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#### Abstract

In this paper, we prove several new parity results for broken $k$-diamond partitions on certain types of arithmetic progressions. We also obtain bounds for the parity of broken $k$-diamond partitions and more general colored partitions.


## 1. Introduction

Ramanujan's beautiful work on congruences for the partition function has inspired many mathematicians to further explore this area. Andrews, Paule and Riese [2] introduced "partition diamonds" - a new variation of plane partitions studied by MacMahon in his book "Combinatory Analysis" [10]. For plane partitions, the non-negative integer parts $a_{i}$ satisfy the relations

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{1} \geq a_{2}, a_{1} \geq a_{3}, a_{2} \geq a_{4} \text { and } a_{3} \geq a_{4} . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Pictorially, one can represent this as a directed graph with the arrows describing the relation " $\geq$ ". The parts $a_{i}$ are placed at the vertices of a square and the arrow pointing from $a_{i}$ to $a_{j}$ depicts the relation $a_{i} \geq a_{j}$. For instance, Figure 1 represents the relations given in


Figure 1
(1.1). For the generating function for such partitions, MacMahon considered the generating series

$$
\sum_{a_{1}, a_{2}, a_{3}, a_{4}} x_{1}^{a_{1}} x_{2}^{a_{2}} x_{3}^{a_{3}} x_{4}^{a_{4}}=\frac{1-x_{1}^{2} x_{2} x_{3}}{\left(1-x_{1}\right)\left(1-x_{1} x_{2}\right)\left(1-x_{1} x_{3}\right)\left(1-x_{1} x_{2} x_{3}\right)\left(1-x_{1} x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}\right)},
$$

the sum being extended to all quadruples satisfying (1.1). Hence after substituting $q$ to each $x_{j}$, the closed form of the generating function of the number $A(n)$ of such quadruples is given by

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} A(n) q^{n}=\frac{1}{(1-q)\left(1-q^{2}\right)^{2}\left(1-q^{3}\right)}(|q|<1)
$$

Instead of using squares as building blocks of the chain, Andrews and Paule [1] considered $k$-elongated diamonds of length $m$. A $k$ - elongated diamond of length 1 and length $m$ are
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Figure 2
shown below in Figure 2 and Figure 3 respectively. A broken $k$-diamond [Figure 4] consists


Figure 3
of two separated $k$-elongated diamond partitions, each of length $m$, where in one of them the source (vertex with no incoming arrows) is deleted. For an integer $k \geq 0$, the number


Figure 4
of broken $k$-diamond partitions of a non-negative integer $n$ is denoted by $\Delta_{k}(n)$ and its generating function in [1] is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{k}(n) q^{n}=\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(1-q^{2 n}\right)\left(1-q^{(2 k+1) n}\right)}{\left(1-q^{n}\right)^{3}\left(1-q^{(4 k+2) n}\right)},|q|<1 . \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Throughout the paper, we assume $|q|<1$. Andrews and Paule [1] made the following conjectures about congruences satisfied by the broken 2-diamond partitions. For all nonnegative integers $n$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\Delta_{2}(10 n+2) & \equiv 0(\bmod 2),  \tag{1.3}\\
\Delta_{2}(25 n+14) & \equiv 0(\bmod 5), \tag{1.4}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta_{2}(625 n+314) \equiv 0\left(\bmod 5^{2}\right) \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hirschhorn and Sellers [9] proved (1.3) and more, including the following congruences. For all non-negative integers $n$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{1}(4 n+2) & \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \\
\Delta_{1}(4 n+3) & \equiv 0(\bmod 2)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\Delta_{2}(10 n+6) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) .
$$

Conjecture (1.4) was proved by Chan [6] who also gave a more general result involving higher powers of 5 in the modulus. Radu and Sellers [11] extended this list of congruences significantly. Their congruences concerned the parity of broken $k$-diamond partitions along arithmetic progressions of the form $a n+b$, where $a=4 k+2$.

In this paper, we discuss bounds on the parity of broken $k$-diamond partitions and prove congruences modulo 2 , including some ones for arithmetic progressions of the form $M(2 k+$ 1) $n+b$ for $M=4$ and $M=8$. Notice that the case $M=2$ has been considered by Radu and Sellers [11].

We now state our main results where simultaneous congruences $\Delta_{k}\left(a n+b_{i}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$, $1 \leq i \leq l$ are denoted as $\Delta_{k}\left(a n+b_{1}, b_{2}, \ldots, b_{l}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$.

