Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. (First published online 2026), page 1 of 8*
doi:10.1017/S0004972726101889
*Provisional—final page numbers to be inserted when paper edition is published

CONGRUENCES FOR HECKE EIGENVALUES VIA PERIOD POLYNOMIALS

LIUBOMIR CHIRIAC

(Received 19 June 2026 UTC; accepted 3 July 2026 UTC)

Abstract

We study a conjecture motivated by Coleman and Stein's work on approximating eigenforms of infinite slope by those of finite slopes, which was recast by Rustom ['Congruences modulo prime powers of Hecke eigenvalues in level 1', *Res. Number Theory* **5**(1) (2019), Article no. 10, 27 pages] as a congruence for the second Fourier coefficient. We establish the weight condition required for this coefficient to be divisible by nine and obtain the full conjecture under a natural ramification hypothesis. The proof uses period polynomials, especially Zagier's description of the Hecke action on them.

2020 *Mathematics subject classification*: primary 11F33; secondary 11F11, 11F67.

Keywords and phrases: Hecke eigenvalues, period polynomials.

1. Introduction

A conjecture of Kiming *et al.* [4, Conjecture 1] asserts that for any prime power p^m and $N \geq 1$ coprime to p, the set of reductions modulo p^m of eigenforms of level N is finite. The case $m = 1$ is classical, originating in ideas of Serre and Tate, and carried out in full generality by Jochnowitz [3]. For $m > 1$, explicit evidence is much more limited; prominent results include the level-one congruences modulo 128 obtained by Rustom [7]. Earlier, and independently of the above conjecture, Coleman and Stein [1, Conjecture 3.4] developed for $N \in \{1, 3, 9\}$, a detailed prediction for the possible systems of eigenvalues modulo 9, stemming from their study of the approximation of infinite-slope eigenforms by finite-slope eigenforms. One consequence of their prediction is that the system of eigenvalues modulo 9 attached to the weight 2 cusp form on $X_0(27)$ should not arise from any eigenform of level dividing 9. This complements their finding that the weight 2 cusp form on $X_0(32)$ is not 2-adically approximable by eigenforms of tame level one and finite slope, which employs an extension of a theorem of Hatada [2] on systems of eigenvalues modulo 8.

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of Australian Mathematical Publishing Association Inc. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889

For $N = 1$, Rustom [7, Theorem 9.2] showed that the finiteness assertion modulo 9 would follow from the following condition involving only the second Fourier coefficient a_2. Another congruence in [2] already implies that a_2 is divisible by 3, but that analysis does not address the more delicate behaviour of a_2 modulo 9.

Throughout this paper, an eigenform means a cuspidal Hecke eigenform for $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$, normalised so that its first Fourier coefficient is 1.

CONJECTURE 1.1. Let $f = \sum_{n\geq 1} a_n q^n$ be an eigenform of weight k. Then,

$$a_2 \equiv \begin{cases} 0 \pmod{9\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3} & \text{if } k \equiv 4 \pmod 6, \\ 3 \text{ or } 6 \pmod{9\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3} & \text{if } k \not\equiv 4 \pmod 6. \end{cases}$$

The principal result proved here is the following necessary condition for the vanishing congruence formulated in the conjecture.

THEOREM 1.2. *Let $f = \sum_{n\geq 1} a_n q^n$ be an eigenform of weight k. Assume that*

$$a_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{9\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3}.$$

Then, $k \equiv 4 \pmod 6$.

Hatada's argument is formulated in terms of the action of Hecke operators on lattices generated by periods of modular forms, while Rustom uses Merel's theory of modular symbols. We work instead in the closely related language of period polynomials. In particular, we make essential use of a theorem of Zagier [8, Theorem 2] that gives an explicit description of the action of Hecke operators on period polynomials. This approach is inspired by an article of Kohnen [5], where it is shown that $a_2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\mathfrak{p}}$ for every prime ideal $\mathfrak{p}$ of the coefficient field K_f of f lying above 5. Kohnen also indicated that the method should be applicable to more general congruence problems, an observation validated by this note.

Building on our theorem, we establish a conditional proof of the full conjecture.

COROLLARY 1.3. *Conjecture 1.1 holds assuming that 3 is unramified in the field of coefficients of the eigenform.*

The hypothesis in the corollary is precisely what allows the residue-field information obtained from period polynomials to be lifted to a congruence modulo 9. Moreover, it appears to impose no restriction in practice. Indeed, Rustom [7, page 3] notes that the hypothesis is satisfied for all weights $k \leq 1000$. Therefore, the conjecture holds unconditionally in that range.

