A THEOREM OF BOMBIERI-VINOGRADOV TYPE WITH FEW EXCEPTIONAL MODULI

ROGER BAKER

ABSTRACT. Let \( 1 \leq Q \leq x^{9/40} \) and let \( S \) be a set of pairwise relatively prime integers in \( (Q, 2Q) \). The prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions in the form

\[
\max_{y \leq x} \max_{(a, q) = 1} \left| \sum_{n \equiv a \pmod{q}, n \leq y} \Lambda(n) - \frac{x}{\phi(q)} \right| < \frac{x}{\phi(q)(\log x)^A}
\]

holds for all \( q \) in \( S \) with \( O((\log x)^{34 + A}) \) exceptions.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \( \Lambda(n) \) denote the von Mangoldt function. The prime number theorem in the form

\[
\sum_{n \leq x, n \equiv a \pmod{q}} \Lambda(n) = \frac{x}{\phi(q)} \left( 1 + O_A((\log x)^{-A}) \right)
\]

for every \( A > 0 \), holds for \( q \leq (\log x)^A, (a, q) = 1 \). The best-known average result for a set of moduli \( q \) is the Bombieri-Vinogradov theorem. Let

\[
E(x; q, a) = \sum_{n \leq x, n \equiv a \pmod{q}} \Lambda(n) - \frac{x}{\phi(q)},
\]

\[
E(x, q) = \max_{(a, q) = 1} |E(x; q, a)|, \quad E^*(x, q) = \max_{y \leq x} |E(y, q)|
\]

It is easy to deduce from the presentation of the Bombieri-Vinogradov theorem in [2] that
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for all integers \( q \) in \([Q, 2Q]\) with at most \( O(Q(\log x)^{-A}) \) exceptions, provided that \( Q \leq x^{1/2}(\log x)^{-2A-6} \).

It is of interest to restrict the size of this exceptional set further. Following Cui and Xue \cite{1} we find that provided only prime moduli \( q \) are considered, the exceptional set has cardinality \( O(\mathcal{L}^{C+A}) \) for some absolute constant \( C \) when \( Q \leq x^{1/5} \).

Glyn Harman has pointed out to me that one can obtain the result of \cite{1} directly from Vaughan \cite[Theorem 1]{9} with \( C = 3 \).

In the present paper, the constant 1/5 is increased to 9/40 by adding a ‘Halasz-Montgomery-Huxley’ bound to the tools employed in \cite{1}; see Lemma 3 below. We also relax the primality condition a little.

**Theorem.** Let \( Q \leq x^{9/40} \). Let \( S \) be a set of pairwise relatively prime integers in \([Q, 2Q]\). The number of \( q \) in \( S \) for which

\[
E^*(x, q) \leq \frac{x}{\phi(q)(\log x)^A}
\]

is \( O((\log x)^{34+A}) \).

As a simple example, we may take \( S \) to be the set of prime powers in \([Q, 2Q]\). The constant 34 could be reduced with further effort. Constants implied by ‘\( O \)', ‘\( \ll \)' are absolute constants throughout the paper. We write \(|\mathcal{E}|\) for the cardinality of a finite set \( \mathcal{E} \) and 

\[
\mathcal{L} = \log x.
\]

We suppose, as we may, that \( x \) is large.

2. A proposition which implies the theorem

We write

\[
\sum'_{\chi (\mod q)}', \quad \sum^*_{\chi (\mod q)}
\]

for a sum respectively over non-principal characters and primitive characters \( (\mod q) \). For \( y \leq x \), let

\[
\psi(y, \chi) = \sum_{n \leq y} \Lambda(n)\chi(n), \quad \psi_q(n) = \sum_{n \leq y \atop (n,q)=1} \Lambda(n).
\]

We note the identity, for \((a, q) = 1\),
\( (2.1) \quad \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \atop n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \Lambda(n) - \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \psi_q(y) = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum' \bar{\chi}(a) \psi(y, \chi). \)

For brevity, we write \( \delta = 1/20. \)

**Proposition.** Let \( Q \leq x^{9/40}. \) Then

\[
S(Q) := \sum_{q < 2Q} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \max_{y \leq x} |\psi(y, \chi)| \ll x L^{34 - \delta}.
\]

