other sporadic simple groups). Its theta series is the unique modular form of weight 12 on \( \Gamma_1 \) with Fourier expansion starting \( 1 + 0q + \cdots \), so it must equal \( E_{12}(z) - \frac{21736}{691}\Delta(z) \), i.e., the number \( r_{\text{Leech}}(n) \) of vectors of length \( 2n \) in the Leech lattice equals \( \frac{21736}{691}(\sigma_{11}(n) - \tau(n)) \) for every positive integer \( n \). This gives another proof and an interpretation of Ramanujan’s congruence (28).

In rank 32, things become even more interesting: here the complete classification is not known, and we know that we cannot expect it very soon, because there are more than 80 million isomorphism classes! This, too, is a consequence of the theory of modular forms, but of a much more sophisticated part than we are presenting here. Specifically, there is a fundamental theorem of Siegel saying that the average value of the theta series associated to the quadratic forms in a single genus (we omit the definition) is always an Eisenstein series. Specialized to the particular case of even unimodular forms of rank \( m = 2k \equiv 0 \pmod{8} \), which form a single genus, this theorem says that there are only finitely many such forms up to equivalence for each \( k \) and that, if we number them \( Q_1, \ldots, Q_I \), then we have the relation

\[
\sum_{i=1}^I \frac{1}{w_i} \Theta_{Q_i}(z) = m_k E_k(z),
\]

where \( w_i \) is the number of automorphisms of the form \( Q_i \) (i.e., the number of matrices \( \gamma \in \text{SL}(m, \mathbb{Z}) \) such that \( Q_i(\gamma x) = Q_i(x) \) for all \( x \in \mathbb{Z}^m \)) and \( m_k \) is the positive rational number given by the formula

\[
m_k = \frac{B_k}{2k} \frac{B_2}{4} \frac{B_4}{8} \cdots \frac{B_{2k-2}}{4k-4},
\]

where \( B_i \) denotes the \( i \)th Bernoulli number. In particular, by comparing the constant terms on the left- and right-hand sides of (39), we see that \( \sum_{i=1}^I 1/w_i = m_k \), the Minkowski-Siegel mass formula. The numbers \( m_4 \approx 1.44 \times 10^{-9} \), \( m_8 \approx 2.49 \times 10^{-18} \) and \( m_{12} \approx 7.94 \times 10^{-15} \) are small, but \( m_{16} \approx 4.03 \times 10^{7} \) (the next two values are \( m_{20} \approx 4.39 \times 10^{51} \) and \( m_{24} \approx 1.53 \times 10^{121} \)), and since \( w_i \geq 2 \) for every \( i \) (one has at the very least the automorphisms \( \pm \text{Id}_m \)), this shows that \( I > 80000000 \) for \( m = 32 \) as asserted.

A further consequence of the fact that \( \Theta_Q \in M_k(\Gamma_1) \) for \( Q \) even and unimodular of rank \( m = 2k \) is that the minimal value of \( Q(x) \) for non-zero \( x \in \Lambda \) is bounded by \( r = \text{dim} M_k(\Gamma_1) = \lceil k/12 \rceil + 1 \). The lattice \( L \) is called extremal if this bound is attained. The three lattices of rank 8 and 16 are extremal for trivial reasons. (Here \( r = 1 \).) For \( m = 24 \) we have \( r = 2 \) and the only extremal lattice is the Leech lattice. Extremal unimodular lattices are also known to exist for \( m = 32, 40, 48, 56, 64 \) and 80, while the case \( m = 72 \) is open. Surprisingly, however, there are no examples of large rank:

**Theorem (Mallows–Odlyzko–Sloane).** There are only finitely many non-isomorphic extremal even unimodular lattices.
We sketch the proof, which, not surprisingly, is completely modular. Since there are only finitely many non-isomorphic even unimodular lattices of any given rank, the theorem is equivalent to saying that there is an absolute bound on the value of the rank \( m \) for extremal lattices. For simplicity, let us suppose that \( m = 24n \). (The cases \( m = 24n + 8 \) and \( m = 24n + 16 \) are similar.) The theta series of any extremal unimodular lattice of this rank must be equal to the unique modular form \( f_n \in M_{24n}(S\ell(2, \mathbb{Z})) \) whose \( q \)-development has the form \( 1 + \mathcal{O}(q^{n+1}) \). By an elementary argument which we omit but which the reader may want to look for, we find that this \( q \)-development has the form