Theorem 1.1. For any non-negative integer n,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Delta_{9}(76 n+11,15,27,39,43,47,51,59,67) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)  \tag{1.6}\\
& \Delta_{15}(124 n+10,26,30,38,42,50,54,58,62,78,86,94,98,102,122) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \tag{1.7}
\end{align*}
$$

Theorem 1.2. For any non-negative integer n,

$$
\Delta_{12}(10 n+9) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)
$$

Theorem 1.3. For any non-negative integer $k$, and for $N$ large enough,

$$
\#\left\{n \leq N: \Delta_{k}(n) \text { is odd }\right\} \geq N^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{c}{\log \log N}},
$$

for some positive real number c.
For $k, a, N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, define $\rho_{k}(a, b, N)$ to be the density of even values of $\Delta_{k}(a n+b)$ for $n$ up to $N$, that is,

$$
\rho_{k}(a, b, N):=\frac{\#\left\{n \in\{0, \ldots, N-1\}: \Delta_{k}(a n+b) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)\right\}}{N}
$$

For example, from (1.6), $\rho_{9}(76,11, N)=1$ for each $N$.
A natural question that arises is whether more generally the limit $\lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{k}(a, b, N)$ exists for any choice of $k, a$ and $b$.
Question: Is it true that for any $k, a \in \mathbb{N}$ and any non-negative integer $b$, the limit $\lim _{N \rightarrow \infty} \rho_{k}(a, b, N)$ exists?
In favor of a positive answer, in Table 1, we present the values of $\rho_{k}(1,0, N)$ for $0 \leq k \leq$ $10, a=1, b=0$, and some values of $N$ up to 20,000 .

| $k$ | $N:$ | 1000 | 2000 | 5000 | 10000 | 20000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.7220 | 0.7355 | 0.7476 | 0.7459 | 0.7498 |  |
| 1 | 0.7410 | 0.7455 | 0.7476 | 0.7488 | 0.7518 |  |
| 2 | 0.5770 | 0.5840 | 0.5864 | 0.5922 | 0.5927 |  |
| 3 | 0.7510 | 0.7720 | 0.7926 | 0.8076 | 0.8172 |  |
| 4 | 0.4960 | 0.5015 | 0.4998 | 0.5059 | 0.5030 |  |
| 5 | 0.7510 | 0.7640 | 0.7816 | 0.7900 | 0.7958 |  |
| 6 | 0.6190 | 0.6270 | 0.6066 | 0.6135 | 0.6174 |  |
| 7 | 0.6230 | 0.6450 | 0.6634 | 0.6773 | 0.6864 |  |
| 8 | 0.7280 | 0.7240 | 0.7280 | 0.7378 | 0.7441 |  |
| 9 | 0.6710 | 0.6825 | 0.7002 | 0.7120 | 0.7203 |  |
| 10 | 0.4870 | 0.4860 | 0.4944 | 0.4930 | 0.4999 |  |
|  | TABLE | 1. Values of $\rho_{k}(1,0, N)$ |  |  |  |  |

## 2. Congruences for $\Delta_{k}((8 k+4) n+b)$

In this section, we consider the congruences for broken $k$-diamond partitions along arithmetic progressions $a n+b$ with modulus $a=8 k+4$. The arithmetic progressions in Theorem 1.1 are of this form for $k=9$ and $k=15$. To prove Theorem 1.1, we use the following result which relates congruences along $(8 k+4) n+b$, for broken $k$-diamond partitions and $(2 k+1)$-core partitions. For the definitions and more on $t$-core partitions, the reader is referred to [3].

Lemma 2.1. For $n, b, k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$
\Delta_{k}((8 k+4) n+b) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \text { if and only if } a_{2 k+1}((8 k+4) n+b) \equiv 0(\bmod 2),
$$

where $a_{t}(n)$ denotes the number of $t$-core partitions of $n$.
Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary 1.2 in [11].
Therefore, in order to obtain the congruences in Theorem 1.1, it suffices to prove the following congruences for $(2 k+1)$-core partitions:

$$
\begin{align*}
& a_{19}(76 n+11,15,27,39,43,47,51,59,67) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)  \tag{2.1}\\
& a_{31}(124 n+10,26,30,38,42,50,54,58,62,78,86,94,98,102,122) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \tag{2.2}
\end{align*}
$$

We begin by introducing some notations and definitions to be used in Lemma 2.3, which plays a key role in proving these congruences.

Let $\Gamma:=S L_{2}(\mathbb{Z})$, and for a positive integer $N$, let

$$
\Gamma_{0}(N):=\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc}
x & y \\
z & w
\end{array}\right) \in \Gamma: N \mid z\right\} \text { and } \Gamma_{\infty}:=\left\{\left(\begin{array}{cc}
1 & h \\
0 & 1
\end{array}\right): h \in \mathbb{Z}\right\} .
$$

For $M \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$
R(M):=\left\{\mathbf{r}=\left(r_{\delta_{1}}, r_{\delta_{2}}, \ldots, r_{\delta_{D}}\right): r_{\delta_{i}} \in \mathbb{Z}, 1 \leq i \leq D\right\}
$$

where $\delta_{i}$ runs over the set of positive divisors of $M$ and $D$ is the number of such divisors. Next, for $\mathbf{r} \in R(M)$, we define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{\mathbf{r}}(n) q^{n}:=\prod_{\delta \mid M} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty}\left(1-q^{\delta n}\right)^{r_{\delta}} \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $m, M \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{r} \in R(M), t \in \mathbb{Z}_{m}, \kappa:=\operatorname{gcd}\left(m^{2}-1,24\right)$ and $\gamma=\left(\begin{array}{cc}x & y \\ z & w\end{array}\right) \in \Gamma$, let

