The 2-adic Analysis of Stirling Numbers of the Second Kind via Higher Order Bernoulli Numbers and Polynomials

Arnold Adelberg Myra Steele Emeritus Professor of Mathematics Department of Mathematics and Statistics Grinnell College Grinnell, IA 50112

December 4, 2019

Abstract

Several new estimates for the 2-adic valuations of Stirling numbers of the second kind are proved. These estimates, together with criteria for when they are sharp, lead to improvements in several known theorems and their proofs, as well as to new theorems. The estimates and criteria all depend on our previous analysis of powers of 2 in the denominators of coefficients of higher order Bernoulli polynomials. The corresponding estimates for Stirling numbers of the first kind are also proved.

Some attention is given to asymptotic cases, which will be further explored in subsequent publications.

Keywords: Stirling numbers of the second kind, 2-adic analysis, higher order Bernoulli numbers and polynomials, estimates and exact values, Newton polygons. *MSC*/2010]: 11B68, 11B73, 05A10, 11S05.

1 Introduction

This paper brings together and extends a collection of related results on the 2adic analysis of Stirling numbers of the second kind. We hope that our approach, based on our earlier results for higher order Bernoulli numbers and polynomials, provides a coherent theoretical basis that others will find useful for further investigations. The proofs we give for known results are shorter and simpler, often dramatically so. The results themselves are typically sharper and broader. We also get some new results, most of which involve new estimates that are stronger than those in the literature.

The current paper is a continuation of [4] but is quite different in its goals and scope. Whereas the previous paper considered all primes and Stirling numbers of both kinds, for reasons of brevity and focus this paper will primarily consider only the even prime and will concentrate on Stirling numbers of the second kind S(n,k).

Lengyel [11] proved in 1994 that $\nu_2(S(2^h, k)) = \sigma_2(k) - 1$, if h is sufficiently large and k > 0, and conjectured that this formula holds whenever $1 \le k \le 2^h$, where $\sigma_2(k) =$ sum of base 2 digits. This was eventually proven in 2005 by De Wannemaker [7]. Subsequently Lengyel [13] gave another proof and adapted De Wannemaker's proof to extend the theorem to $\nu_2(S(c2^h, k)) = \sigma_2(k) - 1$ if $c \ge 1$ and $1 \le k \le 2^h$.

We found a much simpler proof of De Wannemaker's Theorem in [4], which we were able to generalize to odd primes and to minimum zero cases (MZC), which are based on the estimate

$$\nu_2(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma_2(k) - \sigma_2(n) \tag{1.1}$$

which we call the minimum zero estimate. When it is sharp, we have the minimum zero case (MZC).

In the current paper, we give several other useful estimates. One, which is based on recursive properties of Stirling polynomials, is

$$\nu_2(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma_2(k-1) - \sigma_2(n-1) \tag{1.2}$$

which we call the shifted minimum zero estimate. When this is sharp, we have the shifted minimum zero case (SMZC).

Significantly better than these estimates are our new almost minimum zero estimate

$$\nu_2(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma_2(k) - \sigma_2(n) + \#(\text{common 2-powers in } n \text{ and } n-k)$$
(1.3)

and our new shifted almost minimum zero estimate

$$\nu_2(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma_2(k-1) - \sigma_2(n-1) + \#(\text{common 2-powers in } n-1 \text{ and } n-k)$$
(1.4)

An almost minimum zero case (AMZC) is one where the estimate (1.3) is sharp, but which is not a MZC, while a shifted almost minimum zero case (SAMZC) is one which is not a SMZC and the estimate (1.4) is sharp. When the distinction between MZC and AMZC is unimportant, we may use AMZC for the sharp almost minimum zero estimate. We may also adopt the analogous convention for SAMZC.

Unlike the minimum zero and shifted minimum zero estimates, these estimates are never vacuous (negative). This leads to very simple new necessary and sufficient conditions for when a Stirling number S(n, k) is odd. [Theorem 3.2]

Most of the significant analysis of this paper rests on the fact that since $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}$ is a cofficient of $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}(x)$ the 2-adic pole of $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}$, i.e., the highest power of 2 in its denominator, is less than or equal to the maximum pole of $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}(x)$, which is the highest power of 2 in the denominators of all the coefficients. We

have a simple formula for this maximum pole (cf. [1,2]), which is given in the Appendix.

The geometry of these cases is instructive: The MZC occurs when the Newton polygon of $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}(x)$ is strictly decreasing; the SMZC occurs when the Newton polygon of $B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(x)$ is strictly decreasing; the AMZC occurs when the Newton polygon of $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}(x)$ is weakly decreasing, i.e., the last segment of the Newton polygon is horizontal; the SAMZC holds when the pole of $B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(1)$ is the maximum pole of $B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(x)$, but this pole also occurs in at least one coefficient other than the constant coefficient.

In our study of the literature, we have found that every significant estimate or exact value of $\nu_2(S(n,k))$ we considered arises from one of our estimates or cases. For example, the proofs in ([9], Theorems 1.1, 1.2, 1.3) are very lengthy and highly technical, while ours are much shorter and more efficient.

Also, in [12] Lengyel gives many proofs of estimates for $\nu_2(S(c2^h, 2^h + a))$, which we handle easily by our methods with far less computation. He also gives estimates for $\nu_2(S(c2^h + u, k))$ which are not as good as our almost minimum zero estimates (unless u is a power of 2), and his proofs are more involved than ours.