\[
f_n(z) = 1 + n a_n q^{n+1} + \left( \frac{nb_n}{2} - 24n(n+31)a_n \right) q^{n+2} + \cdots
\]

where \( a_n \) and \( b_n \) are the coefficients of \( \Delta(z)^n \) in the modular functions \( j(z) \) and \( j(z)^2 \), respectively, when these are expressed (locally, for small \( q \)) as Laurent series in the modular form \( \Delta(z) = q - 24q^2 + 252q^3 - \cdots \). It is not hard to show that \( a_n \) has the asymptotic behavior \( a_n \approx \Lambda^{-3/2}C^n \) for some constants \( \Lambda = 225153.793389 \cdots \) and \( C = 1/\Delta(z_0) = 69.1164201716 \cdots \), where \( z_0 = 0.5235217017992\cdots \) is the unique zero on the imaginary axis of the function \( E_2(z) \) defined in (17) (this is because \( E_2(z) \) is the logarithmic derivative of \( \Delta(z) \)), while \( b_n \) has a similar expansion but with \( A \) replaced by \( 2\Lambda A \) with \( \lambda = j(z_0) - 720 = 163067.793145 \cdots \). It follows that the coefficient \( \frac{1}{2}nb_n - 24n(n+31)a_n \) of \( q^{n+2} \) in \( f_n \) is negative for \( n \) larger than roughly 6800, corresponding to \( m \approx 163000 \), and that therefore extremal lattices of rank larger than this cannot exist.

\[\heartsuit\]

\section*{Drums Whose Shape One Cannot Hear}

Marc Kac asked a famous question, “Can one hear the shape of a drum?” Expressed more mathematically, this means: can there be two riemannian manifolds (in the case of real “drums” these would presumably be two-dimensional manifolds with boundary) which are not isometric but have the same spectra of eigenvalues of their Laplace operators? The first example of such a pair of manifolds to be found was given by Milnor, and involved 16-dimensional closed “drums.” More drum-like examples consisting of domains in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) with polygonal boundary are now also known, but they are difficult to construct, whereas Milnor’s example is very easy. It goes as follows. As we already mentioned, there are two non-isomorphic even unimodular lattices \( A_1 = \Gamma_8 \oplus \Gamma_8 \) and \( A_2 = \Gamma_{16} \) in dimension 16. The fact that they are non-isomorphic means that the two Riemannian manifolds \( M_1 = \mathbb{R}^{16}/A_1 \) and \( M_2 = \mathbb{R}^{16}/A_2 \), which are topologically both just tori \( (S^1)^{16} \), are not isometric to each other. But the spectrum of the Laplace operator on any torus \( \mathbb{R}^n/A \) is just the set of norms \( \|\lambda\|^2 \) (\( \lambda \in A \)), counted with multiplicities, and these spectra agree for \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) because the theta series \( \sum_{\lambda \in A_1} q^{\|\lambda\|^2} \) and \( \sum_{\lambda \in A_2} q^{\|\lambda\|^2} \) coincide.

\[\heartsuit\]
\[ \#(L_{24}, 2m) = \frac{65520}{691}(\sigma_{11}(m) - \tau(m)) \quad \text{für alle} \quad m \geq 1. \]

Aus Korollar A, Korollar 6A, Satz III.4.3 und 1(4) folgt man direkt das

**Korollar B.** Für positives \( k \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \) ist jedes \( f \in \mathcal{M}_k \) eine Linearkombination von Theta-Reihen zu geraden, unimodularen, positiv definiten \( 2k \times 2k \) Matrizen.