The Proposition implies the Theorem. For if \( q \in [Q, 2Q], \) an argument on page 163 of [2] yields, for \( y \leq x, \)

\[
(2.2) \quad \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \left( \sum_{n \leq y} \Lambda(n) - \psi_q(y) \right) \ll \frac{L^2 \log L}{Q}
\]

and

\[
(2.3) \quad \frac{1}{\phi(q)} (\psi(y, \chi_1) - \psi(y, \chi)) \ll \frac{L^2 \log L}{Q}
\]

where \( \chi \) is induced by the primitive character \( \chi_1. \) Let

\[
E^\dagger(x, q) = \max_{y \leq x} \max_{(a, q) = 1} \left| \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \atop n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \Lambda(n) - \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{n \leq y} \Lambda(n) \right|.
\]

We combine all contributions to \( E^\dagger(x, q) \) made by an individual primitive character. We see from \((2.1) - (2.3)\) that

\[
\sum_{q \in S} E^\dagger(x, Q) \ll \sum_{q \leq Q} L^2 \log L
\]

\[
+ \sum_{3 \leq q_1 \leq Q} \sum_{\chi_1 \pmod{q_1}} \max_{y \leq x} |\psi(y, \chi_1)| \sum_{\substack{Q_{q_1} \leq k < 2Q_{q_1} \atop q_1 k \in \mathcal{S}}} \frac{1}{\phi(kq_1)}
\]

\[
\ll Q L^3 + \frac{\log L}{Q} \sum_{3 \leq q_1 \leq Q} \sum_{\chi_1 \pmod{q_1}} \max_{y \leq x} |\psi(y, \chi_1)| \sum_{\substack{Q_{q_1} \leq k < 2Q_{q_1} \atop q_1 k \in \mathcal{S}}} 1.
\]
The inner sum is 0 or 1 by our hypothesis on $S$, and we obtain
\[ \sum_{q \in S} E^i(x, Q) \ll QL^3 + \frac{\log L}{Q} S(Q) \ll \frac{xL^{34}}{Q}. \]

The set $A$ of $q \in [Q, 2Q)$ for which
\[ E^i(x, q) > \frac{x}{2\phi(q)} L^{-A} \]
thus has cardinality
\[ |A| \ll L^{34+A}. \]

For $q \in S_Q - A$, $y \leq x$, $(a, q) = 1$ we have
\[
\left| \sum_{n \leq y \atop n \equiv a \pmod{q}} \Lambda(n) - \frac{y}{\phi(q)} \right| \\
\leq \frac{xL^{-A}}{2\phi(q)} + \left| \sum_{n \leq y} \Lambda(n) - \frac{y}{\phi(q)} \right| \\
\leq \frac{x}{\phi(q)} L^{-A}
\]
by the prime number theorem. This completes the proof of the theorem.

We now explain the initial stage of the proof of the proposition. For $\chi \pmod{q}$ a primitive character, $Q \leq q < 2Q$, choose $y(\chi)$ to maximize
\[
\left| \sum_{n \leq y} \Lambda(n)\chi(n) \right| \quad (y \leq x)
\]
and $a(\chi)$ so that $|a(\chi)| = 1$,
\[
a(\chi) \sum_{n \leq y(\chi)} \Lambda(n)\chi(n) = \left| \sum_{n \leq y(\chi)} \Lambda(n)\chi(n) \right|.
\]

Thus
\[
S(Q) = \sum_{q < 2Q} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}}^* a(\chi) \sum_{n \leq y(\chi)} \Lambda(n)\chi(n).
\]
From the discussion in Heath-Brown [3], $S(Q)$ is a linear combination, with bounded coefficients, of $O(L^3)$ sums of the form

$$S := \sum_{q < 2Q} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}}^* a(\chi) \sum_{n_1 \ldots n_8 \leq y(\chi)} (\log n_1) \mu(n_5) \ldots \mu(n_8) \chi(n_1) \ldots \chi(n_8)$$

in which $I_i = (N_i, 2N_i]$, $\prod_i N_i \leq x$ and $2N_i \leq x^{1/4}$ if $i > 4$. Some of the intervals $I_i$ may contain only the integer 1, and we replace these by $[1, 2)$ without affecting the upper bound $\prod_i N_i \leq x$. Now we need only bound $S$ by $O(xL^{2-\delta}/Q)$.