2. Period polynomials

Let S_k denote the space of level one cusp forms of even weight $k \geq 12$. For $0 \leq m \leq k-2$, the mth period of an element $f = \sum_{n\geq 1} a_n q^n \in S_k$ is defined as

$$r_m(f) = \int_0^{i\infty} f(z) z^m \, dz = \frac{m!}{(-2\pi i)^{m+1}} L(f, m+1),$$

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889

where the integral is taken along the imaginary axis and $L(f,s) = \sum_{n\geq 1} a_n n^{-s}$ is the L-series of f. The period polynomial of f is the polynomial

$$r_f(x) = \sum_{m=0}^{k-2} (-1)^m \binom{k-2}{m} r_m(f) x^{k-2-m}.$$

Write $r_f^{\pm}(x) = \frac{1}{2}(r_f(x) \pm r_f(-x))$ for the even and odd parts of r_f, respectively.

Let V_{k-2} be the set of polynomials of degree $\leq k-2$. For any integral matrix $\gamma = \left(\begin{smallmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{smallmatrix}\right)$ with nonzero determinant and $P \in V_{k-2}$, define

$$(P \mid \gamma)(x) = (cx+d)^{k-2} P\left(\frac{ax+b}{cx+d}\right).$$

This gives a right action on V_{k-2}, which can be extended linearly to formal sums of matrices. Consider the matrices:

$$\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad U = TS = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Obviously, $(P \mid \varepsilon)(x) = P(-x)$. Moreover, it is known (see, for example, [6, Section 1.1]) that both $r_f^{\pm}$ belong to the space

$$W_{k-2} := \{P \in V_{k-2} : P \mid (1+S) = P \mid (1+U+U^2) = 0\}.$$

Having recalled the standard properties of period polynomials, we now introduce our principal technical input: a formula of Zagier [8, Section 6] expressing the period polynomial under the action of the Hecke operator T_ℓ in terms of a finite, explicitly described set of matrices. Specialising to $\ell = 2$, Zagier's formula states that if $f \in S_k$, then

$$r^{\pm}_{T_2(f)} = \sum_{M \in \mathrm{Man}_2} r_f^{\pm} \mid M,$$

where

$$\mathrm{Man}_2 = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right\}.$$

We first illustrate the utility of this formula by recovering the divisibility-by-3 result mentioned in the introduction, for it emerges quite naturally from the framework developed above. Related proofs can be found in [2, 7], where the argument is expressed in terms of modular symbols.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let $f = \sum_{n\geq 1} a_n q^n \in S_k$ be an eigenform. Then, $a_2/3$ is an algebraic integer.*

PROOF. By Manin's rationality theorem for periods (see [6, page 202]), there exists a period $\omega^- \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the polynomial $P_K = r_f^-/\omega^-$ has coefficients in K_f, the number field generated by the Fourier coefficients of f. Let O_f be the ring of integers of K_f.

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889

Fix a 3-adic embedding $K_f \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_3$ and let $\mathfrak{p} \mid 3$ be the corresponding prime of K_f. Let R be the ring of integers of the $\mathfrak{p}$-adic completion of K_f. This is a complete discrete valuation ring. Let π be a uniformiser and normalise $v_\mathfrak{p}$ by $v_\mathfrak{p}(\pi) = 1$. Write $P_K(x) = \sum_i c_i x^i$, and let $m = \min_{c_i \neq 0} v_\mathfrak{p}(c_i)$. Define $P(x) = \pi^{-m} P_K(x)$. Then, $P \in R[x]$ and at least one coefficient of P is a unit of R. By construction, P is nonzero and satisfies the same relations as r_f^-, namely:

$$a_2 P = \sum_{M \in \mathrm{Man}_2} P \mid M, \quad P \mid (1+S) = 0, \quad P \mid (1+U+U^2) = 0.$$

We now compute the T_2-action modulo the ideal $3R$. Viewing the integer matrices modulo 3, we readily establish the congruences:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \varepsilon \pmod 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \equiv -\varepsilon \pmod 3.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \equiv -SU\varepsilon \pmod 3 \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \equiv SU^2\varepsilon \pmod 3.$$