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathcal{A}_{m, \mathbf{r}}(\gamma):=\min _{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{m}} \sum_{\delta \mid M} r_{\delta} \frac{(\operatorname{gcd}(\delta x+\delta \kappa \lambda z, m z))^{2}}{24 \delta m}  \tag{2.4}\\
& \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma):=\sum_{\delta \mid M} r_{\delta} \frac{(\operatorname{gcd}(\delta, z))^{2}}{24 \delta} \tag{2.5}
\end{align*}
$$

For $\mathbf{r} \in R(M)$, let $\pi(M, \mathbf{r})$ be the tuple of non-negative integers $(s, j)$ such that $\prod_{\delta \mid M} \delta^{\left|r r_{\delta}\right|}=$ $2^{s} j$ where $j$ is odd. For such $m, M, N, t$ and $\mathbf{r} \in R(M)$, we define the set $\Omega$ consisting of elements of the form ( $m, M, N, t, \mathbf{r}$ ) with the conditions:
(1) $\kappa N \sum_{\delta \mid M} r_{\delta} \frac{m N}{\delta} \equiv 0(\bmod 24)$ and $\kappa N \sum_{\delta \mid M} r_{\delta} \equiv 0(\bmod 8)$;
(2) either 4 divides $\kappa N$ and 8 divides $N s$, or 2 divides $s$ and 8 divides $N(1-j)$;
(3) $\frac{24 m}{\operatorname{gcd}\left(-24 \kappa t-\kappa \sum_{\delta \mid M} \delta r_{\delta}, 24 m\right)}$ divides $N$;
(4) $p|m \Rightarrow p| N$ for every prime $p$ and $\delta|M \Rightarrow \delta| m N$ for every $\delta$ with $r_{\delta} \neq 0$.

For a positive integer $m$, let $\mathbb{Z}_{m}$ be the set of residue classes modulo $m$ identified to the (ordered) set $\{0,1, \ldots, m-1\}$ and let $\mathbb{Z}^{*}{ }_{m}$ be the set of residues coprime to $m$. Let $\mathbb{S}_{m}$ be the set of squares in $\mathbb{Z}^{*}{ }_{m}$. For $\mathbf{r} \in R(M)$, define the function

$$
\odot: \mathbb{S}_{24 m} \times \mathbb{Z}_{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{m}
$$

whose image is uniquely determined by the relation

$$
[s] \odot t \equiv t s+\frac{s-1}{24} \sum_{\delta \mid M} \delta r_{\delta}(\bmod m)
$$

For $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{m}$, let $P_{m, \mathbf{r}}(t)$ denote the set

$$
P_{m, \mathbf{r}}(t):=\left\{[s] \odot t:[s] \in \mathbb{S}_{24 m}\right\}
$$

Now, we consider the generating function for $t$-core partitions $a_{t}(n)$ given by

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{t}(n) q^{n}=\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(1-q^{t n}\right)^{t}}{1-q^{n}}
$$

Observe that the above generating function for $a_{t}(n)$ for $t=19$ and $t=31$ coincides with that of $c_{\mathbf{r}}(n)$ in $(2.3)$ for $\mathbf{r}=(-1,19)$ and $\mathbf{r}=(-1,31)$, respectively. Recall that $M=19=m$ in the first case and $M=31=m$ in the second one. Thus, proving congruences (2.1) and (2.2) is equivalent to proving the following result.

Theorem 2.2. For any non-negative integer n,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& c_{\mathbf{r}}(76 n+11,15,27,39,43,47,51,59,67) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \text { for } \mathbf{r}=(-1,19) \\
& c_{\mathbf{r}}(124 n+10,26,30,38,42,50,54,58,62,78,86,94,98,102,122) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \\
& \text { for } \mathbf{r}=(-1,31)
\end{aligned}
$$

We provide a proof of this theorem using the result below. With the help of this result, it suffices to check the above congruences up to only a finite number of terms.

Lemma 2.3. [11, Lemma 1.8] Let l be a positive integer and ( $m, M, N, t, \mathbf{r}) \in \Omega$. Let $\mathbf{u} \in$ $R(N)$ and $\left\{\gamma_{1}, \gamma_{2}, \ldots, \gamma_{n_{0}}\right\} \subseteq \Gamma$ be a complete set of representatives of the double cosets $\Gamma_{0}(N) \backslash \Gamma / \Gamma_{\infty}$. Assume that $\mathcal{A}_{m, \mathbf{r}}\left(\gamma_{i}\right)+\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{u}}\left(\gamma_{i}\right) \geq 0$ for all $i \in\left\{1,2, \ldots, n_{0}\right\}$. By $t_{\min }$, denote the minimum value of $t^{\prime} \in P_{m, \mathbf{r}}(t)$, and let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nu:=\frac{1}{24}\left[\Gamma: \Gamma_{0}(N)\right]\left(\sum_{\delta \mid N} u_{\delta}+\sum_{\delta \mid M} r_{\delta}\right)-\frac{1}{24} \sum_{\delta \mid N} \delta u_{\delta}-\frac{1}{24 m} \sum_{\delta \mid M} \delta r_{\delta}-\frac{t_{\min }}{m} . \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

