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Abstract. Let \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1,1\} \) be a completely multiplicative function and let \( \mu_2(n) \) be the indicator that \( n \) is cubefree. We prove that \( f = \mu_2^2 g \) has unbounded partial sums. In the squarefree case \( f = \mu^2 g \), we provided a necessary condition for bounded partial sums: \( f \) pretends to be a real and primitive Dirichlet character \( \chi \) of conductor \( q \) coprime with 6, and \( f(2)\chi(2) = f(3)\chi(3) = -1 \). Our proofs are built upon Klurman & Mangerel’s proof of Chudakov’s conjecture \([4]\), Klurman’s work on correlations of multiplicative functions \([3]\) and Tao’s resolution of the Erdős discrepancy problem \([7]\).

1. Introduction.

The Erdős discrepancy problem asks if there exists an arithmetic function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1,1\} \) that is well distributed along all homogeneous arithmetic progressions, in the sense that

\[
\sup_{x,d} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} f(nd) \right| < \infty.
\]

This problem became the subject of the Polymath5 project in 2010, and as Tao showed in 2015 \([7]\), for such \( f \) the sup of the quantity above is equal to infinity. In particular, if \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1,1\} \) is completely multiplicative, then \( f \) has unbounded partial sums. However, if \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1,1\} \) is assumed to be only multiplicative, then \( f \) may have bounded partial sums, for instance \( f(n) = (-1)^{n+1} \).

Following Granville & Soundararajan \([2]\), define the “distance” between two multiplicative functions \( |f|,|g| \leq 1 \) up to \( x \) as

\[
\mathbb{D}(f, g; x) := \left( \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1 - \text{Re}(f(p)g(p))}{p} \right)^{1/2},
\]

where in the sum above \( p \) denotes a generic prime. Moreover, let \( \mathbb{D}(f, g) := \mathbb{D}(f, g; \infty) \), and we say that \( f \) pretends to be \( g \), or that \( f \) is \( g \)-pretentious if \( \mathbb{D}(f, g) < \infty \).

In \([4]\), Tao showed that if \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1,1\} \) is multiplicative and has bounded partial sums, then \( f \) is 1-pretentious and \( f(2^k) = -1 \) for all \( k \geq 1 \). In \([3]\), Klurman provided a complete classification of such \( f \) with bounded partial sums – It has been proved the Erdős-Coons-Tao
conjecture: A multiplicative function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \) has bounded partial sums if and only if there exists an integer \( m \geq 1 \) such that for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), \( f(n + m) = f(n) \) and \( \sum_{n=1}^{m} f(n) = 0 \).

When we allow zero values, that is, for a completely multiplicative function \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 0, 1\} \) such that \( f(p) = 0 \) only for a finite subset of primes \( p \), then also \( f \) may have bounded partial sums, for instance, any real non-principal Dirichlet character \( \chi \). Moreover, in [4], Klurman & Mangerel established the Chudakov’s conjecture: Assume that \( f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C} \) is completely multiplicative; Take only a finite number of values; Has bounded partial sums; The set \( \{ \{ p \text{ is a prime} : f(p) = 0 \} \} < \infty \). Then \( f \) is a Dirichlet character.

Here we are interested in the discrepancy problem for multiplicative functions \( f \) assuming zero values and such that at primes, \( f(p) = \pm 1 \). More precisely, we are interested in knowing if such \( f \) has bounded, or unbounded partial sums when the summation \( \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) \) is restricted to certain subsets of integers with additional arithmetic properties. As showed in [3], [4] and [7] (see Proposition 2.1 below), if such \( f \) has bounded partial sums, then \( f \) must be \( \chi \)-pretentious for some real and primitive Dirichlet character \( \chi \).

In [1], the author addressed the question of how small can we make the partial sums of a multiplicative function supported on the squarefree integers, that is, \( f = \mu^2 g \), where \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \) is a completely multiplicative function and \( \mu \) is the M"obius function. As mentioned above, when we seek for multiplicative functions with small partial sums, then one needs to look firstly to multiplicative functions that pretends to be a Dirichlet character \( \chi \). In [1], it has been proved that if \( f \) is strongly \( \chi \)-pretentious for some real and non-principal Dirichlet character \( \chi \), i.e., \( \sum_{p \leq x} \left| 1 - f(p)\chi(p) \right| \ll 1 \), then the partial sums of \( f \) can not have too much cancellation, more precisely \( \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) \) is \( \Omega(x^{1/4-\epsilon}) \). This motivate us to conjecture:

**Conjecture 1.1.** If \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \) is multiplicative, then \( f = \mu^2 g \) has unbounded partial sums.

Towards this conjecture, our first result states:

**Theorem 1.1.** Let \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \) be multiplicative and \( f = \mu^2 g \). If \( f \) has bounded partial sums, then \( \mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty \) for some real and primitive character \( \chi \) of conductor \( q \) coprime with 6, and \( f(2)\chi(2) = f(3)\chi(3) = -1 \).

The theorem above, stated in another way, says essentially that if the condition \( f(2)\chi(2) = f(3)\chi(3) = -1 \) is violated, then \( f \) has unbounded partial sums.