It is convenient to get rid of the factor $\log n_1$ in $S$. We have

$$S = \sum_{q \leq \chi} \int_1^{N_1} \frac{1}{v} \sum_{n_i \in I'_i} \mu(n_5) \ldots \mu(n_8) \chi(n_1) \ldots \chi(n_8) dv,$$

where $I_1 = (\max(v, N_1), 2N_1]$, and $I'_i = I_i$ for $i > 1$.

Next we use Perron’s formula [8, Lemma 3.12]. Let

$$F_j(s, \chi) = F_j(s, \chi, v) = \sum_{n \in I'_j} a_j(n) \chi(n) n^{-s}$$

where $a_j(n) = 1$ $(j \leq 4)$, $a_j(n) = \mu(n)$ $(j > 4)$. Then

$$\sum_{n_i \in I'_i \atop n_1 \ldots n_8 \leq y(\chi)} \mu(n_5) \ldots \mu(n_8) \chi(n_1) \ldots \chi(n_8)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{1-L^{-1}+ix}^{1-L^{-1}-ix} F_1(s, \chi) \ldots F_8(s, \chi) \frac{y(\chi)^s}{s} dx + O(L^2).$$

We shift the path of integration to $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$. We have

$$\left| \prod_{j=1}^8 F_j(\sigma \pm ix, \chi) \right| \leq \prod_{j=1}^8 N_j^{1-\sigma} \leq x^{1-\sigma},$$
so that the integral on the horizontal segments is \( O(1) \). Thus

\[
S = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \sum_{q,\chi} \int_{1}^{N_1} \frac{1}{v} \int_{-x}^{x} \prod_{j=1}^{8} F_j \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \frac{y(\chi)^{1+it}}{\frac{1}{2} + it} \, dt \, dv + O(Q^2 \mathcal{L}^2)
\]

\[
\ll x^{1/2} \mathcal{L} \sum_{q,\chi,T} T^{-1} \int_{-T}^{T} \prod_{j=1}^{8} \left| F_j \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right| \, dt + O(Q^2 \mathcal{L}^2)
\]

where \( T \) takes the values \( 2^k, 1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{L}/\log 2 \). Here \( v \) is now fixed in \([1, N_1]\). Since \( Q^4 < x \), we need only show that

\[
\sum_{q<2Q} \sum_{\chi \, \text{mod} \, q} \int_{-T}^{T} \prod_{j=1}^{8} \left| F_j \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right| \, dt \ll T^{39/40} x^{1/2} \mathcal{L}^{25-\delta} \ (1 \leq T \leq x).
\]

This is done by grouping \( F_1 \ldots F_8 \) into two or three subproducts. It is time to state the lemmas we need on Dirichlet polynomials. For the rest of this section, let

\[
S(s, \chi) = \sum_{n=N}^{N'} a_n \chi(n)n^{-s}
\]

where \( 1 \leq N \leq x, N \leq N' \leq cN \) with an absolute constant \( c \), and let

\[
G = \sum_{n=N}^{N'} |a_n|^2.
\]

**Lemma 1.** Let \( 1 \leq T, Q \leq x \). For a primitive character \( \chi \, \text{mod} \, q \) let \( J_\chi \) be a set of numbers in \([-T, T]\) such that \(|t - t'| \geq 1\) for distinct \( t, t' \) in \( J_\chi \). Then

\[
\sum_{q<2Q} \sum_{\chi \, \text{mod} \, q} \sum_{t \in J_\chi} \left| S(it, \chi) \right|^2 \ll \mathcal{L}(Q^2 T + N)G.
\]

**Proof.** This follows at once from Theorem 7.3 of Montgomery [7]. \( \square \)

**Lemma 2.** Let \( a_n = 1 \ (N \leq n \leq N') \) in (2.4). Let \( J_\chi \) be as in Lemma [1]. Then

\[
\sum_{q<2Q} \sum_{\chi \, \text{mod} \, q} \sum_{t \in J_\chi} \left| S \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^4 \ll Q^2 T \mathcal{L}^4.
\]
Proof. Following the argument of Liu and Liu [6], proof of Proposition 5.3, we find that

\[(2.8) \quad M_1 := \sum_{q < 2Q} \sum^*_{\chi (\text{mod } q)} \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^4 dt \ll Q^2 T \mathcal{L}^9 \]

and, for the derivative \( S' \),

\[(2.9) \quad M_2 := \sum_{q < 2Q} \sum^*_{\chi (\text{mod } q)} \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S' \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^2 dt \ll Q^2 T \mathcal{L}^{13}. \]

