THE VALUE OF BERNOULLI POLYNOMIALS AT RATIONAL NUMBERS
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ABSTRACT

We give a short elementary proof of a result of Almkvist and Meurman [1] on an integrality property of the values taken by the Bernoulli polynomials at a rational number. We use a lemma on the divisibility properties of certain binomial coefficients which seems to be of independent interest.

0. Introduction

As is well known, the Bernoulli polynomials $B_n(t)$ defined by

$$\frac{xe^{tx}}{e^x-1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n(t)}{n!} x^n$$

occur naturally while summing powers of the natural numbers. They also appear in other places, like in the evaluation of the Riemann zeta function at even integers, or while finding out whether or not a prime number is regular. As such, the properties of these polynomials are of some number-theoretic interest. Recently, G. Almkvist and A. Meurman proved the following result in [1].

**Theorem.** Writing $\tilde{B}_n(t) = B_n(t) - B_n(0)$, we have for all $h, k, n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$k^n \tilde{B}_n \left( \frac{h}{k} \right) \in \mathbb{Z}.$$  

The purpose of this note is to give a short and completely elementary proof of this theorem.

**Remark.** As observed in [1], it is enough to prove the theorem with the assumption that $h = 1$, since we have the addition formula

$$B_n(x+y) = \sum_{m=0}^{n} B_m(x) y^{n-m}.$$ 

From now on, we write $a_n = k^n \tilde{B}_n \left( \frac{1}{k} \right)$ for simplicity. We employ two different recursions for the numbers $a_n$ and a lemma on the divisibility properties of certain binomial coefficients which seems to be of independent interest.
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1. Two recursions for $a_n$

From the definition,
\[
\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n X^n}{n!} = \frac{kX(e^X - 1)}{e^{kX} - 1}.
\]

The equation
\[
\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n X^n}{n!} \cdot (e^{kX} - 1) = kX(e^X - 1)
\]
gives, on comparing the coefficients of like powers of $X$,
\[
\sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \binom{n+1}{l} a_l k^{n-l} = (n+1)(1-a_n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1. \tag{A}
\]

On the other hand, the first equation can also be written as
\[
\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{a_n X^n}{n!} \cdot (1+e^X+\ldots+e^{(k-1)X}) = kX,
\]
which gives $a_1 = 1$ and
\[
\sum_{l=1}^{n-1} \binom{n}{l} a_l p_{n-l} = -ka_n \quad \text{for all } n \geq 2. \tag{B}
\]

Here $p_0 = k$ and $p_n = \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} l^n$ for $n > 0$.

2. Proof of the theorem

The following lemma will be used.

**LEMMA.** For a prime $p$, integers $1 \leq l \leq r$ and $(p,s) = 1$, we have
\[
\binom{sp^r}{l} \equiv \text{mod} \ p^{r-l+1}.
\]

**Proof.** Let $v_p(l)$ be the number of times $p$ occurs in $l$. Then it is obvious from the definition of the binomial coefficient that
\[
\binom{sp^r}{l} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p^{r-v_p(l)},
\]
and since $v_p(l) \leq l-1$, the lemma follows. (Indeed, equality occurs only for $p = l = 2$.)

Now we can prove the theorem.

First, we treat the case when $k$ is a prime $p$. We shall show by induction that $a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Now $a_1 = 1$. Assume that $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus the left-hand sides of (A) and (B) are integers. Therefore $pa_n, (n+1)a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $(p, n+1) = 1$, then clearly $a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

If $p\mid (n+1)$, we write $n+1 = sp^r$ with $(p,s) = 1$. The left-hand side of (A) is divisible by $p^r$ provided we have, for $sp^r - r \leq l \leq sp^r - 2$,
\[
\binom{sp^r}{l} \equiv 0 \text{ mod } p^r.
\]
But this is immediate from the lemma.

Now we consider a general $k = p_1^{i_1} \ldots p_m^{i_m}$. Once again, we proceed by induction, and assume that $a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $(k, n+1) = 1$, then (A) and (B) evidently give $a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume $n+1 = sp^r$, where $p \mid k$ and $r \geq 1$. Applying the lemma, we obtain $sa_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, corresponding to each prime $p_i$ dividing $k$, there exists $(s_i, p_i) = 1$ such that $s_i a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $s_1, \ldots, s_m, k$ are coprime, we have $a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the proof is complete.
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