Let us consider for a moment multiplicative functions not necessarily bounded by 1 and assuming zero values, but with the restriction \( f(p) \neq 0 \) for all primes \( p \). Then, the next example
shows the technical issue that we obtain in order to establish the conjecture \[1.1\]. More precisely, the next example shows that the values of \( f \) at powers of 2 are pivotal for bounded partial sums:

**Example 1.1.** Let \( f \) be the multiplicative function such that: for \( k \geq 1 \), \( f(2^k) = -2\mu^2(2^k) \), and for each prime \( p > 2 \), for all \( k \geq 1 \), \( f(p^k) = 1 \). Then \( f(n + 4) = f(n) \), for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), and \( f(1), f(2), f(3), f(4) = 1, -2, 1, 0 \). Thus, \( f \) has bounded partial sums. However, clearly \( f \) is not a counterexample to our Conjecture \[1.1\] since \( f \) is not supported on the squarefree integers neither is bounded by 1, although, it represents the kind of issue that we have in the case \( f(2)\chi(2) = f(3)\chi(3) = -1 \) in Theorem \[1.1\] above.

Let \( \mu_2^2(n) \) be the indicator that \( n \) is cubefree, i.e., \( \mu_2^2 \) is multiplicative and at each prime \( p \), \( \mu_2^2(p^k) = 1 \) if \( k \in \{0, 1, 2\} \), and 0 otherwise. In the cubefree case, for \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \) completely multiplicative, we have a certain rigidity of \( f = \mu_2^2 g \) at primes squared: \( f(p^2) = 1 \). On the one hand, one could think that this could prevent \( f \) to have small partial sums, when actually the opposite is true, at least when compared with the squarefree case: In the squarefree case, we can provide examples of multiplicative functions \( f = \mu_2^2 g \) whose partial sums have square root cancellation, see [1]; In the cubefree case we can provide examples of \( f = \mu_2^2 g \) with partial sums \( \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) \ll x^{1/3+\epsilon} \), for any \( \epsilon > 0 \). Indeed, we can get an example of this by adjusting, in a standard way, any real non-principal Dirichlet character \( \chi \) to a completely multiplicative function \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \), and then restrict \( g \) to the cubefree integers. With an extra effort, one could, perhaps, remove the \(+\epsilon\) from the exponent, by following the same line of reasoning of [1]. Our next result states:

**Theorem 1.2.** Let \( g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \) be completely multiplicative and let \( f = \mu_2^2 g \). Then \( f \) has unbounded partial sums.

In our proofs, we follow essentially the same line of reasoning of the proof of Chudakov’s conjecture [4]. As mentioned above, if our \( f \) has bounded partial sums, then \( f \) is \( \chi \)-pretentious for some real and primitive Dirichlet character \( \chi \) of conductor \( q \), and when this happens, in [3], it has been established formulae for the correlations (see Theorem 2.2 below):

\[
S_d := \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n+d) := v(d; f\chi)\lambda(d; |f|, \chi).
\]

The function \( \lambda(d) \) depends essentially on the sum \( \sum_{a \leq q} \chi(a)\chi(a+d) \), and the function \( v(d) \) can be expressed as a constant \( C = C(f) \) times \( 1 \ast u(d) \), where \( u \) is a well behaved multiplicative function. With these correlations formulae, we can give precise estimates for

\[
\Lambda(H) := \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \left| \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+H} f(k) \right|^2 = \sum_{|h| \leq H} (H - |h|) S_{|h|}.
\]
If \( f \) has bounded partial sums, then \( \Lambda(H) = O(1) \), and as we show below, the structure of \( u \) implies that this impossible in the cubefree case. In the squarefree case we are not able to handle the case in which \( f \) is \( \chi \)-pretentious and \( f(2)\chi(2) = f(3)\chi(3) = -1 \), however we still believe that Conjecture 1.1 is true.

From the analysis below, it seems likely that if \( f \) is the restriction of a completely multiplicative function \( g: \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\} \) to the \( k \)-free integers, \( k \geq 2 \), then we will have Theorem 1.1 if \( k \) is even and Theorem 1.2 if \( k \) is odd. Moreover, it will be interesting to investigate the case in which \( g \) is only multiplicative, which is subject of future research.

Let \( \chi \) be a real and primitive Dirichlet character of conductor \( q \) and let \( \chi^* \) be a completely multiplicative extension of \( \chi \), i.e., \( \chi^*(n) = \chi(n) \) if \( \gcd(n, q) = 1 \), and at each prime \( p|q \), \( \chi^*(p) = \pm 1 \). Let \( f_1 = \mu^2\chi^* \) and \( f_2 = \mu^2\chi^* \). Clearly \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) are \( \chi \)-pretentious. In [1], it has been proved that if \( \chi \) is real and non-principal, and if we assume RH for \( L(s, \chi) \), then the statement \( \sum_{n \leq x} f_1(n) \ll x^{1/4+\epsilon} \) for any \( \epsilon > 0 \) implies RH for \( \zeta \). Towards this fact we have:

**Theorem 1.3.** Let \( f_1 \) and \( f_2 \) be as above and let \( \Lambda(H) \) be as in [1]. Then, in the squarefree case, \( \Lambda(H) \ll H^{1/2} \); In the cubefree case \( \Lambda(H) \ll H^{1/3} \).

We can interpret \( \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} |\cdot|^2 \) as an expectation \( \mathbb{E} |\cdot|^2 \) where \( n \) is a random number chosen with probability \( \frac{1}{x} \) in the set \( \{1, \ldots, x\} \subset \mathbb{N} \). Thus, for each fixed \( x \), we have Hölder’s inequality: \( \mathbb{E} |\cdot| \leq (\mathbb{E} |\cdot|^2)^{1/2} \). By defining \( \mathbb{E}^* = \limsup_{x \to \infty} \mathbb{E} \), Theorem 1.3 says that, in the squarefree case, for a certain proportion of \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), the short sum \( |\sum_{k=n+1}^{n+H} f_1(k)| \) has \( H^{1/4} \)-cancellation, and similarly, we have \( H^{1/6} \)-cancellation in the cubefree case, which is, as mentioned above, consistent with GRH. It seems likely that we will have the same pattern if \( f_k \) is the restriction of \( \chi^* \) to the \( k \)-free integers.