We now appeal to Lemma 1.4 of [4] with \( S^2, 2SS' \) in place of \( S' \). This gives for the left-hand side of (2.7) the bound

\[
\sum_{q < 2Q} \sum^*_{\chi (\text{mod } q)} \left\{ \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^4 dt + \left( \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^4 dt \right)^{1/2} \left( \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S' \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^2 \left( \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S' \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^2 dt \right)^{1/2} \right) \right\}.
\]

By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the product contributes at most

\[
\sum_{q < 2Q} \sum^*_{\chi (\text{mod } q)} \left( \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^4 dt \right)^{3/4} \left( \int_{-T}^{T} \left| S' \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^4 dt \right)^{1/4},
\]

which by Hölder’s inequality is at most \( M_1^{3/4} M_2^{1/4} \). The proof is now completed using (2.8), (2.9). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.** Let \( \mathcal{B} \) be the set of \((q, \chi, t)\) with \( q \leq Q \), \( \chi \) (mod \( q \)), \( t \in J_\chi \) and

\[|S(it, \chi)| \geq V > 0\]

in Lemma 1. Then

\[(2.10) \quad |\mathcal{B}| \ll G N V^{-2} \mathcal{L}^6 + G^3 N Q^2 T V^{-6} \mathcal{L}^{18}. \]

**Proof.** This is a very slight variant of Iwaniec and Kowalski [5, Theorem 9.18]. \( \square \)

Let \( \tau_b(n) \) be the number of factorizations \( n = n_1 \ldots n_b \).
If \( S(it, \chi) \) is the product of \( b \) of the above functions \( F_j \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \), it is clear that

\[
(2.11) \quad G \leq N^{-1} \sum_{n \leq cN} \tau_b^2(n) \ll \mathcal{L}^{b^2-1}.
\]

The last step is a standard application of Perron’s formula to

\[
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\tau_b^2(n)}{n^s},
\]

which we can write as \( F(s) \zeta(s)^b \) with \( F \) analytic and bounded in \( \text{Re}(s) \geq 2/3 \). It follows that, with \( J_\chi \) as in Lemma 1,

\[
(2.12) \quad \sum_{q<2Q} \sum^*_{\chi \pmod{q}} \sum_{t \in J_\chi} \left| F_j \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|^2 \ll x^{9/20} \mathcal{L}^{10}
\]

for \( N_j \ll x^{9/40} \) (using Lemma 1 and (2.11)) and for \( N_j > x^{1/4} \) (using Lemma 2). This explains the role of the ‘difficult interval’ \((9/40, 1/4)\) in Lemma 4 below.

3. Proof of the Proposition

Lemma 4. Let \( u_1 \geq \cdots \geq u_8 \geq 0, u_1 + \cdots + u_8 \leq 1 \). Then either

(a) there is a partition \( \{i\}, A_1, A_2 \) of \( \{1, \ldots, 8\} \) with \( \max(|A_1|, |A_2|) \leq 5 \),

\[
\begin{align*}
u_i \not\in (9/40, 1/4), & \quad \max \left( \sum_{j \in A_1} u_j, \sum_{j \in A_2} u_j \right) \leq 9/20,
\end{align*}
\]

or

(b) there is a partition \( A_1, A_2 \) of \( \{1, \ldots, 8\} \) with \( \max(|A_1|, |A_2|) \leq 6 \),

\[
\sum_{j \in A_i} u_j \leq 11/20 \quad (i = 1, 2).
\]

Proof. If \( u_1 + \cdots + u_5 \leq 11/20 \) we have (b) with \( A_1 = \{1, \ldots, 5\} \) since \( u_6 + u_7 + u_8 \leq \frac{3}{8} \). Assume \( u_1 + \cdots + u_5 > 11/20 \). Let \( k \) be the least integer such that

\[
u_1 + \cdots + u_k \geq 9/20.
\]

One of the following cases must occur.