If

$$
\forall\left(n, t^{\prime}\right) \in\{0, \ldots,\lfloor\nu+1\rfloor\} \times P_{m, \mathbf{r}}(t), \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(m n+t^{\prime}\right) q^{n} \equiv 0(\bmod l)
$$

then, for all non-negative integers $n$, the congruence

$$
c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(m n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod l)
$$

holds for all $t^{\prime} \in P_{m, \mathbf{r}}(t)$.
In the above lemma, we set $m=4 p, M=p$ and $\mathbf{r}=(-1, p)$, where $p$ is a prime, and for these values, we compute the sets $P_{m, \mathbf{r}}(t)$ using the following result.

Lemma 2.4. Let $p \geq 5$ be a prime. Let $\mathbf{r}=(-1, p) \in R(p)$. Then

$$
P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)=\left\{t^{\prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{4 p} \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{24 t^{\prime}-1}{p}\right)=\left(\frac{24 t-1}{p}\right)\right. \text { and } t^{\prime} \equiv t(\bmod 4)\right\}
$$

where $\left(\frac{\cdot}{p}\right)$ denotes the Legendre symbol.
Proof. For $\mathbf{r}=(-1, p), m=4 p, M=p$, we have $\sum_{\delta \mid M} \delta r_{\delta}=p^{2}-1$ and since $\operatorname{gcd}(p, 6)=1$, we have $24 \mid p^{2}-1$. Therefore,

$$
P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)=\left\{t^{\prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{4 p} \left\lvert\, t^{\prime} \equiv t s+(s-1) \frac{p^{2}-1}{24}(\bmod 4 p)\right.,[s] \in \mathbb{S}_{96 p}\right\}
$$

As $[s] \in \mathbb{S}_{96 p}$, one has $s \equiv 1(\bmod 4)$ and by the Chinese remainder theorem, one has

$$
P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)=\left\{t^{\prime} \left\lvert\, t^{\prime} \equiv t s+(s-1) \frac{p^{2}-1}{24}(\bmod p)\right., t^{\prime} \equiv t(\bmod 4),[s] \in \mathbb{S}_{96 p}\right\}
$$

Notice that

$$
t^{\prime} \equiv t s+(s-1) \frac{p^{2}-1}{24}(\bmod p) \Leftrightarrow 24 t^{\prime}-1 \equiv s(24 t-1)(\bmod p)
$$

Since the equality $\left(\frac{24 t^{\prime}-1}{p}\right)=\left(\frac{24 t-1}{p}\right)$ (respectively the congruence $\left.t^{\prime} \equiv t(\bmod 4)\right)$ means that $24 t-1$ and $24 t^{\prime}-1$ are simultaneously square or non-square modulo $p$ (respectively modulo 96), one arrives to

$$
P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)=\left\{t^{\prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{4 p} \left\lvert\,\left(\frac{24 t^{\prime}-1}{p}\right)=\left(\frac{24 t-1}{p}\right)\right. \text { and } t^{\prime} \equiv t(\bmod 4)\right\} .
$$

Notice that the special case where $p$ divides $24 t-1$ corresponds to $P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)=\{t\}$. We now proceed to prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. As mentioned before, we set $m=N=4 p, M=p$ and $\mathbf{r}=(-1, p)$ in Lemma 2.3. In order to use this lemma, we first show that ( $4 p, p, 4 p, t, \mathbf{r}$ ) belongs to $\Omega$ and then compute the sets $P_{m, \mathbf{r}}(t)$ for $p=19, t=11$ in the first case and for $p=31, t=10$ in the other one.

Case I: $p=19, t=11$. Here, $\mathbf{r}=(-1,19) \in R(19)$ and $\kappa=\operatorname{gcd}\left(76^{2}-1,24\right)=3$. Also $\prod_{\delta \mid M} \delta^{\left|r_{\delta}\right|}=19^{19}$, therefore $s=0$ and $j=19^{19}$. Thus, conditions (1) to (4) stated earlier are easily verified, and we conclude that $(76,19,76,11,(-1,19)) \in \Omega$. Next, using Lemma 2.4, we compute the set $P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)$. Since,

$$
\left(\frac{24 \times t-1}{p}\right)=\left(\frac{263}{19}\right)=1,
$$

the set $P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)$, consisting of $t^{\prime} \in \mathbb{Z}_{4 p}$ for which $\left(\frac{24 t^{\prime}-1}{19}\right)=1$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv 11(\bmod 4)$, is given by $\{11,15,27,39,43,47,51,59,67\}$. Hence for $\mathbf{r}=(-1,19)$,