**Remark.** The first version of this paper has been uploaded to arXiv in September, 2019. In November, 2019, our Theorem 1.1 has been strenghtened by Klurman, Mangerel, Pohoata and Teräväinen [5]. Indeed, in their first version uploaded to arXiv, they showed that if \( f \) as in Theorem 1.1 has bounded partial sums, then \( f(p) = \chi(p) \) for all sufficiently large primes \( p \). By following a suggestion of the author, more precisely, by combining their result with an unconditional version of Theorem 1.3 of [1], the authors of [5] have completely solved our conjecture 1.1 in their version 2 uploaded to arXiv in December, 2019.
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2. Proofs of the main results

Notation. Here $U = \{ z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| \leq 1 \}$. We use both $f(x) \ll g(x)$ and $f(x) = O(g(x))$ whenever there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $x \geq 1$ we have that $|f(x)| \leq C |g(x)|$. Further, $\ll_{\delta}$ means that the implicit constant may depend on $\delta$. The standard $f(x) = o(g(x))$ means that $\lim_{x \to \infty} f(x) / g(x) = 0$. We let $P$ for the set of primes and $p$ for a generic element of $P$. The notation $p^k \| n$ means that $k$ is the largest power of $p$ for which $p^k$ divides $n$. The Möbius function is denoted by $\mu$, i.e., the multiplicative function with support on the squarefree integers and such that at the primes $\mu(p) = -1$. Dirichlet convolution is denoted by $\ast$. Given a subset $A \subset \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $1_A(n)$ the characteristic function of $A$. We let $\mu_2(n) = 1[n$ is cubefree], i.e., at power of primes $\mu_2(p^l) = 1_{l \in \{0,1,2\}}$. Here $\text{rad}(n) = \prod_{p \mid n} p$. Given multiplicative functions $f, g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C}$,

$$D(f, g ; x) := \left( \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1 - \Re (f(p) g(p))}{p} \right)^{1/2},$$

and $D(f, g) = \lim_{x \to \infty} D(f, g ; x)$. We let $\mathbb{N}(q) = \{ m \in \mathbb{N} : \text{rad}(m) \mid q \}$. Finally, $\omega(k)$ is the number of distinct primes that divide a certain $k$.

2.1. Preliminaries. The proof of our results starts with the Proposition below, which is essentially due to Tao [7] Remark 3.1, Klurman [3] Lemma 4.3 and Klurman & Mangerel [4] Lemma 5.1. Hence, for the convenience of the reader, in Appendix A.1 we only indicate how to obtain it from these results.

Proposition 2.1. Suppose that $f : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is a multiplicative function such $\sum_{n \leq x} f^2(n) = (c + o(1)) x$ for some positive constant $c$, and further assume that at primes $f(p)^2 = 1$. If $f$ has bounded partial sums, then there exists a real and primitive Dirichlet character $\chi$ of conductor $q$ such that $D(f, \chi) < \infty$.

Theorem 2.1 (Klurman, [3], Corollary 3.3). Let $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{C}$ be a multiplicative function such that $D(1, f) < \infty$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) f(n + d) = \sum_{r \mid d} \frac{G(r)}{r},$$
where \( G(r) \) is given by:

\[
G(r) = \prod_{\substack{p^k || r \\
(k \geq 0)}} \left( |f \ast \mu(p^k)|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{Re(f \ast \mu(p^k) \bar{f} \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^{i-k}} \right).
\]

Now we will suppose that \( f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{U} \) is multiplicative, \( \mathbb{D}(f, \chi n^t) < \infty \) for some \( t \in \mathbb{R} \) and for some primitive Dirichlet character \( \chi \) of conductor \( q \). We define \( F \) to be the multiplicative function such that

\[
(2) \quad F(p^k) = \begin{cases} 
  f(p^k)\chi(p^k)p^{-ikt}, & \text{if } p \nmid q \\
  1, & \text{if } p|q.
\end{cases}
\]

For \( p \nmid q \), let \( F_p(\cdot) \) be the multiplicative function such that for each prime \( \tilde{p} \),

\[
F_p(p^k) = \begin{cases} 
  F(p^k), & \text{if } \tilde{p} = p \\
  1, & \text{if } \tilde{p} \neq p.
\end{cases}
\]

For \( p \nmid q \), let \( M_p(F, F, d) \) be given by

\[
M_p(F, F, d) = \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} F_p(n)\overline{F_p(n+d)}.
\]

**Lemma 2.1.** Suppose that \( p \nmid q \) and that \( p^n || d \), where \( n \geq 0 \). Let \( F \) be given by (2). Then

\[
M_p(F, F, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{n} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^n)|^2}{p^n} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{Re(F \ast \mu(p^n)\overline{F \ast \mu(p^i)})}{p^i} \right).
\]

**Proof.** For \( p \nmid q \), observe that \( \mathbb{D}(1, F_p) = \sqrt{\frac{1 - Re(F(p))}{p}} \). Thus Theorem 2.1 is applicable to \( F_p \):

\[
M_p(F, F, d) = \sum_{r || d} \frac{G_p(r)}{r},
\]

where

\[
G_p(r) = \prod_{\substack{\tilde{p}^k || r \\
(k \geq 0)}} \left( |F_p \ast \mu(\tilde{p}^k)|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} \frac{Re(F_p \ast \mu(\tilde{p}^k)\overline{F_p \ast \mu(\tilde{p}^i)})}{\tilde{p}^{i-k}} \right).
\]