The organization of this paper is as follows: Section 2 states a number of elementary, useful facts about base two arithmetic, gives some basic definitions, and states the main theorems of this paper. Our statements include the estimate or case that leads to our proof, since that provides insight into why the theorems are true. Section 3 provides simple, effective criteria for the four cases, establishes certain invariance properties for these estimates and cases, and proves a couple of new theorems. Included in this section are new necessary and sufficient conditions for the Stirling number S(n, k) to be odd, which generalize our conditions for the central Stirling numbers S(2k, k) (cf. [4]). We also state, for reference, the estimates and cases for Stirling numbers of the first kind. Section 4 proves the main non-asymptotic theorems. Section 5 proves an illustrative asymptotic theorem, which is more simply stated and with an exponentially better estimate for when the limit is attained than in the literature. Our proof in this section does not depend on the estimates given in the Introduction but depends instead on a new estimate for the partition dependent terms, which is given in the Appendix [Theorem 6.1]. Section 6 collects the material on higher order Bernoulli numbers and polynomials needed for this paper.

2 Base two preliminaries, definitions, and statement of main theorems

Since we deal only with the prime two in this paper, we will omit the prime in our notations; e.g., we will write ν instead of ν_2 for the 2-adic valuation and σ instead of σ_2 for the sum of the base two digits, which is the same as the number of powers of two in the base two representation.

We extend our previous notion of pole to allow a 2-adic unit to be considered as a pole of order zero, so if $N \ge 0$ and $\nu(a) \ge -N$, then we say that a has at most a pole of order N.

Let [n] = set of 2-powers in its base two expansion, so if $n = \sum a_i 2^i$ with all $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$, then [n] corresponds to the ones in the expansion, i.e., the ones in the base two representation of n. The following facts are obvious but useful:

$$#([n]) = \sigma(n), \quad \min([n]) = 2^{\nu(n)}, \quad \max([n]) = 2^{\lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor}, \\ [n-1] = \left([n] - \{2^{\nu(n)}\} \right) \cup \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{\nu(n)-1}\} \text{ (disjoint union)}, \\ \text{so } \sigma(n-1) = \sigma(n) - 1 + \nu(n) \ (cf.[4]), \text{ and} \\ 2^{\nu(n-m)} = \min([n] \cup [m] - [n] \cap [m]) \tag{2.1}$$

The basic facts that we need about binomial coefficients are as follows:

$$\nu\binom{a+b}{a} = \sigma(a) + \sigma(b) - \sigma(a+b) = \#(\text{base two carries for } a+b)$$
(2.2)

If $a = \sum a_i 2^i$ and $b = \sum b_i 2^i$, then we have a base 2 carry if either $a_i = b_i = 1$, or if $\{a_i, b_i\} = \{0, 1\}$ and the carry results from previous carries. A carry where $a_i = b_i = 1$ is called a forced carry, and other carries are said to be unforced. The number of forced carries is $\#([a] \cap [b])$.

Lemma 2.1. If $n \ge m$ then $\#([n] \cap [n-m]) \ge \sigma(n) - \sigma(m)$, i.e., $\#([n] - [n-m]) \le \sigma(m)$, using the set difference.

Proof. If $m = 2^i$, then n - m removes the smallest 2-power in [n] which is greater than or equal to 2^i , and if this power is bigger than 2^i we insert the powers down to 2^i . We continue subtracting m by subtracting its 2-powers one at a time, iterating the process.

Lemma 2.2. If $\binom{b}{a}$ is odd, then $\#([b] \cap [b-a]) = \#([b-a]) = \sigma(b) - \sigma(a)$; if b is odd and greater than 1, then $\#([b] \cap [b-3]) = \sigma(b) - 2$, while if b is even and greater than 2, then $\#[b] \cap [b-3]) = \sigma(b) - 1$.

Proof. The first assertion follows from (2.2). The other parts follow from $2^{\alpha} - 2 = 2^{\alpha-1} + \cdots + 2$, first subtracting 2 from b, then subtracting 1.

Next we list the main theorems, most of which come from [9,12]. We have edited them them to conform to our notations and conventions and include the relevant estimates or cases.

Theorem 2.1. (cf. [9], Theorem 1.2) Let $a, c, h \in \mathbb{N}$ with $c \ge 1$ being odd and $1 \le a \le 2^h$. Then $S(c2^h, (c-1)2^h + a)$ is a MZC and

$$\nu(S(c2^{h}, (c-1)2^{h} + a)) = \sigma(a) - 1$$

Note. In ([9] Theorem 1.2), it is assumed that $h \ge 2$, which appears from our proof to be an unnecessary assumption.

Theorem 2.2. (cf. [9] Theorem 1.1) Let $h, a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 < a < 2^{h+1}$, $b2^{h+1} + a \leq c2^h$ and $c \geq 1$ being odd. Then the almost minimum zero estimate is

$$\nu(S(c2^{h}, b2^{h+1} + a)) \ge \sigma(a) - 1$$

Theorem 2.3. (cf.[9] Theorem 1.4) Let $a, b, c, m, h \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $0 < a < 2^{h+1}$, $b2^{h+1}+2^h < 2^m$, and $c \ge 1$ being odd. Then if $a < 2^{h+1}-1$, the almost minimum zero estimate is $\nu(S(c2^m+b2^{h+1}+2^h, b2^{h+2}+a)) \ge \sigma(a)-1$, which is not sharp, i.e., $\nu(S(c2^m+b2^{h+1}+2^h, b2^{h+2}+a) \ge \sigma(a)$. If $a = 2^{h+1}-1$, we have a AMZC with the same estimate, i.e., $\nu(S(c2^m+b2^{h+1}+2^h, b2^{h+2}+a)) = \sigma(a)-1 = h$.

Theorem 2.4. ([cf. [12] Theorem 6) Let $h, u, c \in \mathbb{N}$ with $u \leq 2^h$. Then if $u < 2^h$, the shifted almost minimum zero estimate is

$$\nu(S(c2^{h} + u, 2^{h})) \ge h - 1 - \nu(u)$$

Furthermore u is even and $u \leq 2^{h-1}$, or u = 1, or $u = 1 + 2^{h-1}$ are all the cases where the estimate is sharp, i.e., where

$$\nu(S(c2^{h} + u, 2^{h})) = h - 1 - \nu(u)$$

Finally if $u = 2^h$, then $\nu(S(c2^h + u, 2^h) = 0$.