$$
P_{76, \mathbf{r}}(11)=\{11,15,27,39,43,47,51,59,67\} .
$$

Case II: $p=31, t=10$. In this case, we find $\mathbf{r}=(-1,31) \in R(31), \kappa=3, s=0$ and $j=31^{31}$. It can be verified that conditions (1) to (4) hold here as well. This shows that $(124,31,124,10,(-1,31)) \in \Omega$. To compute the set $P_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(t)$, since

$$
\left(\frac{24 \times t-1}{p}\right)=\left(\frac{239}{31}\right)=-1
$$

we need to find all those $t^{\prime} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $0 \leq t^{\prime} \leq 4 p-1, \quad\left(\frac{24 t^{\prime}-1}{31}\right)=-1$ and $t^{\prime} \equiv 10$ $(\bmod 4)$. This means $t^{\prime} \in\{10,26,30,38,42,50,54,58,62,78,86,94,98,102,122\}$. Therefore, for $\mathbf{r}=(-1,31)$,

$$
P_{124, \mathbf{r}}(10)=\{10,26,30,38,42,50,54,58,62,78,86,94,98,102,122\} .
$$

Next, we check the assumption in Lemma 2.3 that for prime $p$ and $\mathbf{u} \in R(N)$, the inequality $\mathcal{A}_{m, \mathbf{r}}(\gamma)+\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{u}}(\gamma) \geq 0$ holds for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Choose $\mathbf{u}$ to be the zero tuple so that $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{u}}(\gamma)=0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Therefore, it suffices to show $\mathcal{A}_{m, \mathbf{r}}(\gamma) \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma$. Let $\gamma=\left(\begin{array}{cc}x & y \\ z & w\end{array}\right) \in \Gamma$. From the definition of $\mathcal{A}_{m, \mathbf{r}}(\gamma)$ in (2.4) and the fact that $x$ and $z$ are coprime, since $w x-y z=1$,
we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(\gamma) & =\frac{1}{24} \min _{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{4 p}}\left(-\frac{(\operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p z))^{2}}{4 p}+p \frac{(\operatorname{gcd}(p x+p \kappa \lambda z, 4 p z))^{2}}{4 p^{2}}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{24} \min _{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{4 p}} \frac{1}{24}\left(-\frac{(\operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p))^{2}}{4 p}+p \frac{(\operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4))^{2}}{4}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
F(\gamma, p, \lambda):=\frac{-(\operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p))^{2}}{4 p}+\frac{p(\operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4))^{2}}{4} .
$$

Now we consider all possibilities for $\operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p)$, and this yields the following implications:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p)=1 \Rightarrow F(\gamma, p, \lambda)=\frac{-1}{4 p}+\frac{p}{4} \geq 0 \\
& \operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p)=2 \Rightarrow F(\gamma, p, \lambda)=\frac{-4}{4 p}+\frac{4 p}{4} \geq 0 \\
& \operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p)=4 \Rightarrow F(\gamma, p, \lambda)=\frac{-16}{4 p}+\frac{16 p}{4} \geq 0 \\
& \operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p)=p \Rightarrow F(\gamma, p, \lambda)=\frac{-p^{2}}{4 p}+\frac{p}{4}=0, \\
& \operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p)=2 p \Rightarrow F(\gamma, p, \lambda)=\frac{-4 p^{2}}{4 p}+\frac{4 p}{4}=0, \\
& \operatorname{gcd}(x+\kappa \lambda z, 4 p)=4 p \Rightarrow F(\gamma, p, \lambda)=\frac{-16 p^{2}}{4 p}+\frac{16 p}{4}=0
\end{aligned}
$$

This proves that $\mathcal{A}_{4 p, \mathbf{r}}(\gamma) \geq 0$ for each $\gamma \in \Gamma$.
Lastly, using the fact that $\left[\Gamma: \Gamma_{0}(N)\right]=N \prod_{p \mid N}\left(1+\frac{1}{p}\right)$, we calculate $\nu$ in (2.6) for the two cases. For $p=19, t=11, \mathbf{r}=(-1,19), \mathbf{u}=(0,0, \ldots, 0)$ and $t_{\text {min }}=11$,

$$
\nu=90-\frac{26}{76} \text { and hence }\lfloor\nu\rfloor=89 \text {. }
$$

For $p=31, t=10, \mathbf{r}=(-1,31), \mathbf{u}=(0,0, \ldots, 0)$ and $t_{\text {min }}=10$,

$$
\nu=240-\frac{50}{124}, \text { therefore }\lfloor\nu\rfloor=239 \text {. }
$$