**Bemerkung.** Das zur Matrix \( L_{24} \) gehörige Gitter wurde von J. LEECH im Jahre 1967 (Canadian J. Math. 19, 251–265) im Zusammenhang mit der dichtesten Kugelpackung im \( \mathbb{R}^{24} \) konstruiert. Aus der in Bemerkung 5b) erwähnten Klassifikation von H. NIEMEIER ergibt sich, dass es nur eine Klasse \( \langle S \rangle \) von geraden, unimodularen Matrizen in \( \text{Pos}(24; \mathbb{Z}) \) mit \( \mu(S) > 2 \) gibt. Also ist die Klasse \( \langle L_{24} \rangle \) durch die Bedingung (3) eindeutig bestimmt. Zur Konstruktion und Klassifikation von Gittern vergleiche man J.H. CONWAY und N.J.A. SLOANE [1999]. Insbesondere findet man dort eine Konstruktion des LEECH-Gitteriss.-Vs mit Hilfe von Codes und mit der KNESERSchen Nachbarschaftsmethode

---

8*. **Extremale Gitter.** Das Minimum \( \mu(S) \) (vgl. 1.5(1)) einer unimodularen Matrix \( S \in \text{Pos}(n; \mathbb{Z}) \) kann nicht beliebig groß werden. Aus der Ungleichung von HERMITE in Korollar 1.5A folgt

\[ \mu(S) \leq \left( \frac{4}{3} \right)^{(n-1)/2}. \]

Ist \( S \) gerade, so kann man diese Abschätzung wesentlich verbessern.

**Satz.** Sei \( S \in \text{Pos}(n; \mathbb{Z}) \) gerade und unimodular. Dann gilt

\[ \mu(S) \leq 2 \left[ \frac{n}{24} \right] + 2. \]

**Beweis.** Wir führen den Beweis indirekt und nehmen an, dass \( \mu(S) > 2 \left[ \frac{n}{24} \right] + 2 \) gilt. Man betrachte die Theta-Reihe

\[ \Theta(\cdot; S) \in \mathcal{M}_k, \quad k = n/2, \]

nach Satz 6. Die FOURIER-Koeffizienten erfüllen dann

\[ \#(S, 0) = 1, \quad \#(S, 2m) = 0, \quad 1 \leq m \leq \left[ \frac{k}{12} \right] + 1. \]

Wegen \( \dim \mathcal{M}_k = \left[ \frac{k}{12} \right] + 1 \) nach III.4.1 für \( k \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \) erhalten wir einen Widerspruch zu Korollar III.6.5. \( \square \)

Eine gerade, unimodulare Matrix \( S \in \text{Pos}(n; \mathbb{Z}) \) mit \( \mu(S) = 2 \left[ \frac{n}{24} \right] + 2 \) nennt man extremal. Ist \( G \) ein gerades, selbstduales Gitter in einem euklidischen Vektorraum \( (V, \sigma) \), so heißt \( G \) extremal, wenn die zugehörige GRAM-Matrix extremal ist, d.h.

\[ \sigma(g, g) \geq 2 \left[ \frac{n}{24} \right] + 2 \quad \text{für alle} \quad g \in G, \quad g \neq 0. \]
Es ist nun wesentlich zu zeigen, dass $\beta_k(0) \neq 0$ gilt.

**Satz.** Für gerades $k \geq 4$ gilt

$$(-1)^{k/2} \beta_k(0) < 0.$$  

**Beweis.** (i) Sei $k \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$. Dann gilt

$$G_{12t-k+2}^{*} = C_4^{*\nu}, \quad \nu \in \{0, 1, 2\},$$

wenn man 4.2(2) und 2.1(10) beachtet. Aus (3) und (5) folgt dann

$$\beta_k(m) > 0 \quad \text{für alle} \quad m \geq -t.$$

(ii) Sei $k \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, $k \equiv 4\nu \pmod{12}$ mit $\nu \in \{0, 1, 2\}$. Dann gilt

$$G_{k-12t+12}^{*} = G_4^{*\nu}.$$  

Verwendet man (4) und 2.4(1), so liefert eine einfache Rechnung

$$2\pi i \cdot g_k = -G_4^{*\nu} \cdot \Delta^{*1-t} \cdot \frac{dj}{d\tau} = \frac{3}{\nu - 3} \Delta^{*1-t-\nu/3} \cdot \frac{dj^{1-\nu/3}}{d\tau} \Delta^{s-t} + \frac{3t + \nu - 3}{(3 - \nu)t} G_4^{*3-\nu} \cdot \frac{d\Delta^{s-t}}{d\tau}.$$  

Der letzte Darstellung entnimmt man, dass $\beta_k(0)$ auch der konstante Koeffizient in der FOURIER-Entwicklung von