For \( \tilde{p} \neq p \) and \( k \geq 1 \), we have that \( F_p \ast \mu(\tilde{p}^k) = F_p(\tilde{p}^k) - F_p(\tilde{p}^{k-1}) = 1 - 1 = 0 \). Thus, if \( r \) is divisible by some prime \( \tilde{p} \neq p \), for \( \tilde{p}^k || r \), we have that \( G_p(r) = 0 \). Hence, if \( p^n || d, n \geq 0 \),

\[
M_p(F, F, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{n} \frac{G_p(p^n)}{p^n}.
\]
For \(a \geq 0:\)

\[
G_p(p^a) = \left( |F_p \ast \mu(p^a)|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F_p \ast \mu(p^a)F_p \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^{i-a}} \right) \\
\times \prod_{\tilde{p} \neq p} \left( |F_p \ast \mu(1)|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F_p \ast \mu(1)F_p \ast \mu(\tilde{p}^i))}{\tilde{p}^i} \right) \\
= |F_p \ast \mu(p^a)|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F_p \ast \mu(p^a)F_p \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^{i-a}} \\
= |F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2 + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F \ast \mu(p^a)F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^{i-a}}.
\]

\[\square\]

**Theorem 2.2** (Klurman, [3], Theorem 1.5, correct formulation\[1\]). Let \(f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}\) be multiplicative and such that \(\mathbb{D}(f, \chi^{nt}) < \infty\), for some \(t \in \mathbb{R}\) and for some primitive Dirichlet character \(\chi\) of conductor \(q\). Let \(F\) be as in (2). For \(d \in \mathbb{N}\), let

\[
S_d := \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)f(n + d).
\]

Then

\[
S_d = \prod_{p \mid q} M_p(F, \overline{F}, d) \prod_{p' \parallel q} M_{p'}(f, \overline{f}, d),
\]

where

\[
M_p(f, \overline{f}, d) = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } p^{l-1} \nmid d, \\
-\frac{1}{p}, & \text{if } p^{l-1} \parallel d, \\
\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sum_{j=0}^{k} \frac{|f(p^j)|^2}{p^j} - \frac{|f(p^{j+1})|^2}{p^{j+2}}, & \text{if } p^{j+k} \mid d, \text{ where } k \geq 0,
\end{cases}
\]

and if \(p^n \parallel d\) for some \(n \geq 0\), \(M_p(F, \overline{F}, d)\) is given by Lemma 2.1.

**2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.1.** From now on, we will assume that \(f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}\) is multiplicative, at primes \(f(p) = \pm 1\), and \(f = \mu^2 f\). Further, in light of Proposition 2.1, we will assume that \(\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty\) for some real, non-principal and primitive character \(\chi\) of conductor \(q\).

Let \(F\) be given by (2). For each prime \(p \nmid q\), let

\[
h(p) = 1 - \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p} - \frac{2F(p)}{p^2}.
\]

\[\text{Private communication; The formula (19) of [4] is correct. In our Lemma 2.5 and Appendix A.2 we deduce the correct formulation of Theorem 2.2 from formula (19) of [4].}\]
The hypothesis $D(f, \chi) < \infty$ implies that the series $\sum_{p \nmid q} |1 - h(p)|$ converges, and hence it is well defined

(4) \[ C := \prod_{p \nmid q} h(p). \]

Further, a simple calculation shows that $C \neq 0$.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $f$ be as above, $F$ be given by (2) and $h$ be given by (3). Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $p^n \parallel d$, $n \geq 0$. Then

\[
M_p(F, F, d) = \begin{cases} \ h(p), & \text{if } n = 0, \\ 1 - \frac{2}{p^2}, & \text{if } n = 1, \\ 1 - \frac{1}{p^2}, & \text{if } n \geq 2. \end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** We begin by observing that for each prime $p \nmid q$, and any power $k \geq 0$:

\[
F(p^k) = \begin{cases} \ 1, & \text{if } k = 0, \\ f(p)\chi(p), & \text{if } k = 1, \\ 0, & \text{if } k \geq 2. \end{cases}
\]

Thus, for $k \geq 1$:

\[
F \ast \mu(p^k) = F(p^k) - F(p^{k-1}) = \begin{cases} \ F(p) - 1, & \text{if } k = 1, \\ -F(p), & \text{if } k = 2, \\ 0, & \text{if } k \geq 3. \end{cases}
\]

Now suppose that $p^n \parallel d$, where $n \geq 0$. If $n = 0$, by Lemma 2.1

\[
M_p(F, F, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{0} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} \right) + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \left( \frac{Re(F \ast \mu(p^a)F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^i} \right) = 1 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{F \ast \mu(p^i)}{p^i} = 1 + 2 \left( \frac{F(p) - 1 - F(p)}{p} - \frac{F(p)}{p^2} \right) = h(p).
\]
If $n = 1$:

$$M_p(F, F, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{|F * \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F * \mu(p^a) \overline{F * \mu(p^i)})}{p^i} \right)$$

$$= h(p) + \frac{|F * \mu(p)|^2}{p} + 2 \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{F * \mu(p) F * \mu(p^i)}{p^i}$$

$$= h(p) + \frac{|1 - F(p)|^2}{p} + 2 \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{(F(p) - 1)(-F(p))}{p^2}$$

$$= h(p) + \frac{|1 - F(p)|^2}{p} - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{2F(p)}{p^2}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p} + \frac{2F(p)}{p^2}$$

$$= 1 + \frac{-2(1 - F(p)) + |1 - F(p)|^2}{p} - \frac{2}{p^2}$$

$$= 1 + \frac{-(1 - F(p))(1 + F(p)) - 2}{p^2}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{2}{p^2}.$$  