Theorem 2.5. (cf. [12] Theorem 7) Let $h, k, u, c \in \mathbb{N}$ with $1 \leq k \leq 2^h$ and $u \leq 2^{\nu(k)}$. Then if u < k the shifted almost minimum zero estimate is

$$\nu(S(c2^h + u, k) \ge \nu(k) + \sigma(k) - \nu(u) - 2$$

Furthermore we have the sharp estimate

$$\nu(S(c2^{h} + u, k)) = \nu(k) + \sigma(k) - \nu(u) - 2$$

if and only if u = 1, or $1 \le u \le 2^{\nu(k)-1}$ and u is even, or $u = 1 + 2^{\nu(k)-1}$, or $u = 2^{\nu(k)}$. Finally if u = k, so that $\sigma(k) = 1$, then $\nu(S(c2^h + u, k)) = 0$.

Notes. Theorem (2.4) is the special case of Theorem (2.5) for $k = 2^h$. The estimates given by Lengyel in [12] are considerably weaker than ours, since $\nu(u) < \lfloor \log_2(u) \rfloor$ unless $u = 2^m$. Also he gets exact values only for the 2-powers instead of for all the even numbers less than or equal to $2^{\nu(k)-1}$.

The next asymptotic result does not depend on the estimates or cases given in the Introduction but depends instead on the new estimate given in the Appendix.

Theorem 2.6. (cf. [12] Theorem 5) If $\nu(k) < \nu(n)$ or if $\nu(k) = \nu(n)$ and $2^{\nu(n-k)} \in [k]$, then

$$\lim_{h \to \infty} \nu(S(2^h n, 2^h k)) = \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \nu \binom{n+n-k}{n}$$

and this limit is attained if $2^{h-1+\nu(n-k)} \ge \nu \binom{n+n-k}{n}$. If $\nu(n) < \nu(k)$ or $\nu(n) = \nu(k)$ and $2^{\nu(n-k)} \in [n]$, then

$$\lim_{h \to \infty} \nu(S(2^h n, 2^h k)) = \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \nu \binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$$

Furthermore, if $\nu(n) < \nu(k)$, the limit is attained if $2^{h-1+\nu(n)} \ge \nu \binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$, while if $\nu(n) = \nu(k)$ and $2^{\nu(n-k)} \in [n]$, the limit is attained if $2^{h-1+\nu(n)} > \nu \binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$.

Remark. Our formulas for the limit are simplier than Lengyel's, and the estimates for when the limits are attained are exponentially better.

3 Basic properties of the estimates and cases, some examples and new results

The key formula is

$$S(n,k) = \binom{n}{k} B_{n-k}^{(-k)}$$
(3.1)

and since $B_{n-k}^{(-k)} = (k/n)B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(1)$, we get

$$S(n,k) = {\binom{n-1}{k-1}} B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(1)$$
(3.2)

Hence, from our maximum pole formula, we have

$$\nu(S(n,k)) = \nu\binom{n}{k} + \nu\left(B_{n-k}^{(-k)}\right) \ge \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \#([n] \cap [n-k])$$
(3.3)

and

$$\nu(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \#([n-1] \cap [n-k])$$
(3.4)

Formula (3.3) is the almost minimum zero estimate, which is sharp without the MZC iff the Newton polygon of $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}(x)$ is weakly decreasing, i.e., its final segment is horizontal. The geometry of sharpness for the shifted almost minimum zero case is less clear, namely we may or may not have a horizontal final segment.

Theorem 3.1. The almost minimum zero and shifted almost minum zero estimates are non-negative.

Proof. The almost minimum zero estimate is

$$\nu(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \#([n] \cap [n-k])$$

which is non-negative by (Lemma 2.1). The proof for the shifted estimate is identical, replacing (n, k) by (n - 1, k - 1).

Note that $\nu \left(B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(1) \right) = -\sigma(n-k)$ iff $\nu \left(B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)} \right) = -\sigma(n-k)$ iff $B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(x)$ is a maximum pole case iff S(n-1,k-1) is a MZC. This gives an alternative proof of the Amdeberhan conjecture [5] which was proved in [8]. Thus $\nu(S(n+1,k+1)) = \sigma(k) - \sigma(n)$ iff S(n,k) is a MZC, in which case $\nu(S(n+1, k+1)) = \nu(S(n, k)).$

Theorem 3.2. (Odd Stirling numbers of the second kind) The following are equivalent:

- (a) S(n,k) is odd.
- (b) $\#([n] \cap [n-k]) = \sigma(n) \sigma(k)$ and S(n,k) is a MZC or AMZC.
- (c) $\#([n-1] \cap [n-k]) = \sigma(n-1) \sigma(k-1)$ and S(n,k) is a SMZC or SAMZC.

Proof. Since $\nu(S(n,k)) > \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \#([n] \cap [n-k]) > 0$, we have $\nu(S(n,k)) =$ 0 iff the almost minimum zero estimate is sharp and zero, i.e., $\#([n] \cap [n-k]) =$ $\sigma(n) - \sigma(k)$ and the estimate is sharp. The argument is similar for the shifted case.

A different necessary and sufficient condition for S(n,k) to be odd is proved in ([6], Theorem 2.1), which has no obvious relation to ours.

The preceding theorem is particularly helpful once we have established criteria for the different cases.