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \cdot \frac{3t + \nu - 3}{(3 - \nu)t} \cdot G_4^{*3-\nu} \cdot \frac{d}{d\tau} \Delta^{s-t}$$

ist. Alle FOURIER-Koeffizienten $\alpha(m), \ m \geq 0$, von $G_4^{*3-\nu}$ sind positiv. Aus (5) schließt man, dass für die FOURIER-Koeffizienten $\gamma(m)$ von $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \cdot \frac{d}{d\tau} \Delta^{s-t}$ gilt

$$\gamma(m) < 0 \quad \text{für} \quad -t \leq m < 0 \quad \text{und} \quad \gamma(0) = 0.$$  

Daraus folgt

$$\beta_k(0) < 0.$$
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Let \( W(z) = 1 + A_d e^{2\pi i d z} + A_{d+1} e^{2\pi i (d+1) z} + \cdots \) be a modular form of weight \( n \) for the full modular group. Then for every constant \( b \) there exists an \( n_0 = n_0(b) \) such that if \( d > n/6 - b \) and \( n > n_0 \), then one of \( A_d, A_{d+1}, \ldots \) has a negative real part. This implies that there is no even unimodular lattice in \( E^n \), for \( n > n_0 \), having minimum nonzero squared length \( > n/12 - b \). A similar argument shows that there is no binary self-dual code of length \( n > n_0 \) having all weights divisible by 4 and minimum nonzero weight \( > n/6 - b \). A corresponding result holds for ternary codes.

1. MODULAR FORMS

Let \( E_2(z) = 1 + 240 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sigma_3(r) q^r, E_3(z) = 1 - 504 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \sigma_6(r) q^r, \Delta(z) = q \prod_{n=1}^\infty (1 - q^n)^{24} \), where \( q = e^{2\pi iz}, \sigma_n(r) = \sum_{d|n} d^n \). Then \( E_2, E_3, \Delta \) are modular forms (for the full modular group) of weights 2, 3, 6, respectively. Furthermore any modular form of weight \( n \) can be written as

\[
W(z) = \sum_{2s+3t=n} c_s E_2^s E_3^t,
\]
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where there are \( \mu + 1 \) complex constants \( c_s \) in the sum, and \( \mu = \lfloor n/6 \rfloor - 1 \) if \( n \equiv 1 \pmod{6} \), \( \mu = \lfloor n/6 \rfloor \) if \( n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{6} \) [8, 13].

**Theorem 1.** Let \( b \) be any constant. Then there exists a constant \( n_0(b) \) such that if

\[
W(q) = 1 + A_d q^d + A_{d+1} q^{d+1} + \ldots
\]

is a modular form of weight \( n \geq n_0(b) \) with \( d \geq \mu + 1 - b \), then one of the coefficients \( A_d, A_{d+1}, \ldots \) has a negative real part.

**Remark.** An explicit bound for \( n_0(b) \) could also be obtained by our methods.

## 2. Lattices

Let \( L \) be an even unimodular lattice in Euclidean space \( E^n \), where \( n \) is a multiple of 8. Let \( A_r \) be the number of lattice points of squared length \( 2r \), let \( d \) be the smallest nonzero squared length of any lattice point, and let

\[
W(z) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} A_r z^r = 1 + A_{d/2} z^{d/2} + A_{d/2+1} z^{d/2+1} + \ldots
\]

Then \( W(z) \) is a modular form of weight \( n/4 \) [8, 13]. Lattices with \( d = 2[n/24] + 2 \) are known for small \( n \) [9, 10], and have connections with simple groups [4, 5]. However, Theorem 1 implies:

**Corollary.** If \( b \) is any constant, an even unimodular lattice with \( d \geq 2[n/24] + 2 - 2b \) does not exist for \( n \geq n_0(b) \).

[The proof shows that for \( d = 2[n/24] + 2 \), the coefficient \( A_{d/2+1} \) first goes negative when \( n \) is about 41,000. But other coefficients may go negative before this.]

