ has k_0 zeros and k_1 ones with $k_0 \ge 1$, then*

$$a_n^I = \binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k_1}\left(1-S_{n,I}^{(0)}\right)$$

where

$$0 \le S_{n,I}^{(0)} \le \frac{C_1 k(k-1)}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Proof. By definition, permuting the entries of I does not change the value of a_n^I, so without loss of generality we can assume $I = (1,\cdots,1,0,\cdots,0)$. If $k_0 = 1$ then the lemma is precisely Lemma 3.1, so we assume $k_0 \ge 2$. If $k_1 = 0$ then

$$a_n^I = \sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n} 1 = \binom{n+k-1}{k-1}$$

so $S_{n,I}^{(0)} = 0$, and the lemma is obvious. Now assume $k_1 \ge 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
a_n^I &= \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} a_{x_1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k_1},0)} a_{x_2}^{(0,\cdots,0)} \\
&= \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} a_{x_1}^{(\mathbf{1}_{k_1},0)}\binom{x_2+k_0-2}{k_0-2} \\
&= \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} \binom{x_1+k_1}{k_1}(C-1)^{k_1}\left(1-R_{x_1,k_1+1}\right)\binom{x_2+k_0-2}{k_0-2} \\
&= \binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k_1} - \sum_{x_1+x_2=n}\binom{x_1+k_1}{k_1}(C-1)^{k_1}R_{x_1,k_1+1}\binom{x_2+k_0-2}{k_0-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1 we have the bound

$$0 \le R_{x_1,k_1+1} \le \frac{C_1(k_1+1)k_1}{(x_1+k_1)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Thus $S^{(0)}_{n,I} \geq 0$. We also have the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
S^{(0)}_{n,I} =& \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} \binom{x_1+k_1}{k_1}(C-1)^{k_1} R_{x_1,k_1+1}\binom{x_2+k_0-2}{k_0-2} \\
\leq& \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} \binom{x_1+k_1}{k_1}(C-1)^{k_1} \frac{C_1(k_1+1)k_1}{(x_1+k_1)^{1-\alpha}}\binom{x_2+k_0-2}{k_0-2} \\
\leq& \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} \binom{x_1+k_1-1}{k_1-1}(C-1)^{k_1} C_1(k_1+1)\cdot(x_1+k_1)^{\alpha}\binom{x_2+k_0-2}{k_0-2} \\
\leq& (C-1)^{k_1} C_1(k_1+1)\cdot(n+k_1)^{\alpha} \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} \binom{x_1+k_1-1}{k_1-1}\binom{x_2+k_0-2}{k_0-2} \\
\leq& (C-1)^{k_1} C_1(k_1+1)\cdot(n+k_1)^{\alpha} \binom{n+k-2}{k-2} \\
\leq& (C-1)^{k_1} \binom{n+k-1}{k-1}\cdot C_1 \frac{(k-1)k}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}}.
\end{aligned}$$

So we have the desired inequality

$$S^{(0)}_{n,I} \leq \frac{C_1 k(k-1)}{(n+k-1)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

□

We arrive at the crucial second-order difference estimates.

Lemma 3.3. *There exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that for any $n \geq -1$ and $k \geq 3$, if the tuple $I \in \{0,1\}^k$ has k_0 zeros and k_1 ones with $k_0 \geq 3$, then*

$$a^I_{n+1} - 2a^I_n + a^I_{n-1} = \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(C-1)^{k_1}\left(1 - S^{(2)}_{n,I}\right)$$

where

$$0 \leq S^{(2)}_{n,I} \leq \frac{C_2 k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Proof. If I' is the tuple obtained by removing two zeros from I, then

$$a^I_n = \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} a^{I'}_{x_1} a^{(0,0)}_{x_2} = \sum_{x_1+x_2=n} a^{I'}_{x_1}(x_2+1)\mathbf{1}_{x_2\geq 0}.$$