Theorem 3.3. (Criteria for the four cases)

- (i) S(n,k) is a MZC iff $[n-k] \cap [n] = \emptyset$.
- (ii) S(n,k) is a SMZC iff $[n-k] \cap [n-1] = \emptyset$.
- (iii) S(n,k) is a AMZC iff $[n-k] \cap [n] \neq \emptyset$ and precisely one of the following conditions holds:

 - (a) $\nu\binom{n+n-k}{n} = \#([n] \cap [n-k])$, i.e., n+n-k has no unforced carries. (b) $\nu\binom{n+n-k-1}{n} = \#([n] \cap [n-k]) 1$, i.e., $\nu(n) = \nu(n-k)$ and n+n-k-1 has no unforced carries.
 - (c) n-k is odd and $\nu\binom{n+n-k-2}{n} = \#([n] \cap [n-k]) 1$, i.e., n-k is odd, the least positive exponent in [n] is the same as the least positive exponent in [n-k], and n+n-k-2 has no unforced carries.
- (iv) S(n,k) is a SAMZC iff $[n-k] \cap [n-1] \neq \emptyset$ and precisely one of the following conditions holds:
 - (a) $\nu \binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1} = \#([n-1] \cap [n-k]), \text{ i.e., } n-1+n-k \text{ has no unforced carries.}$
 - (b) n-k is odd and $\nu \binom{n-1+n-k-2}{n-1} = \#([n-1]\cap[n-k])-1$, i.e., n-k is odd, the least positive exponent in [n-1] is the least positive exponent in [n-k], and n-1+n-k-2 has no unforced carries.

Remark. Note that the shift is generally advisable only if $\nu(n) < \nu(k)$.

Proof. We omit the proof details, which follow from the material on maximum poles in the Appendix, other than to note that in (iii), (a) comes from the partition where $u_1 = n - k$, and (b) comes from the partition where $u_1 = n - k - 1$, and (c) comes from the partition where $u_1 = n - k - 3$ and $u_3 = 1$. Similarly for (iv). Conditions (b) and (c) cannot both hold by Lemma 2.2, since if $2^0 \in [n] \cap [n - k]$ and $2^1 \in [n] - [n - k - 2]$ or $2^1 \in [n - k - 2] - [n]$, then n + n - k - 2 has an unforced carry in place 2^1 . Lemma 2.2 also eliminates the a priori possibility that the partition where $u_1 = n - k - 4$ and $u_3 = 1$, with d = n - k - 3 being odd, gives the maximum pole. Thus the partitions noted in (iii) or (iv) are the only ones that can give the maximum pole of $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}(x)$ or $B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(x)$.

Corollary 3.1. (Hong-Amdeberhan [5,8]) $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1)$ iff S(n,k) is a SMZC iff S(n-1,k-1) is a MZC iff $\binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$ is odd.

Corollary 3.2. (Central Stirling numbers) For the central Stirling number S(2k, k) the almost minimum zero estimate is

- (a) $\nu(S(2k,k)) \ge \#(pairs of consecutive ones in k)$, and
- (b) $\nu(S(2k,k)) = 1$ iff S(2k,k) is a AMZC iff k = 3 + 8k' with k' Fibbinary.

Proof. For (a), if n = 2k, then $\sigma(n) = \sigma(k)$ and #(pairs of consecutive ones in k) = #([k] ∩ [2k]) = #([n] ∩ [n - k]) so the inequality is just the almost zero minimum zero estimate. For (b), we have $\nu(S(2k, k)) = 1$ iff #([n] ∩ [n - k]) = 1 iff S(n, k) is a AMZC. If k = 3 + 8k' where k' is Fibbinary then n - k = k is odd, so the least positive exponent in k is 1, which is the least positive exponent in n. Also n + n - k - 2 = 6 + 16k' + 1 + 8k' = 2 + 4 + 8(2k' + k') + 1 has no carries, so (iii) part (c) applies. Finally, if there is a different pair of consecutive ones in k, it is easy to see that none of the conditions in (iii) apply, so S(n, k) is not a AMZC.

The parts of the next theorem can be found in the literature, e.g., in ([9] and [12]). It is included here as an excellent example of our estimates and cases.

Theorem 3.4. Let $c \geq 3$ be odd, $n = c2^h$, and $1 \leq k \leq 2^{h+1}$. Then

- (i) If $k \leq 2^h$ then S(n,k) is a AMZC and $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(k) 1$. (Lengyel's extension of De Wannemacker's theorem.)
- (ii) If $2^h < k < 2^{h+1}$ and $k = 2^h + a$, then the almost minimum zero estimate is $\nu(S(n,k)) = \nu(S(n,2^h + a)) \ge \sigma(a) = \sigma(k) 1$.
- (iii) If $k = 2^h + a$ with $0 < a < 2^h 1$, so $k < 2^{h+1} 1$, then S(n,k) is not a AMZC, so $\nu(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma(a) + 1 = \sigma(k)$, while if $a = 2^h 1$, so that $k = 2^{h+1} 1$, then S(n,k) is a AMZC, and $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(a) = h$.

(iv) If $a = 2^h$, i.e., $k = 2^{h+1}$, then S(n,k) is a AMZC and SAMZC, and $\nu(S(n,k)) = 0$.

Proof. For (i), we have $n-k = (c-1)2^h + 2^h - k$, so $\#([n-k] \cap [n]) = \sigma(c) - 1$. For the sum n-k+n, the carries are the same as for c-1+c, which are all unforced. Also $\nu(n-k) \neq \nu(n) = h$, and the smallest positive exponent in n-k is not equal to the smallest positive exponent in n. Thus S(n,k) is a AMZC with $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \sigma(c) - 1 = \sigma(k) - \sigma(c) + \sigma(c) - 1 = \sigma(k) - 1$.

For (ii), if $k = 2^h + a$ with $0 < a < 2^h$, then $\sigma(k) - \sigma(n) = 1 + \sigma(a) - \sigma(c)$ and if $\alpha = \nu(c-1)$ and T = c-1, then $n-k = (T-2^{\alpha})2^h + (2^{\alpha+h}-2^h) + 2^h - k = (T-2^{\alpha})2^h + 2^{\alpha+h-1} + \dots + 2^h + 2^h - a$, so $[n-k] \cap [n] = [T] - \{2^{\alpha+h}\} \cup \{2^h\}$ and $\#([n-k] \cap [n]) = \sigma(c) - 1$. Thus the minimum zero estimate for S(n,k) is $1 + \sigma(a) - \sigma(c) + \sigma(c) - 1 = \sigma(a) = \sigma(k) - 1$.