## 3. Codes

Let \( s = 8j = 24\mu + 8r \), \( v = 0, 1 \) or \( 2 \). Let \( C \) be a binary self-dual code of length \( n \) (i.e., a self-dual subspace of \( GF(2)^n \)) with the property that the weight of every codeword is a multiple of 4. Let \( A_r \) be the number of codewords of weight \( 4r \), and let \( W(q) = \sum_{r=0}^{n/4} A_r q^r \). Then \( W(q) \) can be written as

\[
W(q) = \sum_{s=0}^{n} c_s f^{j-3a} g^s
\]  

(2)
for suitable real constants \(c_s\), where \(f = 1 + 14q + q^2, g = q(1 - q)^4\) [6, 2, 11]. Codes with minimum nonzero weight \(4[n/24] + 4\) are known for small \(n\) [12]. Besides having high error-correcting capability, such codes are of combinatorial interest because they contain 5-designs [1]. However, we show:

**Theorem 2.** Let \(b\) be any constant. Suppose the \(c_s\) in (2) are chosen so that

\[
W(q) = 1 + \frac{A_{d/4}q^2}{2} + \frac{A_{d/4+1}q^{2+4}}{4} + \cdots
\]

where \(d \geq 4[n/24] + 4 - 4b\). Then one of the coefficients \(A_{d/4}, A_{d/4+1}, \ldots\) is negative, for all sufficiently large \(n\).

**Corollary.** If \(b\) is any constant, then a binary self-dual code of length \(n\) with all weights divisible by 4 and with minimum nonzero weight \(d \geq 4[n/24] + 4 - 4b\) does not exist, for all sufficiently large \(n\).

This result was proved for \(b < 0\) in [12], and for \(b = 0\) by Goethals, MacWilliams, and Mallows [7] using a different method.

When \(b = 0, d = 4[n/24] + 4\), the proof shows that \(A_{d/4+1}\) first goes negative when \(n\) is about 3720. We have confirmed this by computer: for \(n = 3720, b = 0, d = 624\), we find

\[
W(q) = 1 + A_{156}q^{156} + A_{157}q^{157} + \cdots + A_{724}q^{724} + q^{689},
\]

with \(A_{156} = 1.16 \times 10^{170}, A_{157} = -5.84 \times 10^{170}, A_0 > 0\) for 158 \(\leq i \leq 465\), and \(A_{689-1} = A_i\) for all \(i\).

A similar argument establishes the corresponding result for self-dual codes over \(GF(3)\):

**Theorem 3.** If \(b\) is any constant, then a ternary self-dual code of length \(n\) with minimum nonzero weight \(\geq 3[n/12] + 3 - 3b\) does not exist, for all sufficiently large \(n\).

This result was proved for \(b \leq 0\) in [12]. For \(b = 0\), the first negative coefficient in \(W(q)\) occurs when \(n = 72\), as found by J. N. Pierce (see [6]).

### 4. Two Lemmas

**Lemma 1.** Suppose \(G(q), H(q)\) are analytic inside the circle \(|q| = 1\) and satisfy:

(i) \(H(q) = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} H_s q^s\) with \(H_0 > 0, H_1 > 0,\) and \(H_s \geq 0\) for \(s \geq 2;\)
(ii) if \(F(y) = e^{2\pi i H(e^{-2\pi iv})}\), then \(F'(y) = 0\) has a solution \(y = y_0\) in the range \(y > 0, with F(y_0) = c_1 > 0, F'(y_0)/F(y_0) = c_2 > 0, G(e^{-2\pi iy}) \neq 0.\) Then \(\beta_r\), the coefficient of \(q_r\) in \(G(q) H(q)^r\), satisfies

\[
\beta_r \sim \frac{2\pi}{(r c_2)^{1/2}} G(e^{-2\pi i y_0}) c_1^r, \quad as \ r \to \infty.
\]
Proof. From Cauchy’s formula

\[ \beta_r = \int e^{-2\pi i x} G(e^{2\pi i z}) H(e^{2\pi i z})^r \, dz \]

where the integral is along the path \( z = x + iy, -\frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{3}, y \) fixed \( > 0 \). We estimate this integral by the saddle-point method. From (i), \( |e^{-2\pi i x} H(e^{2\pi i z})| \leq e^{2\pi y} H(e^{-2\pi y}) \), with equality for \( -\frac{1}{3} \leq x \leq \frac{1}{3} \) only at \( x = 0 \). Thus the saddle point is at \( \xi = 0 + iy_0 \), and we choose \( y = y_0 \) in the integral. Let \( f(z) = e^{-2\pi i z} H(e^{2\pi i z}) \). Since \( H \) is analytic,

\[ \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \ln f(z) \bigg|_{z=\xi} = \frac{1}{i} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \ln f(z) \bigg|_{z=\xi} = \frac{F'(y_0)}{iF(y_0)} = 0, \]
\[ \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} \ln f(z) \bigg|_{z=\xi} = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \ln f(z) \bigg|_{z=\xi} = -\frac{F''(y_0)}{F(y_0)} = -c_3. \]

The result now follows by standard techniques [3, Section 4.4]. (Note that in that reference \( a_3, a_4, ... \) do not have to be real for the result to hold.)