(i) \( u_1 \not\in (9/40, 1/4), u_2 + u_4 + u_6 + u_8 > 9/20.\)
(ii) \( u_1 \not\in (9/40, 1/4) \), \( u_2 + u_4 + u_6 + u_8 \leq 9/20 \).

(iii) \( u_1 \in (9/40, 1/4) \), \( u_1 + \cdots + u_k \leq 11/20 \).

(iv) \( u_1 \in (9/40, 1/4) \), \( u_1 + \cdots + u_k > 11/20 \).

In Case (i) we have

\[
9/20 < u_2 + u_4 + u_6 + u_8 \leq 1/2
\]

and (b) holds with \( \mathcal{A}_1 = \{2, 4, 6, 8\} \).

In Case (ii) we have \( u_3 + u_5 + u_7 \leq u_2 + u_4 + u_6 \), and (a) holds with \( i = 1, \mathcal{A}_1 = \{3, 5, 7\} \).

In Case (iii), (b) holds with \( \mathcal{A}_1 = \{1, \ldots, k\} \).

In Case (iv), we have \( k \geq 3 \). Now (a) holds with \( i = 2, \mathcal{A}_1 = \{1, 3, \ldots, k\} \). For \( u_2 \leq \frac{u_1 + u_8}{2} < 9/40 \) and \( u_1 + u_3 + \cdots + u_k \leq u_1 + u_2 + \cdots + u_{k-1} < 9/20 \). \( \square \)

**Proof of the Proposition.** In place of (2.4), it clearly suffices to show that, with \( J_\chi \) as in Lemma 1,

\[
E := \sum_{q < 2Q} \sum^* \chi(q) \sum_{t \in J_\chi} \prod_{j=1}^8 \left| F_j \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|
\]

\[
\ll T^{39/40} x^{1/2} \mathcal{L}^{25-\delta}.
\]

We reorder \( N_1, \ldots, N_8 \) so that \( N_1 \geq \cdots \geq N_8 \) and write \( N_j = x^{u_j} \) with \( u_1 \geq \cdots \geq u_8 \geq 0 \), \( u_1 + \cdots + u_8 \leq 1 \). Suppose we are in Case (b) of Lemma 4. Let us write

\[
\prod_{j \in \mathcal{A}_1} N_j = M, \quad \prod_{j \in \mathcal{A}_2} N_j = N, \quad S_b(it, \chi) = \prod_{j \in \mathcal{A}_2} F_j \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right), \quad b = |\mathcal{A}_2|.
\]

We bound \( E \) using Cauchy’s inequality and (2.6), (2.11) for \( S = S_1, S_2 \):

\[
E \ll \left( (Q^2 T + M) \mathcal{L}^{(8-b)^2} \right)^{1/2} \left( (Q^2 T + N) \mathcal{L}^{b^2} \right)^{1/2}
\]

\[
\ll (Q^2 T + x^{1/2} + (Q^2 T)^{1/2}(\max(M, N))^{1/2}) \mathcal{L}^{20}.
\]
Now
\[ Q^2 T \ll T^{19/20} x^{1/2} \]
\[ (Q^2 T)^{1/2} (\max(M, N))^{1/2} \ll T^{1/2} x^{9/40+11/40} \ll T^{1/2} x^{1/2}. \]

This is acceptable in (3.1)

Suppose now we are in Case (a) of Lemma 4. The argument mimics one due to Iwaniec [4]. We retain the notation (3.2), and write
\[ L = x^{\nu_i}. \]
The contribution to \( E \) from those \( t \) with
\[ \min \left( \left| F_i \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right|, |S_1(it, \chi)|, |S_2(it, \chi)| \right) \leq x^{-1} \]
is at most
\[ Q^2 T x^{-1} \ll T^{39/40} x^{1/2} \mathcal{L}^{25-\delta}. \]