For (iii), if $0 < a < 2^h - 1$ then n - k + n has an unforced carry for exponent α , and the other partitions in Theorem 3.3(iii) are also not valid, so S(n,k) is not a AMZC, and $\nu(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma(a) + 1 = \sigma(k)$. If $a = 2^h - 1$, so $k = 2^{h+1} - 1$, it is easy to verify that the first two partitions in Theorem 3.3(iii) still fail to meet the conditions, but the third partition, when $u_1 = n - k - 3$ and $u_3 = 1$ now works, so S(n,k) is a AMZC, and $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(a) = \sigma(2^h - 1) = h = \sigma(k) - 1$.

For (iv), if $a = 2^h$, i.e., $k = 2^{h+1}$, we now have $n - k = (T - 2^{\alpha})2^h + 2^{\alpha+h-1} + \cdots + 2^h$, so the partitions of type (a) and (c) in Theorem 3.3(iii) now fail, but the partition of type (b) where $u_1 = n - k - 1$ works, so S(n,k) is a AMZC and $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \#([n] \cap [n-k]) = 1 - \sigma(c) + \sigma(c) - 1 = 0$. Finally, the shifted minimum zero estimate is $\nu(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \#([n-1] \cap [n-k]) = \sigma(k) - 1 + \nu(k) - (\sigma(n) - 1 + \nu(n)) + \sigma(c) - 2 = 0$, and now the partition of type (a) works and the partition of type (c) doesn't (since n - k is even), so S(n,k) is a SAMZC.

The following theorem can be easily proved using the criteria for the cases, so will not give the proof. It does show that Lengyel's extension of De Wannemacker's Theorem follows formally from DeWannemacker's Theorem.

Theorem 3.5. (Invariance) Suppose $\Delta > 0$ and all 2-powers in Δ are greater than all 2-powers in n. Then

- (a) for all four estimates, the estimate for $\nu(S(n,k))$ is the same as the estimate for $\nu(S(n + \Delta, k))$ and also the same for $\nu(S(n + \Delta, k + \Delta))$.
- (b) $S(n + \Delta, k)$ is a AMZC iff S(n, k) is a AMZC or MZC, and if any of the cases hold, then $\nu(S(n + \Delta, k)) = \nu(S(n, k))$.
- (c) The same results hold if we replace cases by their shifts.
- (d) If $\nu(\Delta) > \lfloor \log_2(n) \rfloor + 1$, then $S(n + \Delta, k + \Delta)$ is a AMZC if S(n, k) is a MZC or AMZC. Similarly for the the shifts. For all of these cases, we have $\nu(S(n + \Delta, k + \Delta)) = \nu(S(n, k))$.

Remark. The assumption in (d) gives a "gap" in the 2-powers between n and

 $n + \Delta$. This is necessary to preserve the no unforced carries conditiion as we pass from (n, k) to $(n + \Delta, k + \Delta)$.

For reference purposes, we include the basic material about Stirling numbers of the first kind s(n, k):

$$s(n,k) = \binom{n-1}{k-1} B_{n-k}^{(n)}$$
(3.5)

Thus by the recursive formula (6.3), we get

$$s(n,k) = \binom{n}{k} B_{n-k}^{(n+1)}(1)$$
(3.6)

From the Appendix, the maximum pole of $B_{n-k}^{(n)}(x)$ is $\#([n-k] \cap [k-1])$, so we get the following four estimates: Minimum zero estimate:

$$\nu(s(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) \tag{3.7}$$

Shifted minimum zero estimate:

$$\nu(s(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) \tag{3.8}$$

Almost minimum zero estimate:

$$\nu(s(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \#([n-k] - [k-1])$$
(3.9)

Shifted almost minimum zero estimate:

$$\nu(s(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \#([n-k] - [k]) \tag{3.10}$$

4 Proofs of theorems 2.1-2.5

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let $n = c2^h$ and $k = (c-1)2^h + a$, with $1 \le a \le 2^h$. $n-k = 2^h - a$, so $[n] \cap [n-k] = \emptyset$, so S(n,k) is a MZC and $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) = \sigma(c-1) + \sigma(a) - \sigma(n) = \sigma(a) - 1$. (If $a = 2^h$, the theorem is trivial.) Proof of Theorem 2.2. Let $n = c2^h$ and $k = b2^{h+1} + a$. Then $\sigma(k) - \sigma(n) = \sigma(a) + \sigma(b) - \sigma(c)$, so by the almost minimum zero estimate, it will suffice to show that $\#([n] \cap [n-k]) \ge \sigma(c) - \sigma(b) - 1$.

If $a \leq 2^h$, then $n - k = (c - 2b - 1)2^h + 2^h - a$, so $[n] \cap [n - k] = [c2^h] \cap ([(c - 2b - 1)2^h] \cup [2^h - a]) = [c2^h] \cap [(c - 2b - 1)2^h] = [c] \cap [c - 2b - 1]$, so by Lemma 2.1, we have $\#([n] \cap [n - k]) \geq \sigma(c) - \sigma(2b + 1) = \sigma(c) - \sigma(b) - 1$, which completes the proof in this case.