Lemma 2. Let \( \beta_{st} \) (0 \( \leq t \leq s \leq n \)) be numbers such that \( 1/c \leq |\beta_{st}| \leq c \) for some constant \( c > 0 \). Then there exists a constant \( d = d(c, n) > 0 \), such that

\[ \sum_{s=0}^{n} \left| \sum_{t=0}^{s} \beta_{st} X_t \right| \geq d \sum_{t=0}^{n} |X_t|. \]

Proof. By induction on \( n \). The result is true for \( n = 0 \). Now suppose \( n > 0 \) and the result is true for \( n - 1 \). Let \( Q \) denote the expression on the left. By the induction hypothesis, there exists \( d_1 > 0 \) such that

\[ Q \geq d_1 \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} |X_t| + |\beta_{s0}X_0 + \cdots + \beta_{sn}X_n| \]

\[ = d_1 \left( \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} |X_t| + |B_0X_0 + \cdots + B_nX_n| \right), \]

where \( B_t = \beta_{st}/d_1 \). Note that \( 1/cd_1 \leq |B_t| \leq c/d_1 \).

Case (i). Suppose \( |X_n| \geq 2c^2 \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} |X_t| \). Then

\[ \left| \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} B_t X_t \right| \leq \frac{c}{d_1} \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} |X_t| \leq \frac{1}{2cd_1} |X_n| \leq \frac{1}{2} |B_nX_n|, \]
\[ \left| \sum_{t=0}^{n} B_t X_t \right| \geq |B_nX_n| - \left| \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} B_t X_t \right| \geq \frac{1}{2} |B_nX_n| \geq \frac{1}{2cd_1} |X_n|, \]
and so

\[ Q \geq d_1 \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{2c d_1} \right\} \sum_0^n |X_t| \]

Case (ii). On the other hand, if \( |X_n| < 2c^2 \sum_0^{n-1} |X_t| \), then

\[ \sum_0^n |X_t| \leq (1 + 2c^2) \sum_0^{n-1} |X_t| \]

and so

\[ Q \geq d_1 \sum_0^{n-1} |X_t| \geq \frac{d_1}{1 + 2c^2} \sum_0^n |X_t| \]

In either case, \( Q \geq d \sum_0^n |X_t| \), where \( d = \min\{d_1, 1/2c, d_1/(1 + 2c^2)\} \).

5. The Proofs of Theorems 1, 2 and 3

Proof of Theorem 1

Part (I), \( n \) even. Let \( n = 2j = 6\mu + 2\nu \), \( \nu = 0, 1 \) or \( 2 \). Since \( \Delta = (1/1728)(E_2^3 - E_2^2) \), we can express \( W(z) \) in terms of \( E_2 \) and \( \Delta \). We first treat the case \( b \leq 0, d \geq \mu + 1 \). Suppose

\[ W(z) = \sum_{s=0}^{\mu} a_s E_2^{j-3s} \Delta^s, \]  

where the \( a_s \) are chosen so that

\[ W(z) = 1 + \sum_{r=\mu+1}^{\infty} A_r q^r. \]

Since both \( E_2 \) and \( \Delta \) have real coefficients in their \( q \)-expansions, both the \( a_s \) and the \( A_r \) are real. We will show \( A_{\mu+1} > 0 \) for all \( n \), and \( A_{\mu+2} = -A_{\mu+1}(24\mu + O(1)) < 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \).