Thus we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
a^I_{n+1} - 2a^I_n + a^I_{n-1} =& \sum_{x_1=0}^{n+1} a^{I'}_{x_1}((n-x_1+2)\mathbf{1}_{x_1\leq n+1} - 2(n-x_1+1)\mathbf{1}_{x_1\leq n} + (n-x_1)\mathbf{1}_{x_1\leq n-1}) \\
=& a^{I'}_{n+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.2, we obtain

$$a^{I'}_{n+1} = \binom{n+k-2}{k-3}(C-1)^{k_1}\left(1 - S^{(0)}_{n+1,I'}\right)$$

where

$$0 \leq S^{(0)}_{n+1,I'} \leq \frac{C_1(k-2)(k-3)}{(n+k-2)^{1-\alpha}} \leq \frac{3C_1 k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Finally, we note that

$$\binom{n+k-2}{k-3} = \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(1 - S_{n,I}^{(1)})$$

where

$$0 \le S_{n,I}^{(1)} = 1 - \prod_{i=2}^{k-2}\left(1 - \frac{i}{n+k}\right) \le \frac{k^2}{n+k}.$$

The error term $S_{n,I}^{(2)}$ satisfies

$$1 - S_{n,I}^{(2)} = (1 - S_{n+1,I'}^{(0)})(1 - S_{n,I}^{(1)}).$$

Therefore we have

$$0 \le S_{n,I}^{(2)} \le S_{n+1,I'}^{(0)} + S_{n,I}^{(1)}$$

and the desired estimate follows. □

Lemma 3.4. *For any $n \ge -1, k \ge 3$, we have*

$$a_{n+1,k} - 2a_{n,k} + a_{n-1,k} = C^k \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(1 + R_{n,k}^{(2)}).$$

where $R_{n,k}^{(2)}$ satisfies

$$\left|R_{n,k}^{(2)}\right| \le E\left(\frac{k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}} + (n+k)^{2+\alpha}A^{-(2+\alpha)k}\right)$$

for some constant $E > 0$.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we use R_i to denote the various error term that contribute to $R_{n,k}^{(2)}$. Recall the identity

$$a_{n,k} = \sum_{I\in\{0,1\}^k} a_n^I$$

We split the sum into two parts. Let S_1 be the set of $I \in \{0,1\}^k$ with at least three ones, and let S_2 be the set of $I \in \{0,1\}^k$ with at most 2 ones. Then

$$a_{n,k} = \sum_{I\in S_1} a_n^I + \sum_{I\in S_2} a_n^I$$

Let $k_1(I)$ denote the number of ones in I. By Lemma 3.3, the second-order difference of the first term is

$$\sum_{I\in S_1} \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(C-1)^{k_1(I)} + R_1 \tag{5}$$

where

$$|R_1| \le \sum_{I\in S_1} \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(C-1)^{k_1(I)}\left|S_{n,I}^{(2)}\right| \le \sum_{I\in S_1} \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(C-1)^{k_1(I)} \cdot \frac{C_2k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}}.$$

The residue R_1 of (5) is bounded by

$$|R_1| \le \sum_{I\in\{0,1\}^k} \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(C-1)^{k_1(I)} \cdot \frac{C_2k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}} = \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}C^k \cdot \frac{C_2k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}}. \tag{6}$$

The main term of (5) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{I\in S_1}\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(C-1)^{k_1(I)}\\ =&\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}\sum_{I\in\{0,1\}^k}(C-1)^{k_1(I)}-\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}\sum_{I\in S_2}(C-1)^{k_1(I)}\\ =&\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}C^k-\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}\sum_{I\in S_2}(C-1)^{k_1(I)},\end{aligned}$$

Let R_2 denote

$$R_2:=-\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}\sum_{I\in S_2}(C-1)^{k_1(I)}.$$

Note that

$$\sum_{I\in S_2}(C-1)^{k_1(I)}=\binom{k}{2}(C-1)^{k-2}+k(C-1)^{k-1}+(C-1)^k\leq k^2C^2(C-1)^{k-2}$$

so

$$|R_2|\leq\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}k^2C^2(C-1)^{k-2}. \tag{7}$$

Thus we conclude that

$$\sum_{I\in S_1}a^I_{n+1}-2\sum_{I\in S_1}a^I_n+\sum_{I\in S_1}a^I_{n-1}=\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}C^k+R_1+R_2$$

where R_1, R_2 are controlled by (6) and (7) respectively.