By a simple splitting-up argument, there is a subset \( \mathcal{B} \) of the set of triples \((q, \chi, t), q < 2Q, \chi \text{ (mod } q), t \in J_\chi \text{ in (3.1)} \) such that, for \((q, \chi, t) \in \mathcal{B}, \) we have
\[ U \leq \left| F_i \left( \frac{1}{2} + it, \chi \right) \right| < 2U, \]
\[ V \leq |S_1(it, \chi)| < 2V, \]
\[ W \leq |S_2(it, \chi)| < 2W \]
for positive numbers \( U, V, W \) with
\[ x^{-1} \leq U \ll x^{\nu_i/2}, x^{-1} \leq V \ll M^{1/2}, x^{-1} \leq W \ll N^{1/2}, \]
while
\[ (3.3) \quad E \ll UVW|\mathcal{B}|\mathcal{L}^3 \]
\[ \ll UVWP\mathcal{L}^3. \]
Here

\[ P = \min \left( \frac{(M + x^{9/20}T)\mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2}}{V^2}, \frac{(N + x^{9/20}T)\mathcal{L}^6}{W^2}, \frac{x^{9/20}T\mathcal{L}^{10}}{U^4} \right), \]

\[ \frac{M}{V^2} \mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2 + 5} + \frac{M x^{9/20}T}{V^6} \mathcal{L}^{3(7-b)^2 + 15}, \frac{N}{W^2} \mathcal{L}^{b^2 + 5} + \frac{x^{9/20}T\mathcal{L}^{3b^2 + 15}}{W^6}, \]

\[ \frac{L^2}{U^4} \mathcal{L}^9 + \frac{L^2 x^{9/20}T}{U^6} \mathcal{L}^{27}, \]

and we have used (2.6), (2.7), (2.10), (2.11) in the second step in (3.3). It remains to show that

\[ UVWP \ll T^{39/40} x^{1/2} \mathcal{L}^{22-\delta}. \]

We consider four cases.

**Case 1.** \( P \leq \frac{2M}{V^2} \mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2 + 5}, \quad P \leq \frac{2N}{W^2} \mathcal{L}^{b^2 + 5}. \)

In this case

\[ UVWP \leq 2UVW \min \left( (V^{-2}M\mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2 + 5}, W^{-2}N\mathcal{L}^{b^2 + 5}) \right) \ll U(MN)^{1/2} \mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2 + 5} \ll x^{1/2} \mathcal{L}^{20}. \]

**Case 2.** \( P > \frac{2M}{V^2} \mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2 + 5}, \quad P > \frac{2N}{W^2} \mathcal{L}^{b^2 + 5} \). In this case,

\[ P \leq 2A_1 + 2B_1, \]

where

\[ A_1 = \min \left( x^{9/20}TV^{-2} \mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2 + 5}, x^{9/20}TW^{-2} \mathcal{L}^{b^2 + 5}, \right. \]

\[ x^{9/20}TMV^{-6} \mathcal{L}^{3(7-b)^2 + 15}, x^{9/20}TNW^{-6} \mathcal{L}^{3b^2 + 15}, \]

\[ x^{9/20}TU^{-4} \mathcal{L}^{10}, L^2U^{-4} \mathcal{L}^9 \]

and

\[ B_1 = \min \left( x^{9/20}TV^{-2} \mathcal{L}^{(7-b)^2 + 5}, x^{9/20}TW^{-2} \mathcal{L}^{b^2 + 5}, \right. \]

\[ x^{9/20}TMV^{-6} \mathcal{L}^{3(7-b)^2 + 15}, x^{9/20}TNW^{-6} \mathcal{L}^{3b^2 + 15}, \]