Taking $l=2$ in Lemma 2.3, we see that

- if $c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(76 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for all $0 \leq n \leq 90$ and $t^{\prime} \in P_{76, \mathbf{r}}(11), \mathbf{r}=(-1,19)$, then $c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(76 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $t^{\prime} \in P_{76, \mathbf{r}}(11)$.
- if $c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(124 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for all $0 \leq n \leq 240$ and $t^{\prime} \in P_{124, \mathbf{r}}(10), \mathbf{r}=(-1,31)$, then $c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(124 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $t^{\prime} \in P_{124, \mathbf{r}}(10)$.
Using Mathematica, we verify the calculations $c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(76 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for $0 \leq n \leq$ 90 and $c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(124 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for $0 \leq n \leq 240$, and thus conclude that

$$
c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(76 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \text { for all } n \geq 0 \text { and } t^{\prime} \in P_{76, \mathbf{r}}(11)
$$

and $c_{\mathbf{r}}\left(124 n+t^{\prime}\right) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for all $n \geq 0$ and $t^{\prime} \in P_{124, \mathbf{r}}(10)$.
This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

Remark. In a similar fashion, one can prove congruences for broken $k$-diamond partitions along arithmetic progressions $(16 k+8) n+b$ by taking $m$ in Lemma 2.3 and Lemma 2.4 to be $8 p$ instead of $4 p$. The proof works in a similar manner and one obtains, for instance, the congruences

$$
\Delta_{3}(56 n+2,15,20,28,29,31,34,39,42,44,45,47,53) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \text { for all integers } n \geq 0
$$

## 3. Some congruences for broken 12-diamond partitions

Radu and Sellers [11] considered broken ( $2 k+1$ )-diamond partitions, where $2 k+1$ is a prime and $2 \leq k \leq 11$. They obtained parity results for arithmetic progressions $(4 k+$ $2) n+b$. In fact, for each such $k$, there are exactly $k$ many arithmetic progressions for which $\Delta_{k}((4 k+2) n+b) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$. We investigate such congruences for $k=12$. In this case, we find only five congruences, namely

$$
\Delta_{12}(50 n+9,19,29,39,49) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)
$$

for all non-negative integers $n$. This is possibly due to the fact that 50 is not a prime number. Notice that this result is equivalent to Theorem 1.2.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. We make use of the following result of Ramanujan, [8]:

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{(q ; q)_{\infty}}= & \frac{\left(q^{25} ; q^{25}\right)_{\infty}^{5}}{\left(q^{5} ; q^{5}\right)_{\infty}^{6}}\left\{R\left(q^{5}\right)^{4}+q R\left(q^{5}\right)^{3}+2 q^{2} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{2}+3 q^{3} R\left(q^{5}\right)+5 q^{4}\right. \\
& \left.-3 q^{5} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{-1}+2 q^{6} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{-2}-q^{7} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{-3}+q^{8} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{-4}\right\} \tag{3.1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $R(q)=\prod_{n \geq 1} \frac{\left(1-q^{5 n-3}\right)\left(1-q^{5 n-2}\right)}{\left(1-q^{5 n-4}\right)\left(1-q^{5 n-1}\right)}$, and as usual $(z ; q)_{\infty}:=\prod_{l=0}^{\infty}\left(1-z q^{l}\right)$. From (1.2) and (3.1), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_{12}(n) q^{n}= & \frac{(-q ; q)_{\infty}}{(q ; q)_{\infty}^{2}\left(-q^{25} ; q^{25}\right)_{\infty}} \\
\equiv & \frac{1}{(q ; q)_{\infty}\left(q^{25} ; q^{25}\right)_{\infty}}(\bmod 2) \\
\equiv & \frac{\left(q^{25} ; q^{25}\right)_{\infty}^{4}}{\left(q^{5} ; q^{5}\right)_{\infty}^{6}}\left\{R\left(q^{5}\right)^{4}+q R\left(q^{5}\right)^{3}+q^{3} R\left(q^{5}\right)+q^{4}\right. \\
& \left.+q^{5} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{-1}+q^{7} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{-3}+q^{8} R\left(q^{5}\right)^{-4}\right\}(\bmod 2)
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n \geq 0} \Delta_{12}(5 n+4) q^{n}(\bmod 2) \\
& \equiv \frac{\left(q^{5} ; q^{5}\right)_{\infty}^{4}}{(q ; q)_{\infty}^{6}}(\bmod 2) \equiv \prod_{n \geq 1} \frac{\left(1-q^{5 n}\right)^{4}}{\left(1-q^{n}\right)^{6}}(\bmod 2) \\
& \equiv 1 / \prod_{n \geq 1}\left(1-q^{5 n-4}\right)^{6}\left(1-q^{5 n-3}\right)^{6}\left(1-q^{5 n-2}\right)^{6}\left(1-q^{5 n-1}\right)^{6}\left(1-q^{5 n}\right)^{2}(\bmod 2) \\
& \equiv 1 / \prod_{n \geq 1}\left(1-q^{10 n-8}\right)^{3}\left(1-q^{10 n-6}\right)^{3}\left(1-q^{10 n-4}\right)^{3}\left(1-q^{10 n-2}\right)^{3}\left(1-q^{10 n}\right)(\bmod 2) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Since the last expression is an even function of $q$, we conclude that

$$
\Delta_{12}(5(2 n+1)+4)=\Delta_{12}(10 n+9) \equiv 0(\bmod 2) \text { for all integers } n \geq 0
$$

## 4. A congruence for broken 3-diamond partitions

In this section, we prove a result for broken 3-diamond partitions along the arithmetic progression $8 n+7$, which is not of the form $(4 k+2) n+b$.