It remains to estimate

$$\sum_{I\in S_2}a^I_n.$$

For each $I=(i_1,\cdots,i_n)\in S_2$, we have

$$a^I_n=\sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n}a^{(i_1)}_{x_1}\cdots a^{(i_n)}_{x_n}.$$

By (4), we have $a_n\leq C+Dn^\alpha\leq(C+D)n^\alpha$. Thus

$$\sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n}a^{(i_1)}_{x_1}\cdots a^{(i_k)}_{x_k}\leq(C+D)n^\alpha\sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n}a^{(i_2)}_{x_2}\cdots a^{(i_k)}_{x_k}.$$

We can appeal to Lemma 3.2 to obtain

$$\sum_{x_1+\cdots+x_k=n}a^{(i_2)}_{x_2}\cdots a^{(i_k)}_{x_k}\leq\binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k_1((i_2,\cdots,i_n))}\leq\binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k_1(I)-1}C.$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{I\in S_2}a^I_n&\leq(C+D)n^\alpha\sum_{I\in S_2}\binom{n+k-1}{k-1}(C-1)^{k_1(I)-1}C\\ &\leq(C+D)n^\alpha\binom{n+k-1}{k-1}\cdot k(k-1)C^3(C-1)^{k-3}.\end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$\sum_{I\in S_2} a_n^I \leq 3(C+D)C^3(C-1)^{k-3}(n+k)^{2+\alpha}\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}$$

Thus the second order difference R_3 of $\sum_{I\in S_2} a_n^I$ is bounded by

$$R_3 \leq E_1 n^{2+\alpha}\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}(C-1)^k \tag{8}$$

for some constant E_1.

We have thus finished the second order difference estimate

$$a_{n+1,k} - 2a_{n,k} + a_{n-1,k} = \frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}C^k + R_1 + R_2 + R_3$$

where the errors R_i satisfy (6), (7) and (8) respectively. We now note that the absolute value of each R_i is at most a constant times

$$\frac{(n+k)^{k-3}}{(k-3)!}C^k \cdot \left(\frac{k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}} + (n+k)^{2+\alpha}\cdot A^{-(2+\alpha)k}\right).$$

Thus we obtain the desired estimate. □

Using the identity

$$a_{n,k} - a_{n-1,k} = \sum_{n'=-1}^{n-1}(a_{n'+1,k} - 2a_{n',k} + a_{n'-1,k})$$

We conclude an analogous estimate on the first-order difference.

Corollary 3.5. *For any $n \geq 0$ and $k \geq 3$, we have*

$$a_{n,k} - a_{n-1,k} = C^k\frac{(n+k)^{k-2}}{(k-2)!}(1 + R_{n,k}^{(1)}).$$

where $R_{n,k}^{(1)}$ satisfies

$$\left|R_{n,k}^{(1)}\right| \leq E\left(\frac{k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}} + (n+k)^{2+\alpha}A^{-(2+\alpha)k}\right)$$

for some constant E.

Again using the identity

$$a_{n-1,k} = \sum_{n'=0}^{n-1}(a_{n',k} - a_{n'-1,k})$$

We conclude an analogous estimate on the zeroth-order difference.

Corollary 3.6. *For any $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 3$, we have*

$$a_{n-1,k} = C^k\frac{(n+k)^{k-1}}{(k-1)!}(1 + R_{n,k}^{(0)}).$$

where $R_{n,k}^{(0)}$ satisfies

$$\left|R_{n,k}^{(0)}\right| \leq E\left(\frac{k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}} + (n+k)^{2+\alpha}A^{-(2+\alpha)k}\right)$$

for some constant E.

Finally, we conclude by Lemma 3.4, Corollary 3.5 and Corollary 3.6 that for any $n \geq -1$, we have

$$\frac{a_{n-1,k}(a_{n+1,k} - 2a_{n,k} + a_{n-1,k})}{(a_{n,k} - a_{n-1,k})^2} = \frac{k-2}{k-1} \cdot \frac{(1 + R_{n,k}^{(0)})(1 + R_{n,k}^{(2)})}{(1 + R_{n,k}^{(1)})^2}$$

where for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ we have

$$\left| R_{n,k}^{(i)} \right| \leq E_i \left(\frac{k^2}{(n+k)^{1-\alpha}} + (n+k)^{2+\alpha} A^{-(2+\alpha)k} \right)$$

for constants E_0, E_1, E_2. If

$$k^{5/(1-\alpha)} \leq n \leq \frac{A^k}{k^2}$$

then for sufficiently large k, we have

$$\left| R_{n,k}^{(i)} \right| \leq \frac{1}{k^2}$$

for each $i \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Therefore we get

$$\frac{a_{n-1,k}(a_{n+1,k} - 2a_{n,k} + a_{n-1,k})}{(a_{n,k} - a_{n-1,k})^2} \leq \frac{k-2}{k-1} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{k^2}\right)^4 < 1.$$