If $n = 2$:

$$M_p(F, F, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{2} \left( \frac{|F * \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F * \mu(p^a) \overline{F * \mu(p^i)})}{p^i} \right)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{|F * \mu(p^2)|^2}{p^2} + 2 \sum_{i=3}^{\infty} \frac{F * \mu(p^2) F * \mu(p^i)}{p^i}$$

$$= 1 - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p^2} + 2 \cdot 0$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{p^2}.$$  

If $n \geq 3$:

$$M_p(F, F, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{n} \left( \frac{|F * \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F * \mu(p^a) \overline{F * \mu(p^i)})}{p^i} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a=0}^{2} \left( \frac{|F * \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F * \mu(p^a) \overline{F * \mu(p^i)})}{p^i} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a=0}^{2} \left( \frac{|F * \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F * \mu(p^a) \overline{F * \mu(p^i)})}{p^i} \right)$$

$$= 1 - \frac{1}{p^2}.$$

□

Let $\mathbb{N}(q) := \{m \in \mathbb{N} : \text{rad}(m)|q\}$. 
Lemma 2.3. Let $h$ be as in (3) and $v : \mathbb{N} \to [-1,1]$ be given by

$$v(d) = \prod_{p \nmid q} M_p(F,F,d).$$

Then, if $\gcd(d,q) = 1$, $v(md) = v(d)$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}(q)$. Further, there exists a multiplicative function $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, such that $v(d) = Cg(d)$, for all $d \in \mathbb{N}$, where $C$ is given by (4) and $g$ is given by:

If $p \nmid q$,

$$g(p^n) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p^2} \right), & \text{if } n = 1, \\ \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right), & \text{if } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

(5)

Proof. Suppose that $\gcd(d,q) = 1$. Thus, by Lemma 2.2

$$v(d) = \prod_{p \nmid q} M_p(F,F,d) = \prod_{p \nmid q} M_p(F,F,d) \prod_{p^n \mid d} M_p(F,F,d)$$

$$= \prod_{p \nmid q} h(p) \prod_{p^n \mid d} M_p(F,F,d) = \prod_{p \nmid q} h(p) \prod_{p^n \mid d} \frac{1}{h(p)} M_p(F,F,d)$$

$$= Cg(d).$$

If $m \in \mathbb{N}(q)$, since $v(d)$ is given by a product that involves only primes $p \nmid q$, we have that $v(m) = C$. Thus, if $d = md$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}(q)$ and $\gcd(d,q) = 1$, $v(d) = v(d)$, and hence, $g(m) = 1$ for all $m \in \mathbb{N}(q)$. □

Lemma 2.4. Let $g$ be as in Lemma 2.3. Let $u = g * \mu$. Then $u$ is multiplicative, supported on the cubefree integers, $u(p^k) = 0$ for each $p \mid q$ and any power $k \geq 1$, and for each $\gcd(p,q) = 1$:

$$u(p) = \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{h(p)p} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right),$$

$$u(p^2) = \frac{1}{h(p)p^2}.$$ 

Moreover, for $l = 1, 2$, $u(p^l)$ can be negative only for $p \in \{2, 3\}$, and this happens if and only if $F(2) = -1$ and $F(3) = -1$, respectively; For all $p \geq 5$, $u(p^2)p^2 \geq 1$, and:

a) $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |u(n)| < \infty$,

b) $\sum_{n \leq H} |u(n)| n = o(H)$,

c) $\sum_{n \leq H} u(n)n \mathbb{1}_{\gcd(n,6)=1} \gg \sqrt{H}.$
Proof. We have for each prime $p$:

$$u(p^n) = g(p^n)\mu(1) + g(p^{n-1})\mu(p) = g(p^n) - g(p^{n-1}).$$

If $p|q$, then $g(p^n) = 1$ for all $n \geq 0$, and hence $u(p^n) = 0$ for all $n \geq 1$. If $p \nmid q$, we have that

$$u(p) = g(p) - 1 = \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p} \right) - 1 = \frac{1 - h(p)}{h(p)} - \frac{2}{p^2 h(p)}$$

$$= \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p} + \frac{2F(p)}{p^2} \right) - \frac{2}{p^2 h(p)}$$

$$= \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{h(p)p} - \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^2 h(p)}.$$

Further

$$u(p^2) = g(p^2) - g(p) = \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right) - \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p^2} \right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{h(p)p^2}.$$

For $n \geq 3$, $g(p^n) = g(p^{n-1})$, and hence, $u(p^n) = 0$.

To proof that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |u(n)|$ converges, we only need to show that the series (see [8], pg. 106, Theorem 2)

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} |u(p^m)|$$

converges. Observe that $h(p) \to 1$ as $p \to \infty$. Hence, the assumption $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty$ implies that

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} |u(p)| \leq \sum_{p \nmid \mathcal{Q}} \left( \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{|h(p)||p|} + \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^2|h(p)|} \right) < \infty.$$ 

Now

$$\sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} |u(p^m)| = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}} |u(p^2)| = \sum_{p \nmid \mathcal{Q}} \frac{1}{|h(p)||p^2|} < \infty.$$ 

This shows that the series $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |u(n)|$ converges. In particular, $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|u(n)||n|}{n}$ converges, and hence, by Kroenecker’s Lemma (see [9], pg. 390 Lemma 2), we have that $\sum_{n \leq H} |u(n)||n| = o(H)$.