Let \( \varphi = \varphi(q) = \Delta/E_2^3 \). We expand \( E_2^{-j} \) in powers of \( \varphi \) using Bürmann’s theorem [14, p. 128]:

\[ E_2^{-j} = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \alpha_s \varphi^s, \]

where

\[ \alpha_s = \frac{1}{s!} \frac{d^{s-1}}{dq^{s-1}} \left\{ \frac{d E_2^{-j}}{dq} \frac{\varphi^s}{\varphi} \right\}_{q=0} \]

\[ = \frac{-j}{s!} \frac{d^{s-1}}{dq^{s-1}} (E_2 E_2^{2s-j-1} H)_{q=0} \]
where \( h(q) = \prod_{r=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^r)^{-24} \). In particular,

\[
\alpha_{\mu+1} = -\frac{j}{(\mu + 1)!} \frac{d^\mu}{dq^{\mu}} (E^2_2 E^{2-\nu \mu+1}_2)_{q=0},
\]

\( \alpha_{\mu+2} = -\frac{j}{(\mu + 2)!} \frac{d^{\mu+1}}{dq^{\mu+1}} (E^2_2 E^{5-\nu \mu+2}_2)_{q=0}. \)

From (3), (4), (5) we see that \( a_s = \alpha_s (0 \leq s \leq \mu) \) and that the \( \alpha_s (s > \mu) \) and \( A_\mu \) are related by

\[
\sum_{r=\mu+1}^{\infty} A_\mu q^r = -\sum_{s=\mu+1}^{\infty} \alpha_s E^{2-\nu \alpha}_2 A^s.
\]

Equating coefficients of \( q^{\mu+1} \) and \( q^{\mu+2} \) we find

\[
A_{\mu+1} = -\alpha_{\mu+1},
\]

\[
A_{\mu+2} = -\alpha_{\mu+2} + \alpha_{\mu+1} (24\mu - 240\nu + 744).
\]

That \( \alpha_{\mu+1} < 0 \) and \( A_{\mu+1} > 0 \) follows immediately from (7) and (9) since \( E^2_2 \) and \( h \) have positive coefficients. We now show that \( |\alpha_{\mu+2}/\alpha_{\mu+1}| \) is bounded, which implies using (10) that \( A_{\mu+2} = -A_{\mu+1} (24\mu + O(1)) < 0 \) as \( n \to \infty \).

We apply Lemma 1 with \( G(q) = G_2(q) = E^2_2(q) E^{2-\nu \mu}_2 h(q), H(q) = h(q) \). Now

\[
\frac{F'(y)}{F(y)} = 2\pi - 48\pi \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{r}{e^{2\pi ry} - 1},
\]

\[
\frac{F''(y)}{F(y)} = \left( \frac{F'(y)}{F(y)} \right)^2 + 96\pi^2 \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \frac{r^2 e^{2\pi ry}}{(e^{2\pi ry} - 1)^2}.
\]

Thus for \( y > 0 \), \( F(y) > 0 \) and \( F''(y) > 0 \). Also \( F'(y)/F(y) \) is a monotonic increasing function of \( y \), which is negative for small \( y \) and positive for large \( y \). Therefore \( F'(y) = 0 \) has a unique solution for \( y > 0 \) (at \( y = y_0 = 0.52352... \)). Thus hypothesis (ii) of the lemma is satisfied. Then, from (7),

\[
\alpha_{\mu+1} \sim -2\pi j c_{2}^{1/2} \mu^{3/2} G_1(e^{-2\pi y_0}) c_1 \mu, \quad \text{as } \mu \to \infty,
\]

where \( c_1 = 69.1... \), \( c_2 \) are constants. Similarly from (8), with \( G_2(q) = E^2_2(q) E^{2-\nu}_2 h(q), H(q) = h(q) \),

\[
\alpha_{\mu+2} \sim -2\pi j c_{2}^{-1/2} \mu^{3/2} G_2(e^{-2\pi y_0}) c_1^{\mu+1}, \quad \text{as } \mu \to \infty.
\]

Hence \( |\alpha_{\mu+2}/\alpha_{\mu+1}| \) is bounded. (In fact it approaches a limit of about \( 1.64 \times 10^5 \) as \( \mu \to \infty \).)
We now treat the case $b > 0$, $d = \mu + 1 - b$. Let $W_{\text{ext}}(z)$ denote the extremal $W(z)$ defined by (3), (4). We complete part (I) of the proof by showing that no matter how the coefficients $x_0, \ldots, x_{b-1}$ are chosen,

\[
W(z) = W_{\text{ext}}(z) + \sum_{s=0}^{b-1} x_{b-1-s} E_2^{s+3} A^{s-z}
\]