So $\{a_{n,k}\}$ is log-concave for $k^{5/(1-\alpha)} \leq n \leq \frac{\eta^k}{k^2}$. As we have shown that $\{a_{n,k}\}$ is log-concave for $n \leq B^{k^{1/3}}$, where $B > 1$ is a constant, the two intervals glue together to obtain Theorem 1.4.

Finally, we prove Corollary 1.5. Let $f(z)$ be defined in Conjecture 1.1 and let

$$g(z) := \frac{f(z)}{z} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sigma_{-1}(n+1) z^n.$$

As $\sigma_{-1}(n) \geq 1$ for any $n \geq 1$, g is 1-lower bounded. Furthermore, we have

$$\sigma_{-1}(1) + \cdots + \sigma_{-1}(n+1) = \sum_{m=1}^{n+1} \sum_{d|m} \frac{1}{d} = \sum_{d=1}^{n+1} \frac{1}{d} \lfloor \frac{n+1}{d} \rfloor.$$

Thus we have

$$\sigma_{-1}(1) + \cdots + \sigma_{-1}(n+1) \leq \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{n+1}{d^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}(n+1)$$

and

$$\sigma_{-1}(1) + \cdots + \sigma_{-1}(n+1) \geq \sum_{d=1}^{n+1} \left(\frac{n+1}{d^2} - \frac{d-1}{d^2} \right) \geq \frac{\pi^2}{6}(n+1) - \log(n+1) - 1.$$

So $g(z)$ satisfies the condition of Theorem 1.4 for $C = \pi^2/6$ and any $\alpha > 0$. Corollary 1.5 then follows from Theorem 1.4.

References

[1] K. Adiprasito, J. Huh, and E. Katz, *Hodge theory for combinatorial geometries.* Annals of Mathematics 188 (2018), 381–452.

[2] T. Braden, J. Huh, J. P. Matherne, N. Proudfoot, B. Wang, *Singular Hodge theory for combinatorial geometries.* arXiv:2010.06088.

[3] F. Brenti, *Unimodal, Log-concave and Pólya Frequency Sequences in Combinatorics.* Mem. Am. Math. Soc. 413 (1989).

[4] B. Heim, M. Neuhauser, *On conjectures regarding the Nekrasov-Okounkov hook length formula.* Arch. Math. 113 (2019), no. 4, 355–366.
[5] B. Heim, M. Neuhauser, *Horizontal and vertical log-concavity.* Res. Number Theory 7 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 18, 12 pp.
[6] L. Hong, S. Zhang, *Towards Heim and Neuhauser's unimodality conjecture on the Nekrasov-Okounkov polynomials.* Res. Number Theory 7 (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 17, 11 pp.
[7] J. Huh, *Milnor numbers of projective hypersurfaces and the chromatic polynomial of graphs.* Journal of the American Mathematical Society 25 (2012), 907–927.
[8] N. A. Nekrasov, A. Okounkov, *Seiberg-Witten theory and random partitions.* The unity of mathematics, 525–596, Progr. Math., 244, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2006.
[9] A. M. Odlyzko, L. B. Richmond, *On the unimodality of high convolutions of discrete distributions.* Ann. Probab. 13 (1985), no. 1, 299–306.
[10] R. P. Stanley, *Log-Concave and Unimodal Sequences in Algebra, Combinatorics, and Geometry.* Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences (1989), no. 1, 500-535.
[11] R. P. Stanley, *Positivity problems and conjectures in algebraic combinatorics.* Mathematics: Frontiers and Perspectives, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI (2000), 295–319.

Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

Email address: stzh1555@mit.edu