On the other hand if $a > 2^h$, then $n - k = (c - 2b - 2)2^h + 2^{h+1} - a$ and $0 \le 2^{h+1} - a < 2^h$, so $[n-k] \cap [n] = [(c-2b-2)2^h] \cap [c2^h] = [c] \cap [c-2b-2] = ([1] \cup [c-1]) \cap ([1] \cup [c-1-(2b+1)])$ so $\#([c] \cap [c-2b-2]) \ge 1 + \sigma(c-1) - \sigma(2b+1) = \sigma(c) - \sigma(b) - 1$.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. The proof of this theorem is similar to our Theorem (3.4). Let $n = c2^m + b2^{h+1} + 2^h$ and $k = b2^{h+2} + a$, where $0 < a < 2^{h+1}$. First assume $0 < a \le 2^h$. Then $n - k = (c - 1)2^m + 2^m - b2^{h+1} + 2^h - a$, so $[n - k] \cap [n] = ([(c - 1)2^m] \cap [c2^m]) \cup ([b2^{h+1}] \cap [2^m - b2^{h+1}])$, so $\#([n - k] \cap [n]) = \sigma(c) - 1 + 1 = \sigma(c)$. Thus the almost minimum zero estimate is $\nu(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma(b) + \sigma(a) - (\sigma(c) + \sigma(b) + 1) + \sigma(c) = \sigma(a) - 1$. But n + n - k has an unforced carry for exponent m and $\nu(n - k) \ne \nu(n)$ and the first positive exponent in n - k is not equal to the first positive exponent in n, so S(n,k) is not a AMZC, by the criteria.

Next assume $2^h < a < 2^{h+1}$. Then $n-k = (c-1)2^m + 2^m - (2b+1)2^h + 2^{h+1} - a$, so again $\#([n-k] \cap [n]) = \sigma(c)$. If $a < 2^{h+1} - 1$, then once more the three partitions don't satisfy the AMZC criterion. Finally if $a = 2^{h+1} - 1$, so that $n-k = (c-1)2^m + 2^m - (2b+1)2^h + 1$, then the partitions when $u_1 = n-k$ and when $u_1 = n-k-1$ fail the the criteria, but the partition when $u_1 = n-k-3$ and $u_3 = 1$ does meet the criteria. Hence S(n,k) is a AMZC when $a = 2^{h+1} - 1$, and $\nu(S(n,k)) = \sigma(a) - 1 = h$.

Since Theorem 2.4 is a special case of the next one, we will not prove it.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. Let $n = c2^h + u$ and $1 \le k \le 2^h$ with $0 < u \le 2^{\nu(k)}$. Then $n-k = (c-1)2^h + u + 2^h - k$. Without loss of generality, we can assume c is odd. Then $n-1 = c2^h + u - 1$ so $\sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) = \sigma(k-1) - (\sigma(c) + \sigma(u-1)) = \sigma(k) - 1 + \nu(k) - \sigma(c) - \sigma(u) + 1 - \nu(u) = \sigma(k) + \nu(k) - \nu(u) - \sigma(c) - \sigma(u)$. Also $[n-1] \cap [n-k] = [(c-1)2^h] \cup ([u] \cap [u-1])$, so $\#([n-1] \cap [n-k] = \sigma(c) - 1 + \sigma(u) - 1$. Therefore, the shifted almost minimum zero estimate if $u \ne k$ is

$$\nu(S(n,k)) \ge \sigma(k) + \nu(k) - \nu(u) - \sigma(c) - \sigma(u) + \sigma(c) + \sigma(u) - 2$$
$$= \nu(k) + \sigma(k) - \nu(u) - 2$$

It remains to show that S(n,k) is a SAMZC (sharp estimate) iff u = 1, or u is a positive even integer which is less than or equal to $2^{\nu(k)-1}$, or $u = 1 + 2^{\nu(k)-1}$, or $u = 2^{\nu(k)} < k$. But $n - k + n - 1 = ((c-1)2^h + (2^h - k) + u) + (c2^h + u - 1)$, which has no unforced carry as long as $u \leq 2^{\nu(k)-1}$. Thus we have a SAMZC

(sharp estimate) iff the partition where $u_1 = n - k - 3$ and $u_3 = 1$ fails the criterion. If u is even then n - k is even, so this partition fails while if u is odd and $u \neq 1$, then the criterion is met, so again we don't have a sharp estimate unless $u = 1 + 2^{\nu(k)-1}$. For all other u, the criterion for a sharp estimate fails. This proof illustrates the fact that precisely one of the partitions must satisfy the criterion for a sharp estimate.

It is easy to see that if u = k so that $\sigma(k) = 1$, then $\nu(S(c2^h + u, k)) = 0$.

5 Proof of the asymptotic theorem 2.6

Proof of Theorem 2.6. We use the notations of the Appendix. (i) First consider the case where $\nu(k) < \nu(n)$, so $\nu(n-k) = \nu(k)$ and $2^{\nu(k)} \notin [n]$. Let $w(u) \le n-k$. Then if $d = n - k - 2^{\nu(k)}$, the number of carries for d + n is the same as the number of carries for n - k + n, so if $n - k \ge d \ge n - k - 2^{\nu(k)}$ then $\nu\binom{d+n}{n} \ge \nu\binom{n-k+n}{n}$. Since $n - k - \nu(u) \ge 0$, with equality iff $u_1 = n - k$, it follows that $\nu(t_u) \ge \nu\binom{n-k+n}{n}$, with equality iff $u_1 = n - k$. Thus the single partition $u_1 = n - k$ has the least 2-adic value among all these terms in this case.

If on the other hand $d < n - k - 2^{\nu(k)}$ then $n - k - d > 2^{\nu(k)}$. If h is such that $2^{\nu(k)+h-1} \ge \nu \binom{n-k+n}{n}$, replace (n,k) by $(2^hn, 2^hk)$. Then by Corollary 6.1, we have $n - k - \nu(u) > \nu \binom{n-k+n}{n}$, so again $\nu(t_u) > \nu \binom{n-k+n}{n}$. Therefore the single partition $u_1 = n - k$ gives the least value if $2^{\nu(k)+h-1} \ge \nu \binom{n-k+n}{n}$, and $\nu(S(2^hn, 2^hk)) = \sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \nu \binom{n+n-k}{n}$. (ii) The case where $\nu(n) = \nu(k)$ and $2^{\nu(n-k)} \in [k]$ is similar, namely in this

(ii) The case where $\nu(n) = \nu(k)$ and $2^{\nu(n-k)} \in [k]$ is similar, namely in this case $2^{\nu(n-k)} \notin [n]$, so we get the same value for $\nu(S(2^h n, 2^h k))$ if $2^{\nu(n-k)+h-1} \geq \nu\binom{n-k+n}{n}$.