Combining these congruences yields

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 P = P \left| \left(\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right. \\ \equiv P \mid (\varepsilon + (-\varepsilon) + (-SU)\varepsilon + SU^2\varepsilon) \pmod{3R}, \\ \equiv P \mid (I_2 + (-I_2) + (-SU) + SU^2) \mid \varepsilon \pmod{3R}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $-I_2$ acts trivially because k is even, so $P \mid A = P \mid -A$ for every matrix A. Thus,

$$P \mid (I_2 + (-I_2) + (-SU) + SU^2) = 2P + P \mid (SU + SU^2),$$

and since $2P \equiv -P \pmod{3R}$ and $-P = P \mid S$, it follows that

$$a_2 P \equiv [P \mid S \mid (1 + U + U^2)] \mid \varepsilon \equiv 0 \mid \varepsilon \equiv 0 \pmod{3R}.$$

Because some coefficient u of P is a unit in R, the corresponding coefficient of $a_2 P$ gives $a_2 u \in 3R$ and so $a_2 \in 3R$. Equivalently, $v_\mathfrak{p}(a_2) \geq v_\mathfrak{p}(3)$. As $\mathfrak{p} \mid 3$ was arbitrary, this inequality holds at every prime of K_f above 3. At the other primes, the element 3 is a unit and a_2 is already an algebraic integer. Therefore, $a_2/3$ is integral at every finite prime of K_f and we conclude that $a_2/3 \in \mathcal{O}_f$. □

3. Proof of the main results

We now refine the period-polynomial argument from the preceding section. Modulo 3, the matrices appearing in Zagier's formula admit particularly simple reductions, so that their effect is governed essentially by the conditions defining the space W_{k-2}. Modulo 9, this coarse reduction no longer suffices, for one has to keep the first

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889

3-adic corrections to the powers of 2 appearing in the slash action. These corrections introduce derivatives of the period polynomial and lead to a differential-difference operator. Isolating this operator is the key step; the computations are explicit, but the obstruction on the weight becomes visible only in this form.

With this preparatory discussion in place, we restate the main theorem and proceed to its proof.

THEOREM 1.2. *Let $f = \sum_{n\geq 1} a_n q^n \in S_k$ be an eigenform. Assume that*

$$a_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{9\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3}.$$

Then, $k \equiv 4 \pmod 6$.

PROOF. Fix a 3-adic embedding $K_f \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_3$ for which the hypothesis $a_2 \in 9\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3$ holds and let R be the ring of integers of the corresponding completion. By the same normalisation as in Lemma 2.1, choose $P \in R[x]$ proportional to the odd period polynomial, with at least one coefficient a unit.

Let $w = k - 2$ and write

$$P = \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \text{ odd}}}^{k-3} c_n x^n.$$

Using Zagier's formula, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} a_2 P = P \Bigg| \left(\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ = P(2x) + 2^w P\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) + (x+1)^w P\left(\frac{2x}{x+1}\right) + 2^w P\left(\frac{x+1}{2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

For every odd $n \geq 1$, we have $2^n = (-1+3)^n \equiv -1 + 3n \pmod 9$ and since w is even, we also get $2^{w-n} \equiv -1 + 3(w-n) \pmod 9$. Thus, the contribution of the first two terms is

$$P(2x) + 2^w P\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \equiv \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \text{ odd}}}^{k-3} c_n(-2+3w)x^n \equiv (-2+3w)P(x) \pmod{9R[x]}.$$

For the third term, set

$$A(x) = \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \text{ odd}}}^{k-3} c_n x^n (x+1)^{w-n} = (x+1)^w P\left(\frac{x}{x+1}\right).$$

Since

$$P \mid U = P \left| \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = x^w P\left(\frac{x-1}{x}\right), \right.$$

we see that $A(x)$ is just $P \mid U$ evaluated at $x+1$. However, $P \mid U = -P - P \mid U^2$ and

$$P \mid U^2 = P \mid ST^{-1} = (P \mid S) \mid T^{-1} = (-P) \mid T^{-1} = -P(x-1),$$

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889

showing that $A(x) = P(x) - P(x+1)$. Moreover, since

$$\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \text{ odd}}}^{k-3} nc_n x^n (x+1)^{w-n} = x(x+1)A'(x) - wxA(x),$$

we obtain, modulo $9R[x]$,

$$(x+1)^w P\left(\frac{2x}{x+1}\right) \equiv -(1+3wx)(P(x) - P(x+1)) + 3x(x+1)(P'(x) - P'(x+1)).$$

Similarly,

$$2^w P\left(\frac{x+1}{2}\right) \equiv (3w-1)P(x+1) - 3(x+1)P'(x+1) \pmod{9R[x]}.$$