\[ x^{9/20}TU^{-4} \mathcal{L}^{10}, x^{9/20}T L^2U^{-12} \mathcal{L}^{27}. \]
We have, for a constant $K_1$,
\[
A_1 \leq \mathcal{L}^{K_1}(x^{9/20}TV^{-2})^{5/16}(x^{9/20}TW^{-2})^{5/16}(x^{9/20}TMV^{-6})^{1/16},
\]
\[
(x^{9/20}TW^{-6})^{1/16}\min(x^{9/20}TU^{-4},L^2U^{-4})^{1/4}
\ll \mathcal{L}^{K_1}(UVW)^{-1}T^{31/32}x^{319/640},
\]
which is acceptable in (3.4). Now
\[
B_1 \leq \min((x^{9/20}TV^{-2}\mathcal{L}(7-b)^2+5)^{5/16}(x^{9/20}TW^{-2}\mathcal{L}b^2+5)^{5/16}.
\]
\[
(x^{9/20}TMV^{-6}\mathcal{L}3(7-b)^2+15)^{1/16}(x^{9/20}TNW^{-6}\mathcal{L}3b^2+15)^{1/16}(x^{9/20}U^{-4}\mathcal{L}10)^{1/4},
\]
\[
(x^{9/20}TV^{-2}\mathcal{L}(7-b)^2+5)^{7/16}(x^{9/20}TW^{-2}\mathcal{L}b^2+5)^{7/16}(x^{9/20}TMV^{-6}\mathcal{L}3(7-b)^2+15)^{1/48}.
\]
\[
(x^{9/20}TNW^{-6}\mathcal{L}3b^2+15)^{1/48}(x^{9/20}TL^2U^{-12}\mathcal{L}27)^{1/12}
\ll (UVW)^{-1}x^{9/20}T^{3/4}(MN)^{1/16}\min(\mathcal{L}^{K_2},T^{1/4}L^{1/6}(MN)^{-1/24}\mathcal{L}^{K_3})
\]
where
\[
K_2 = ((7-b)^2 + b^2) \left( \frac{5}{16} + \frac{3}{16} \right) + \frac{50}{16} + \frac{30}{16} + \frac{10}{4} \leq 22,
\]
\[
K_3 = ((7-b)^2 + b^2) \left( \frac{7}{16} + \frac{3}{48} \right) + \frac{70}{16} + \frac{30}{48} + \frac{27}{12} \leq 22 - \frac{1}{4}.
\]
We bound the last minimum by $\mathcal{L}^{22-3/40}(T^{1/4}L^{1/6}(MN)^{-1/24})^{3/10}$, obtaining
\[
B_1 \ll (UVW)^{-1}T^{39/40}x^{1/2}\mathcal{L}^{22-\delta},
\]
which is acceptable in (3.4).

Case 3. $P > 2V^{-2}M\mathcal{L}(7-b)^2+5, P \leq 2W^{-2}N\mathcal{L}b^2+5$. In this case, for a constant $K_4$,
\[
P \leq \mathcal{L}^{K_4}(A_2 + B_2)
\]
where
\[
A_2 = \min(x^{9/20}TV^{-2},NW^{-2},x^{9/20}TMV^{-6},x^{9/20}TU^{-4},L^2U^{-4}),
\]
\[
B_2 = \min(x^{9/20}TV^{-2},NW^{-2},x^{9/20}TMV^{-6},x^{9/20}TU^{-4},x^{9/20}TL^2U^{-12}).
\]
Now
\[
A_2 \leq (x^{9/20}TV^{-2})^{1/8}(NW^{-2})^{1/2}(x^{9/20}TMV^{-6})^{1/8} \\
\min(x^{9/20}TU^{-4}, L^2U^{-4})^{1/4} \\
= (UVW)^{-1}(x^{9/20}TN)^{1/2}M^{1/8}\min(1, x^{-9/80}T^{-1/4}L^{1/2}),
\]
We bound the last minimum by \((x^{-9/80}T^{-1/4}L^{1/2})^{1/4}\), obtaining
\[
A_2 \ll (UVW)^{-1}T^{7/16}x^{157/320}
\]
(using \(N \leq x^{9/20}\)), which is acceptable. Further,
\[
B_2 \ll \min((x^{9/20}TV^{-2})^{1/8}(NW^{-2})^{1/2}(x^{9/20}TMV^{-6})^{1/8}(x^{9/20}TU^{-4})^{1/4}, \\
(x^{9/20}TV^{-2})^{3/8}(NW^{-2})^{1/2}(x^{9/20}TMV^{-6})^{1/24}(x^{9/20}L^2U^{-12})^{1/12}) \\
= (UVW)^{-1}(x^{9/20}TN)^{1/2}M^{1/8}\min(1, L^{1/6}M^{-1/12}).
\]
We bound the last minimum by \((L^{1/6}M^{-1/12})^{1/2}\). Similarly to the bound for \(A_2\),
\[
B_2 \ll (UVW)^{-1}T^{1/2}x^{119/240},
\]
which is acceptable.

**Case 4.** \(P \leq 2V^{-2}ML^2(7-b)^2+5\), \(P > 2W^{-2}NL^2b^2+5\). We proceed as in Case 3, interchanging the roles of \(S_1\) and \(S_2\).

This establishes (3.4) and completes the proof of the Proposition. □
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