Theorem 4.1. For $n \geq 0, \Delta_{3}(8 n+7) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$.
Proof. Let $\operatorname{asc}_{t}(n)$ denote the number of self-conjugate $t$-core partitions of $n$, [3]. Garvan, Kim and Stanton [7, Equations (7.1a) and (7.1b)] give the generating function for $\operatorname{asc}_{t}(n)$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{asc}_{t}(n) q^{n}=\left(-q ; q^{2}\right)_{\infty}\left(q^{2 t} ; q^{2 t}\right)_{\infty}^{t / 2}, \text { if } t \text { is even, } \\
& \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{asc}_{t}(n) q^{n}=\frac{\left(-q ; q^{2}\right)_{\infty}\left(q^{2 t} ; q^{2 t}\right)_{\infty}^{(t-1) / 2}}{\left(-q^{t} ; q^{2 t}\right)_{\infty}}, \text { if } t \text { is odd. }
\end{aligned}
$$

In particular,

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \operatorname{asc}_{7}(n) q^{n}=\frac{\left(-q ; q^{2}\right)_{\infty}\left(q^{14} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}^{3}}{\left(-q^{7} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}}
$$

Using (1.2) and above, we note that

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta_{3}(n) q^{n} & =\frac{(-q ; q)_{\infty}}{(q ; q)_{\infty}^{2}\left(-q^{7} ; q^{7}\right)_{\infty}} \equiv \frac{\left(-q ; q^{2}\right)_{\infty}}{\left(-q^{7} ; q^{7}\right)_{\infty}}(\bmod 2) \\
& \equiv \frac{\left(-q ; q^{2}\right)_{\infty}}{\left(q^{14} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}\left(-q^{7} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}}(\bmod 2) \\
& \equiv \frac{\left(-q ; q^{2}\right)_{\infty}\left(q^{14} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}^{3}}{\left(q^{14} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}^{4}\left(-q^{7} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}}(\bmod 2) \\
& \equiv \frac{1}{\left(q^{14} ; q^{14}\right)_{\infty}^{4}} \sum_{n \geq 0} \operatorname{asc}_{7}(n) q^{n}(\bmod 2) \tag{4.1}
\end{align*}
$$

Baruah and Sarmah [3, Theorem 3.1] show that $\operatorname{asc}_{7}(8 n+7)=0$ for all $n \geq 0$, which along with (4.1) implies that $\Delta_{3}(8 n+7) \equiv 0(\bmod 2)$ for all integers $n \geq 0$.

## 5. Counts for odd values of $\Delta_{k}(n)$

In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 1.3, which provides a lower bound for the number of odd values of $\Delta_{k}(n)$ for $n$ not exceeding $N$, where $N$ is any large fixed positive integer. We employ the methods developed in [4] and [5].

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We investigate the parity of $\Delta_{k}(n)$, which is the same as the parity of the coefficient of $q^{n}$ in the formal power series,

$$
F(q):=\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(1-q^{2 n}\right)\left(1-q^{(2 k+1) n}\right)}{\left(1-q^{n}\right)^{3}\left(1-q^{(4 k+2) n}\right)}
$$

By reducing the coefficients of $F(q)$ modulo 2 , we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
F(q) & \equiv \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(1-q^{n}\right)^{2}\left(1-q^{(2 k+1) n}\right)}{\left(1-q^{n}\right)^{3}\left(1-q^{(2 k+1) n}\right)^{2}}(\bmod 2) \\
& \equiv \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\left(1-q^{n}\right)\left(1-q^{(2 k+1) n}\right)}(\bmod 2) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
G(q):=\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\left(1-q^{n}\right)\left(1-q^{(2 k+1) n}\right)} \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore, the parity of $\Delta_{k}(n)$ is the same as that of the coefficient of $q^{n}$ in $G(q)$, and we have to prove that the desired lower bound holds for $G(q)$. Passing to the formal logarithmic derivative and then multiplying the resultant by $q$, equation (5.1) leads to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{q G^{\prime}(q)}{G(q)} & =\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} n q^{n m}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(2 k+1) n q^{(2 k+1) n m} \\
& =\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} q^{h} \sum_{n \mid h} n+(2 k+1) \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} q^{(2 k+1) h} \sum_{n \mid h} n \\
& =\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \sigma(h) q^{h}+(2 k+1) \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \sigma(h) q^{(2 k+1) h}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we work in the ring $\mathbb{F}_{2}[[q]]$ and set $H(q):=\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \sigma(h) q^{h}+\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \sigma(h) q^{(2 k+1) h}$. Since, $\sigma(h)$ is odd if and only if each odd prime factor has an even exponent in the prime factorization of $h$, in other words, $h=2^{r}(2 n+1)^{2}$ for some integers $n, r \geq 0, H(q)$ has the form

$$
\begin{align*}
H(q) & =\sum_{n, r \geq 0} q^{2^{r}(2 n+1)^{2}}+\sum_{n, r \geq 0} q^{(2 k+1) 2^{r}(2 n+1)^{2}} \\
& =\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{n^{2}}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{2 n^{2}}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{(2 k+1) n^{2}}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{2(2 k+1) n^{2}} . \tag{5.2}
\end{align*}
$$