(iii) If $\nu(k) > \nu(n)$, then $\nu(n-k) = \nu(n)$, and we consider $\nu(S(n,k)) = \nu\binom{n-1}{k-1} + \nu\left(B_{n-k}^{(-k+1)}(1)\right)$. Since $2^{\nu(n-k)} = \min([n])$, we now have $2^{\nu(n-k)} \notin [n-1]$, so essentially the same argument shows that the term when $u_1 = n-k$ is the single dominant term if $2^{\nu(n)+h-1} \ge \nu\binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$ and $\nu(S(2^hn, 2^hk)) = \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \nu\binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$.

(iv) The final case, when $\nu(n) = \nu(k)$ and $2^{\nu(n-k)} \in [n]$ is slightly more delicate. In this case $\nu(n) < \nu(n-k)$, and if $d > n-k-2^{\nu(n)} = n-k-2^{\nu(n-k)}+2^{\nu(n-k)}-2^{\nu(n)}$ then $d = n-k-2^{\nu(n-k)}+2^{\nu(n)}+\delta$, where $0 < \delta < 2^{\nu(n)}$. Then $[\delta] \cap [n-1] \neq \emptyset$, so if we consider d + n - 1, we get an unforced carry in power $2^{\nu(n)}$, which in turn leads to an unforced carry in power $2^{\nu(n-k)}$. Thus $\nu\binom{d+n-1}{n-1} \ge \nu\binom{n-k+n-1}{n-1}$. Finally, if $2^{\nu(n)+h-1} > \nu\binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$ then the terms when $d \le n-k-2^n$ have bigger value, so again $\nu(S(2^hn,2^hk)) = \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \nu\binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$. The partition when $u_1 = n-k$ is again dominant.

Corollary 5.1. (Central Stirling numbers) $\lim_{h\to\infty} \nu(S(2^{h+1}k, 2^hk)) = \nu\binom{3k}{k}$ and $\nu(S(2^{h+1}k, 2^hk)) = \nu\binom{3k}{k}$ if $2^{h-1+\nu(k)} \ge \nu\binom{3k}{k}$. *Proof.* This follows immediately from the first case of the preceding theorem. \Box

Remark. Since $\binom{n+n-k}{n} = \frac{n+n-k}{n} \binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$, if $\nu(k) < \nu(n)$ then $\nu\left(\frac{n+n-k}{n}\right) = \nu\left(\frac{k}{n}\right) = \nu(k) - \nu(n)$ so $\sigma(k) - \sigma(n) + \nu\binom{n+n-k}{n} = \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \nu\binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$. If $\nu(k) = \nu(n)$ then $\nu\left(\frac{n+n-k}{n}\right) = 0$ and $\sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) = \sigma(k) - \sigma(n)$, so again we get the same value for $\nu(S(2^hn, 2^hk))$. Thus

$$\lim_{h \to \infty} \nu(S(2^h n, 2^h k)) = \sigma(k-1) - \sigma(n-1) + \nu \binom{n-1+n-k}{n-1}$$

in all cases, which can easily be shown to agree with Lengyel's limit.

6 Appendix — Higher order Bernoulli numbers and polynomials

The higher order Bernoulli polynomials $B_n^{(l)}(x)$ are defined by

$$\left(\frac{t}{e^t - 1}\right)^l e^{tx} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} B_n^{(l)}(x) t^n / n!$$
(6.1)

In this paper we assume the order $l \in \mathbb{Z}$. If x = 0, we get the higher order Bernoulli numbers $B_n^{(l)}$, and we get the Appell property $B_n^{(l)}(x) = \sum_{i=0}^n {n \choose i} B_{n-i}^{(l)} x^i$. This polynomial is rational, monic and in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$.

These polynomials satisfy two recursions:

$$\left(B_n^{(l)}(x)\right)' = nB_{n-1}^{(l)}(x) \text{ and } \Delta(B_n^{(l)}(x)) = B_n^{(l)}(x+1) - B_n^{(l)}(x) = nB_{n-1}^{(l-1)}(x)$$
(6.2)

These recursions yield the recursive formula

$$B_n^{(l)} = \frac{l}{l-n} B_n^{(l+1)}(1) \tag{6.3}$$

If $u = (u_1, u_2, ...)$ is a sequence of natural numbers eventually zero, we regard u as a partition of the number $w = w(u) = \sum i u_i$, where u_i is the multiplicity of i in the partition and $d = d(u) = \sum u_i$ is the number of summands.

tiplicity of *i* in the partition and $d = d(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i$ is the number of summands. There is an explicit representation of $B_n^{(l)}$ in terms of the partitions, namely (cf. [1,2])

$$B_n^{(l)} = (-1)^n n! \sum_{w \le n} t_u (l - n - 1)$$
(6.4)

and also

$$B_n^{(l)}(1) = (-1)^n n! \sum_{w=n} t_u (l-n)$$
(6.5)

where $t_u = t_u(s) = {\binom{s}{d}} {\binom{d}{u}} / \Lambda^u$, where ${\binom{d}{u}} = {\binom{d}{u_1 u_2 \dots}}$ is a multinomial coefficient, $\Lambda^u = 2^{u_1} 3^{u_2} \cdots$, and $\nu(u) = \nu(\Lambda^u) = \sum u_i \nu(i+1)$.