Now observe that when $F(p) = 1$, $h(p) = 1 - \frac{1}{p}$ is increasing for $p > 1$, and hence for $p \geq 5$, $h(p) \geq 1 - \frac{4}{5} + \frac{2}{5} = \frac{7}{5}$. In both cases $F(p) = \pm 1$, we have that $h(p) \leq 1$ for all $p \geq 5$, and hence $\frac{1}{h(p)} = u(p^2)p^2 \geq 1$. This implies that $\sum_{n \leq H} u(n)n\mathbb{1}_{\gcd(n,6)=1} \geq \sum_{n \leq H} \mathbb{1}_{\sqrt{n}}\mu^2(\sqrt{n})\mathbb{1}_{\gcd(n,6)=1} \gg \sqrt{H}$. 

The Lemma below is formula (19) of [4], which is in implicit in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

For the convenience of the reader, we do reverse engineering in Appendix A.2 i.e., we deduce the formula below from Theorem 2.2.
Lemma 2.5. Let \( u \) be as in Lemma 2.4. If \( \mathcal{D}(f, \chi) < \infty \), where \( \chi \) is a primitive Dirichlet character of conductor \( q \), then there exists a constant \( C = C(f) \) such that

\[
S_d := \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) \overline{f}(n + d) = C \sum_{\text{rad}(R)/q} \frac{|f(R)|^2}{R} \sum_{a=1}^{q} \chi(a) \overline{\chi}(a + d/R) \sum_{e|d/R} u(e).
\]

In our case, \( |f(R)|^2 = \mu^2(R) \) and \( C \) is given by [4]. A short calculation shows that

\[
\Lambda(H) := \lim_{x \to \infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \left| \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+H} f(k) \right|^2 = \sum_{|h| \leq H} (H - |h|) S_h(|h|/R),
\]

and by Lemma 2.6, after an interchange in the order of summation we obtain that

\[
\Lambda(H) = C \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) \sum_{\text{rad}(R)/q} \frac{\mu^2(R)}{R} \sum_{|h| \leq H \atop R|h|, \overline{d|h}/R} (H - |h|) S_h(|h|/R),
\]

where the inner sum above, is defined and computed as in the same way of [4] (pg. 684 - 687):

\[
S_h(h) := \sum_{a=1}^{q} \chi(a) \overline{\chi}(a + h),
\]

\[
\sum_{|h| \leq H \atop R|h|, \overline{d|h}/R} (H - |h|) S_h(|h|/R) = qdR \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \Delta \left( \frac{Hg}{qdR} \right),
\]

where \( \Delta(t) = \{t\} - \{t\}^2 \). We thus arrive at:

\[
(6) \quad \Lambda(H) = C \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{\text{rad}(R)/q} \mu^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left| \frac{Hg}{qdR} \right|.
\]

Let \( \|t\| = \min\left\{\{t\}, 1 - \{t\}\right\} \). A short calculation shows that \( 4\Delta(t) - \Delta(2t) = 2\|t\| \). Hence

\[
4\Lambda(qH) - \Lambda(2qH) = 2C \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{\text{rad}(R)/q} \mu^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left| \frac{Hg}{qdR} \right|.
\]

Thus, we proved:

**Lemma 2.6.** Assume that \( f \) has bounded partial sums. Then \( \Lambda(H) \ll 1 \) and hence

\[
S(H) := \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{\text{rad}(R)/q} \mu^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left| \frac{Hg}{qdR} \right| \ll 1.
\]

In Lemma 5.5 of [4], it has been proved that for any \( t > 0 \),

\[
(7) \quad \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^a} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \|gt\| \geq 0,
\]

where \( \kappa = 1 \) if \( q \) is even, and \( \kappa = 0 \) otherwise. Now we establish Lemma 2.7 below whose proof is essentially the one contained in Proposition 5.3 of [4]. Since the argument is short, we present it for the convenience of the reader:
Lemma 2.7. Let $\kappa = 1_{2|q}$. Assume that $f$ has bounded partial sums. Then

$$\Sigma(H) := \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{g|\text{rad}(R)q} \mu^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^k} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left\| \frac{Hg}{dR} \right\| \ll 1.$$  

Proof. Let $S(H)$ be as in Lemma 2.6. If $q$ is odd, then the result follows from Lemma 2.6. If $q$ is even, then we will show that $\Sigma(H) \ll 1$. Define

$$T := \sup_H |S(H)|.$$  

From Lemma 2.6, it is clear that $T < \infty$. We now have for any non-negative integer $K$:

$$\Sigma(H) \ll \frac{1}{4K} \Sigma(2^K H) = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{4^k} \left( \Sigma(2^k H) - \frac{1}{4} \Sigma(2^{k+1} H) \right) \ll T \sum_{K=0}^{K-1} \frac{1}{4^k} \ll T.$$  

Now, we recall from Lemma 2.4 that $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} |u(d)| < \infty$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |u(n)| = o(H)$. Observe that for fixed $H$, $d \geq 4H \text{rad}(q)$ implies

$$\Sigma(H) \ll \sum_{d \leq 4H \text{rad}(q)} |u(d)|d + H \sum_{d > 4H \text{rad}(q)} |u(d)| \ll H.$$  

In particular, $\frac{1}{4K} \Sigma(2^K H) \ll \frac{H}{2^K} \to 0$ as $K \to \infty$, which concludes the proof. \hfill \Box