By reducing modulo 2, $G(q)$ takes the form $G(q)=1+q^{n_{1}}+q^{n_{2}}+\cdots$ in $\mathbb{F}_{2}[[q]]$. Now, from $q G^{\prime}(q)=G(q) H(q)$ and (5.2), we derive

$$
\begin{equation*}
q G^{\prime}(q)+\left(q^{n_{1}}+q^{n_{2}}+\cdots\right) H(q)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{n^{2}}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{2 n^{2}}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{(2 k+1) n^{2}}+\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^{2(2 k+1) n^{2}} \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

We now derive a lower bound for $\#\left\{j: n_{j} \leq N\right\}$.
Case I. If at least half of the $\lfloor\sqrt{N}\rfloor$ terms of the form $q^{n^{2}}$ for $n^{2} \leq N$ on the left side of (5.3) are canceled by terms from the series $q G^{\prime}(q)$, then $G^{\prime}(q)$ has at least $\lfloor\sqrt{N} / 2\rfloor$ terms up to $q^{N}$. Hence, $G(q)$ has at least $\lfloor\sqrt{N} / 2\rfloor$ terms up to $q^{N}$ and we obtain the desired lower bound.
Case II. Assume that less than half of the terms of the form $q^{n^{2}}$ for $n^{2} \leq N$ are canceled by terms from $q G^{\prime}(q)$. This implies that at least $\lfloor\sqrt{N} / 2\rfloor$ such terms are left to be canceled by terms from the series $\left(q^{n_{1}}+q^{n_{2}}+\cdots\right) H(q)$. To see how many terms of the form $q^{m^{2}}$
for $m^{2} \leq N$ may appear in a series of the form $q^{n_{j}} H(q)$ for a fixed $n_{j}$, we consider four diophantine equations in positive integers $n$ and $m$, namely,

$$
\begin{align*}
& n_{j}+n^{2}=m^{2},  \tag{5.4}\\
& n_{j}+2 n^{2}=m^{2},  \tag{5.5}\\
& n_{j}+(2 k+1) n^{2}=m^{2},  \tag{5.6}\\
& n_{j}+2(2 k+1) n^{2}=m^{2} . \tag{5.7}
\end{align*}
$$

Using arguments from [4], we find bounds (from above) for the number of solutions of these equations. Equation (5.4) has at most $N^{\frac{2 c_{1}}{\log \log N}}$ solutions for some constant $c_{1}>0$. The number of solutions of equation (5.5) is bounded by $c_{2} \log N$, for some $c_{2}>0$. In order to bound the number of solutions of equations (5.6) and (5.7), we work in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{2 k+1})$, and find the number of solutions to be at most $N^{\frac{c_{3}}{\log \log N}}$, for some fixed $c_{3}>2 \log 2$. Similarly for equation (5.7), the number of solutions is bounded by $c_{4} \log N$. Therefore, the number of solutions of (5.4), (5.5), (5.6) and (5.7) is at most $N^{\frac{c}{\log } \log N}$ for some positive number $c>0$. Thus, we arrive at the desired bound,

$$
\#\left\{n \leq N: \Delta_{k}(n) \text { is odd }\right\} \geq N^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{c}{\log \log N}} .
$$

Remark. For $l, m \in \mathbb{N}$, let $B_{1}, B_{2}, \ldots, B_{l} ; D_{1}, D_{2}, \ldots, D_{m}$ be distinct positive integers. Let $C(n)$ denote the number of colored partitions of $n$ in $l+m$ colors with the following conditions:
(1) the parts appearing in the partitions are multiples of $B_{j}$ 's and $D_{i}$ 's,
(2) the parts which appear as multiples of $B_{j}$ 's are distinct.

Then, the associated generating function is given by

$$
\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} C(n) q^{n}=\prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\left(1+q^{B_{1} n}\right)\left(1+q^{B_{2} n}\right) \ldots\left(1+q^{B_{l} n}\right)}{\left(1-q^{D_{1} n}\right)\left(1-q^{D_{2} n}\right) \ldots\left(1-q^{D_{m} n}\right)}
$$

Note that for $l=1, m=2, B_{1}=2 k+1, D_{1}=1, D_{2}=4 k+2$, one obtains the generating function for the broken $k$-diamond partitions modulo 2. Using similar arguments as above, one concludes, for all $N$ large enough,

$$
\#\{n \leq N: C(n) \text { is odd }\} \geq N^{\frac{1}{2}-\frac{c}{\log \log N}}
$$

for some positive real number $c$.
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