Combining these four terms gives

$$3bP = a_2 P \equiv 3D_w(P) \pmod{9R[x]},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_w(P) = {} & (w-1)P + x(x+1)(P'(x) - P'(x+1)) \\ & - wx(P(x) - P(x+1)) + wP(x+1) - (x+1)P'(x+1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$bP \equiv D_w(P) \pmod{3R[x]}.$$

Let $\mathfrak{m}$ be the maximal ideal of R and let $\kappa = R/\mathfrak{m}$ be the residue field. Since $b \in 3R \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$, we have $\overline{b} = 0 \in \kappa$. Also, since P has a unit coefficient, its reduction $\overline{P} \in \kappa[x]$ is nonzero, which gives $D_w(\overline{P}) = 0$ in $\kappa[x]$.

Let $\delta \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ be the residue class of w modulo 3. Over the field κ, define

$$H_\delta(Q) = xQ' - \delta Q \quad \text{and} \quad L_\delta(Q) = (x+1)(H_\delta(Q)(x) - H_\delta(Q)(x+1)).$$

Then, for every polynomial $Q \in \kappa[x]$,

$$D_w(Q) = (2\delta - 1)Q + L_\delta(Q).$$

Therefore, $0 = D_w(\overline{P}) = (2\delta-1)\overline{P} + L_\delta(\overline{P})$ or, equivalently, $L_\delta(\overline{P}) = -(2\delta-1)\overline{P}$. If $k \not\equiv 4 \pmod 6$, then $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, which leads to either $L_0(\overline{P}) = \overline{P}$ or $L_1(\overline{P}) = 2\overline{P}$. The next lemma rules out both of these possibilities and completes the proof. □

LEMMA 3.1. *Let K be a field of characteristic 3, and let $P \in K[x]$ be a nonzero odd polynomial. For $\delta \in K$, define*

$$H_\delta = xP' - \delta P \quad \text{and} \quad L_\delta(P) = (x+1)(H_\delta(x) - H_\delta(x+1)).$$

Then, $L_0(P) \neq P$ and $L_1(P) \neq 2P$. Moreover, if $\lambda \in K^\times$, then $L_2(P) \neq \lambda P$.

PROOF. Suppose that P has degree d and that $P(x) = a_d x^d + a_{d-2}x^{d-2} + O(x^{d-4})$ with $a_d \neq 0$. Then,

$$H_\delta(x) = (d-\delta)a_d x^d + (d-2-\delta)a_{d-2}x^{d-2} + O(x^{d-4})$$

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889

and

$$H_\delta(x) - H_\delta(x+1) = -(d-\delta)a_d\left[dx^{d-1} + \binom{d}{2}x^{d-2}\right] + O(x^{d-3}),$$

which shows that

$$L_\delta(P)(x) = -d(d-\delta)a_d x^d - \binom{d+1}{2}(d-\delta)a_d x^{d-1} + O(x^{d-2}).$$

If $d \equiv 0 \pmod 3$, then clearly $\deg(L_\delta) < d$, so $L_\delta(P)$ cannot equal any nonzero scalar multiple of $P(x)$.

If $d \equiv 1 \pmod 3$, then $L_\delta(P)(x) = (\delta-1)a_d x^d + (\delta-1)a_d x^{d-1} + O(x^{d-2})$. For $L_\delta(P)$ to be a scalar multiple of $P(x)$, it must mirror the structure of P. Because $P(x)$ is odd, it has no x^{d-1} term, meaning $L_\delta(P)$ must also have a zero coefficient for x^{d-1}, that is,

$$(\delta-1)a_d = 0.$$

Since $a_d \neq 0$, we must have $\delta = 1$. However, if $\delta = 1$, the x^d coefficient $(\delta-1)a_d$ also becomes 0. This means $\deg(L_1(P)) < d$, so $L_1(P) \neq 2P$. For $\delta \in \{0, 2\}$, the required x^{d-1} term fails to vanish.

If $d \equiv -1 \pmod 3$, then the leading term of $L_\delta(P)$ is $-(\delta+1)a_d x^d$ and the x^{d-1} term vanishes. We consider three cases.