There is a companion sequence $\tau_u = \tau_u(s) = (n)_w t_u$, where s = l - n - 1, which is important for the study of the $B_n^{(l)}(x)$. In particular, the maximum pole of $B_n^{(l)}(x)$ is the maximum pole of $\{\tau_u(l-n-1): w \leq n\}$. In [1] we showed that for p = 2 the maximum pole of $B_n^{(l)}(x)$ is $\#\{2^i \in [n]: 2 \nmid \binom{l-n-1}{2^i}\}$. We can use the same reduction method for p = 2 as in the proof of ([1], Lemma 3.1) to show that if τ_u has the maximum pole, then $u_i = 0$ for all i > 1, with the possible exception $u_3 = 1$, i.e., u is concentrated in places 1 and 3, with $u_3 \leq 1$: If $i \neq 1,3$ and $u_i \neq 0$ or if i = 3 and $u_i \geq 2$, delete u_i and increase u_1 by u_i . (We call this a transfer from place i to place 1.) This preserves d and decreases w. It is easy to see that this also decreases $\nu(\tau_u)$, so is impossible if τ_u has the maximum pole.

Since $n!t_u = (n-w)!\tau_u$, we see that $n!t_u$ has the maximum pole of $B_n^{(l)}(x)$ iff τ_u has the maximum pole and w = n - 1 or w = n.

For our application to Stirling numbers of the second kind, we replace n by n-k and l by -k. It follows that the maximum pole is #([n-k]-[n]), and by our analysis (cf. [1]), the first pole has order one, and occurs in codegree of the smallest element of [n-k]-[n], etc. That is how we get the Newton polygon of the higher order Bernoulli polynomial, which is particularly simple, the poles coming in increasing order without gaps (cf. [3]). Newton polygons are used in [10] in a different way.

Furthermore from our analysis of the possible maximum pole terms, we can show that $B_{n-k}^{(-k)}$ has the maximum pole iff precisely one of the following terms gives the maximum pole:

(i)
$$u_1 = n - k$$
, so $w = n - k = d$ and
 $t_u = (-1)^{n-k} \binom{n+n-k}{n} / 2^{n-k}$
(6.6)

(ii)
$$u_1 = n - k - 1$$
, so $w = n - k - 1 = d$ and

$$t_u = (-1)^{n-k-1} \binom{n+n-k-1}{n} / 2^{n-k-1}$$
(6.7)

or (iii) $u_1 = n - k - 3$ and $u_3 = 1$, so w = n - k and d = n - k - 2

and n-k is odd and greater than 1 and

$$t_u = (-1)^{n-k} \binom{n+n-k-2}{n} (n-k-2)/2^{n-k-1}$$
(6.8)

Remark. These three partitions are the ones that determine the mod 4 congruence for $2^{n-k}B_{n-k}^{(-k)}/(n-k)!$. The a priori possible term with $u_1 = n - k - 4$ and $u_3 = 1$ is eliminated in the proof of Theorem 3.3.

Finally, we give a new estimate that is very useful for our asymptotic analysis.

Theorem 6.1. Let $w \le n$. Then $n - \nu(u) \ge n - w + (w - d)/2$ and $n - \nu(u) = (w - d)/2$ iff n = w and u is concentrated in places 1 and 3.

Proof. Since $n - \nu(u) = n - w + w - \nu(u)$, it will suffice to prove that $w - \nu(u) \ge (w - d)/2$, with equality iff u is concentrated in places 1 and 3, i.e., we can assume w = n. But $w - \nu(u) - (w - d)/2 = \sum u_i(i - \nu(i + 1) - (i - 1)/2) = \frac{1}{2} \sum u_i(i + 1 - 2\nu(i + 1)) = \frac{1}{2} \sum u_i(j - 2\nu(j))$, where j = i + 1. But if j > 0, it is easy to see that $j \ge 2\nu(j)$ with equality iff j = 2 or j = 4.

Corollary 6.1. If $w \leq n$ then $n - \nu(u) \geq (n - d)/2$.

Note: For our applications we will often only have an estimate for n - d, so this is how typically we will use Theorem 6.1.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank E. A. Herman for his invaluable help in preparing this paper, and T. Lengyl for his generous advice and encouragement throughout its development.

REFERENCES

1. A. Adelberg, On the degrees of irreducible factors of higher order Bernoulli polynomials, *Acta Arith.* **62** (1992), 329-342.

2. A. Adelberg, Congruences of *p*-adic integer order Bernoulli numbers, *J. Number Theory* **59** No. 2 (1996), 374-388.

3. A. Adelberg, Higher order Bernoulli polynomials and Newton polygons, G. E. Bergum et al (eds.), *Applications of Fibonacci Numbers* **7** (1998), 1-8.

4. A. Adelberg, The *p*-adic analysis of Stirling numbers via higher order Bernoulli numbers, *Int. J. Number Theory* **14** (2018), No. 10, 2767-2779.

5. T. Amdeberhan, D. Manna and V. Moll, The 2-adic valuation of Stirling numbers, *Experimental Math.* **17** (2008), 69-82.

6. O-Y. Chan and D. Manna, Divisibility properties of Stirling numbers of the second kind, Proceedings of the Conference on Experimental Math., T. Amdeberhan, L. A. Medina, and V. Moll eds., *Experimental Math.* (2009).

7. S. De Wannemacker, On 2-adic orders of Stirling numbers of the second kind, Integers Electronic Journal of Combinatorial Number Theory, 5 (1) (2005), A21, 7 pp. (electronic).

8. S. Hong J. Zhao, and W. Zhao, The 2-adic valuations of Stirling numbers of the second kind, *Int. J. Number Theory* 8 (2012), 1057-1066.

9. S. Hong, J. Zhao, and W. Zhao, Divisibility by 2 of Stirling numbers of the second kind and their differences, *J. Number Theory* **140** (2014), 324-348.

10. T. Komatsu and P. T. Young, Exact *p*-adic valuations of Stirling numbers of the first kind, *J. Number Theory* **177** (2017), 20-27.

11. T. Lengyel, On the divisibility by 2 of the Stirling numbers of the second kind, *Fibonacci Quart.* **32** (3) (1994), 194-201.

12. T. Lengyel, On the 2-adic order of Stirling numbers of the second kind and their differences, *DMTCS Proc. AK* (2009), 561-572.

13. T. Lengyel, Alternative proofs on the 2-adic order of Stirling numbers of the second kind, *Integers* **10** (2010), A38, 453-468.