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We will suppose that we are not in the situation $F(2) = F(3) = -1$ and then we will show that $f$ must have unbounded partials sums. Thus there are 3 possibilities: $F(2), F(3) \geq 0$; $F(2) = -1$ and $F(3) \geq 0$; $F(3) = -1$ and $F(2) \geq 0$. In each of this situations we will argue by contradiction, i.e., we will suppose that $f$ has bounded partial sums, and hence Lemma 2.7 holds. By Lemma 2.4, either $u(2), u(4) < 0$ or $u(2) = 0$ and $u(4) \geq 0$, and similarly, either $u(3), u(9) < 0$ or $u(3) = 0$ and $u(9) \geq 0$. Thus, firstly, we consider the case $u(2) = u(3) = 0$. Define

$$\mathcal{M}(H) := \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{g|\text{rad}(R)q} \mu^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^k} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left\| \frac{Hg}{dR} \right\|.$$  

Since by (7) the inner sum above is positive, $u(2) = u(3) = 0$ and $u(9), u(4) \geq 0$, we have that $\mathcal{M}(H) > 0$ and $u(4)4\mathcal{M}(H/4) \geq 0$, and as $O(1) = \Sigma(H) = \mathcal{M}(H) + u(4)4\mathcal{M}(H/4)$, we have that $\mathcal{M}(H) = O(1)$. By interchanging the order of summation between $\text{rad}(R)q$ and $d$, the same argument allow us to conclude that

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^k} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left\| \frac{Hg}{d} \right\| = O(1).$$
Let $d_m = 2m + 1$, where $m \in \{1, 2, \ldots, M\}$. Let $H = \frac{1}{2} \lcm(d_1, \ldots, d_M)$. By Lemma 2.4 we then obtain

$$O(1) = \sum_{\substack{d = 1 \\gcd(d, 2) = 1}}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{g | \rad(q)/2^k} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left\| \frac{H g}{d} \right\| \geq \frac{1}{2} \prod_{p | q} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^2} \right) \sum_{d \leq 2M \atop \gcd(d, 6) = 1} u(d) d \gg \sqrt{M},$$

which is a contradiction for large $M$. We assume now that $u(2) < 0$ and $u(3) = 0$ and consequently $u(9) \geq 0$. A simple calculation shows that $u(2)2 = -4$ and $u(4)4 = -2$. We thus have $\Sigma(H) = \mathcal{M}(H) - 4\mathcal{M}(H/2) - 2\mathcal{M}(H/4)$. Let $T = \sup_H |\Sigma(H)| < \infty$. Thus for all $H \gg 1$

$$\mathcal{M}(4H) = 4\mathcal{M}(2H) + 2\mathcal{M}(H) + \Sigma(4H) \geq 4\mathcal{M}(2H) + 2\mathcal{M}(H) - T. \tag{8}$$

As before, by letting $M \gg T^2$ and $H_0 = \frac{1}{4} \lcm(d_1, \ldots, d_M)$, for $d \leq 2M$ and $\gcd(dg, 2) = 1$, we have $\|2H_0 g/d\| = 1/2$ and $\|H_0 g/d\| = 1/4$ and hence, we can make $\mathcal{M}(2H_0) \geq 2T$ and $\mathcal{M}(H_0) \geq 2T$. We claim: For all $k \geq 0$

$$\mathcal{M}(2^k \cdot 4H_0) \geq 4^k \cdot 11T.$$

We prove by induction on $k$. For $k = 0$, we have $\mathcal{M}(4H_0) \geq 4\mathcal{M}(2H_0) + 2\mathcal{M}(H_0) - T \geq 11T$. Suppose now that the claim holds for all $n \leq k - 1$, and consider $n = k \geq 1$. By (8):

$$\mathcal{M}(2^k \cdot 4H_0) \geq 4\mathcal{M}(2^k \cdot 2H_0) + 2\mathcal{M}(2^k \cdot H_0) - T$$

$$\geq 4\mathcal{M}(2^{k-1} \cdot 4H_0) + 2\mathcal{M}(2^{k-2} \cdot 4 \cdot H_0) - T$$

$$\geq 4 \cdot 4^{k-1} 11T + 4T - T$$

$$\geq 4^k \cdot 11T.$$

Let now $H_k = 2^k \cdot 4H_0$. Thus we have proved that $\mathcal{M}(H_k) \geq H_k^{11T} / \lcm(6)$. However, as we showed in Lemma 2.7 that $\Sigma(H) \ll H$, in the same line of reasoning we can show that $\mathcal{M}(H_k) \ll H_k$, and hence, we again obtain a contradiction. Consider now the case $u(3), u(9) < 0$ and $u(2) = 0$. In this case $u(4) \geq 0$. In this case we define

$$\mathcal{M}(H) := \sum_{\substack{d = 1 \\gcd(d, 3) = 1}}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{R | \rad(q)/2^k} \frac{\mu(R)}{\rad(q)/2^k} \int \frac{H g}{d} \left\| \frac{H g}{d} \right\|.$$ 

Notice that in this case, $u(d) \geq 0$ for all $\gcd(d, 3) = 1$. A simple calculation shows that $u(3)3 = -24$ and $u(9)9 = -9$. We then have $\Sigma(H) = \mathcal{M}(H) - 24\mathcal{H}(H/3) - 9\mathcal{M}(H/9)$. In particular for all $H \gg 1$:

$$\mathcal{M}(9H) = 24\mathcal{M}(3H) + 9\mathcal{M}(H) + \Sigma(9H) \geq 24\mathcal{M}(3H) + 9\mathcal{M}(H) - T. \tag{9}$$