\[
= 1 + \sum_{r=0}^{d} A_r' q^r \quad \text{(say)}
\]

always contains a coefficient $A_r'$ with negative real part when $n$ is sufficiently large. Since $E_2$ and $A$ have real coefficients, we may assume that the $x_i$ are real (otherwise replace the $x_i$ by their real parts). In fact, we show that the assumptions

\[
A_{d'} \geq 0, A_{d'+1} \geq 0, \ldots, A_{\mu+2} \geq 0
\]

lead to a contradiction for large $n$. Upon expanding (11), the $b + 2$ inequalities (12) become, with $m = 24\mu$,

\[
x_0 \geq 0,
\]

\[
\sum_{t=0}^{b-1} x_t \left( \frac{(-m)^{s-t}}{(s-t)!} + O(m^{s-t-1}) \right) \geq 0, \quad s = 1, \ldots, b - 1,
\]

\[
A_{\mu+1} + \sum_{t=0}^{b-1} x_t \left( \frac{(-m)^{b-t}}{(b-t)!} + O(m^{b-t-1}) \right) \geq 0,
\]

\[
-m A_{\mu+1} \left( 1 + O \left( \frac{1}{m} \right) \right) + \sum_{t=0}^{b-1} x_t \left( \frac{(-m)^{b+1-t}}{(b+1-t)!} + O(m^{b-t}) \right) \geq 0.
\]

Set

\[
X_t = \frac{x_t}{m^t} \quad (0 \leq t \leq b - 1), \quad X_b = \frac{A_{\mu+1}}{m^b}, \quad X_{b+1} = 0,
\]

and

\[
\beta_{s,t} = \frac{(-1)^{s-t}}{(s-t)!} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leq t \leq s \leq b + 1.
\]

The inequalities now reduce to

\[
\sum_{t=0}^{s} \left( \beta_{s,t} + O \left( \frac{1}{m} \right) \right) X_t \geq 0, \quad s = 0, \ldots, b + 1.
\]

(13)
Let $\gamma_s = (b + 1)!/(b + 1 - s)!$, and observe that $\sum_{t=0}^{b+1} \beta_{s,t} \gamma_s = 0$ for $t = 0, \ldots, b$. We obtain the contradiction by evaluating in two ways the sum

$$\sum_{t=0}^{b+1} X_t \sum_{s=t}^{b+1} \left( \beta_{s,t} + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \right) \gamma_s.$$ 

On the one hand it equals

$$\sum_{t=0}^{b+1} X_t \sum_{s=t}^{b+1} O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \gamma_s \leq \frac{c_d(b)}{m} \sum_{t=0}^{b+1} |X_t|,$$

while on the other hand it is equal to (from (13))

$$\sum_{s=0}^{b+1} \gamma_s \sum_{t=0}^{s} \left( \beta_{s,t} + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \right) X_t = \sum_{t=0}^{b+1} \gamma_s \sum_{s=0}^{t} \left( \beta_{s,t} + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \right) X_t.$$ 

and for $m$ sufficiently large,

$$\left| \beta_{s,t} + O\left(\frac{1}{m}\right) \right| \geq c_d(b) > 0.$$ 

It now follows from Lemma 2, with $\beta_{s,t}$ in the lemma replaced by $\beta_{s,t} + O(1/m)$, that the sum is

$$\geq c_d(b) \sum_{t=0}^{b+1} |X_t|.$$ 

This is a contradiction for large $m$, since $X_b$ is nonzero.

**Part (II), $n$ odd.** Let $n = 2j + 3 = 6\mu + 2\nu + 3$, $\nu = 0, 1$ or 2. Instead of (3) we write

$$W(x) = \sum_{s=0}^{\mu} a_s E_2^{3s} E_3^{-s},$$

and expand $E_2^{-1} E_3^{-1}$ in powers of $q$. The proof is now parallel to Part (I) and we omit the details.

**Proof of Theorem 2.** This is also parallel to Part (I), with $E_2$, $\Delta$ and $m = 24\mu$ replaced by $f$, $g$, and $m = 4\mu$. Again the details are omitted.

**Proof of Theorem 3.** This is again parallel to Part (I), with $E_2$, $\Delta$ and $m = 24\mu$ replaced by $1 + 8q$, $q(1 - q)^3$, and $m = 3\mu$. 
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