(1) Let $\delta = 0$. The leading coefficient of $L_0(P)$ evaluates to $-a_d$, whereas that of P is a_d. Thus, $L_0(P) \neq P$.
(2) Let $\delta = 1$. This time, the leading coefficient of $L_1(P)$ is $-2a_d \equiv a_d \pmod 3$, whereas that of $2P$ is $2a_d \equiv -a_d \pmod 3$. Hence, $L_1(P) \neq 2P$.
(3) Let $\delta = 2$. Then, the leading coefficient of $L_2(P)$ is $0 \pmod 3$. Since $\deg(L_2(P)) < d$, we have $L_2(P) \neq \lambda P$ for all $\lambda \neq 0$. □

We now explain how the ramification of 3 enters the argument. Our computations above determine the reduction of $a_2/3$ in the residue field of the local coefficient ring. If 3 is unramified, then the maximal ideal is precisely $3R$, so this information is equivalent to knowing a_2 modulo $9R$. In the ramified case, the same reduction gives only a congruence modulo the maximal ideal, which is weaker than a congruence modulo $3R$.

PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.3. We use the notation from the proof of Theorem 1.2. The condition that 3 is unramified in K_f implies that $3R = \mathfrak{m}$, the maximal ideal of R.

First, suppose $k \equiv 4 \pmod 6$. Then, $\delta = 2$, so $\overline{b}\,\overline{P} = L_2(\overline{P})$. By Lemma 3.1, we must have $\overline{b} = 0$, giving $a_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{9\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3}$.

Now, suppose $k \not\equiv 4 \pmod 6$, so $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$. The computation in the proof of Theorem 1.2 shows that

$$bP \equiv D_w(P) \pmod{3R[x]},$$

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889

where $b = a_2/3 \in R$. We emphasise that this part does not require that $a_2 \in 9R$; indeed, this assumption was only used in the theorem to conclude that $b \in 3R$. Then,

$$\overline{b}\,\overline{P} = (2\delta - 1)\overline{P} + L_\delta(\overline{P}).$$

If $\overline{P}$ has degree N and leading term $u \neq 0$, then the coefficient of x^N in $L_\delta(\overline{P})$ is $-N(N-\delta)u$. This yields

$$\overline{b} = (2\delta - 1) - N(N - \delta).$$

It is easy to see that for $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, we have $\overline{b} \in \{1, 2\}$. Thus, in either case, $b \equiv 1$ or $2 \pmod{3R}$. Equivalently, $a_2 \equiv 3$ or $6 \pmod{9\overline{\mathbb{Z}}_3}$. □

Acknowledgement

I thank Wissam Raji for several conversations about period polynomials during the initial stage of this project.

References

[1] R. F. Coleman and W. A. Stein, 'Approximation of eigenforms of infinite slope by eigenforms of finite slope', in: *Geometric Aspects of Dwork Theory*, Vols. I and II (eds. A. Adolphson, F. Baldassarri, P. Berthelot, N. Katz and F. Loeser) (Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2004), 437–449.

[2] K. Hatada, 'Eigenvalues of Hecke operators on SL $(2, \mathbb{Z})$', *Math. Ann.* **239**(1) (1979), 75–96.

[3] N. Jochnowitz, 'Congruences between systems of eigenvalues of modular forms', *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **270**(1) (1982), 269–285.

[4] I. Kiming, N. Rustom and G. Wiese, 'On certain finiteness questions in the arithmetic of modular forms', *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* **94**(2) (2016), 479–502.

[5] W. Kohnen, 'Period polynomials and congruences for Hecke algebras', *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2)* **42**(2) (1999), 217–224 [published as Hohnen].

[6] W. Kohnen and D. Zagier, 'Modular forms with rational periods', in: *Modular Forms (Durham, 1983)*, Ellis Horwood Series Mathematics and its Applications (ed. R. A. Rankin) (Horwood, Chichester, 1984), 197–249.

[7] N. Rustom, 'Congruences modulo prime powers of Hecke eigenvalues in level 1', *Res. Number Theory* **5**(1) (2019), Article no. 10.

[8] D. Zagier, 'Hecke operators and periods of modular forms', in: *Festschrift in Honor of I. I. Piatetski-Shapiro on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday, Part II*, Israel Mathematical Conference Proceedings, 3 (eds. S. Gelbart, R. Howe and P. Sarnak) (Weizmann, Jerusalem, 1990), 321–336.

LIUBOMIR CHIRIAC, Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
Portland State University, 1855 SW Broadway,
Portland, Oregon 97201, USA
e-mail: chiriac@pdx.edu

Downloaded from https://www.cambridge.org/core. UNIVERSIDAD AUTONOMA METROPOLITANA, on 17 Nov 2026 at 05:14:34, subject to the Cambridge Core terms of use, available at https://www.cambridge.org/core/terms. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0004972726101889