Observe that

$$\mathcal{M}(H) \geq \sum_{\substack{d = 1 \\gcd(d, 3) = 1}}^{\infty} u(d) d \sum_{g | \rad(q)/2^k} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \left\| \frac{H g}{d} \right\|. $$
Let $H_0 = H_0(M) = \frac{1}{2} \text{lcm}\{d_1, \ldots, d_M\}$, and observe that in the case $u(3) < 0$, we necessarily have $\gcd(q, 3) = 1$, and hence, for $g|\text{rad}(q)/2^k$, $d \leq 2M$ and $\gcd(d, 2) = 1$, we have $\|3H_0g/d\|, \|H_0g/d\| = \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, again we can make $\mathcal{M}(3H_0), \mathcal{M}(H_0) \gg \sqrt{M}$. We then choose $M$ such that $M(3H_0), M(H_0) \geq 10^T$. By iterating and doing induction as above, we can conclude that $M(3^k9H_0) \geq 24^k \cdot 10^T$. Define $H_k = 3^k9H_0$. We thus showed that

$$\mathcal{M}(H_k) \geq \left(\frac{H_k}{9H_0}\right)^{\log_{24} \frac{\log 24}{\log 3}} \cdot 10^T.$$ 

Since $\mathcal{M}(H_k) \ll H_k$ and $\frac{\log_{24} \frac{\log 24}{\log 3}}{\log 3} \geq 2.8$, we again arrive at a contradiction. \hfill \Box

### 2.3. Proof of Theorem 1.2

We let $f = \mu_2^2g$, where $g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\}$ is a completely multiplicative function, and in light of Proposition 2.1, we suppose that $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi) < \infty$ for some real and primitive Dirichlet character of conductor $q$. We let $F$ be the multiplicative function given by: For all primes $\gcd(p, q) = 1$ and all powers $k$, $F(p^k) = f(p^k)\chi(p^k)$, for each $p|q$ and any power $k$, $F(p^k) = 1$. As in the squarefree case, in light of Theorem 2.2, we let

$$v(d) := \prod_{p\mid q} M_p(F, F, d).$$

Then, again, if $\gcd(d, q) = 1$, $v(md) = v(d)$, for all $m \in \mathbb{N}(q)$. For $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, we redefine:

$$h(p) = 1 - \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p} + \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2}{p^3};$$

$$(10) \quad C = \prod_{p\mid q} h(p).$$

As before, we have that $C \neq 0$.

**Lemma 2.8.** We have that $v(d) = C(1*u)(d)$, where $u$ is the multiplicative function supported on the 4-free integers, $u(p^k) = 0$ for each prime $p|q$ and any power $k \geq 1$, and for $\gcd(p, q) = 1$:

$$u(p) = \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{h(p)p} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p} + \frac{1}{p^2}\right),$$

$$u(p^2) = \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^2h(p)} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

$$u(p^3) = \frac{1}{h(p)p^3}.$$
Moreover, for \( l = 1, 2, 3 \), \( u(p^l) \) can be negative only for \( p = 2 \), and this happens if and only if \( F(2) = -1 \); For all \( p \geq 3 \), \( u(p^3)p^3 \geq 1 \), and:

\[
\begin{align*}
& a) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |u(n)| < \infty, \\
& b) \sum_{n \leq H} |u(n)|n = o(H), \\
& c) \sum_{n \leq H} u(n)n \mathbb{1}_{ \gcd(n,2)=1 } \gg H^{1/3}.
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. In what follows \( \gcd(p,q) = 1 \). Then

\[
F(p^k) = \begin{cases} 
  f(p)\chi(p), & \text{if } k = 1 \\
  1, & \text{if } k = 2 \\
  0, & \text{if } k \geq 3.
\end{cases}
\]

As \( \mu \ast F(p^k) = F(p^k) - F(p^{k-1}) \), we have that

\[
\mu \ast F(p^k) = \begin{cases} 
  F(p) - 1, & \text{if } k = 1 \\
  1 - F(p), & \text{if } k = 2 \\
  -1, & \text{if } k = 3 \\
  0, & \text{if } k \geq 4.
\end{cases}
\]

Suppose that \( p^n \parallel d \). By Lemma 2.1, we have that

\[
M_p(F, \overline{F}, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{n} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F \ast \mu(p^a) F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^i} \right).
\]

Thus, if \( n = 0 \)

\[
M_p(F, \overline{F}, d) = \sum_{a=0}^{0} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\text{Re}(F \ast \mu(p^a) F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^i} \right)
\]

\[
= 1 + 2 \left( \frac{F \ast \mu(p)}{p} + \frac{F \ast \mu(p^2)}{p^2} + \frac{F \ast \mu(p^3)}{p^3} \right)
\]

\[
= 1 + 2 \left( \frac{F(p) - 1}{p} + \frac{1 - F(p)}{p^2} - \frac{1}{p^3} \right)
\]

\[
= h(p).
\]
If \( n = 1 \),
\[
M_p(F, \overline{F}, d) = 1 \sum_{a=0}^{1} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\Re(F \ast \mu(p^i)F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^i} \right)
= h(p) + \frac{|F \ast \mu(p)|^2}{p} + 2 F \ast \mu(p) \left( \frac{F \ast \mu(p^2)}{p^2} + \frac{F \ast \mu(p^3)}{p^3} \right)
= h(p) + \frac{|F(p) - 1|^2}{p} + 2(F(p) - 1) \left( \frac{1 - F(p)}{p^2} - \frac{1}{p^3} \right)
= h(p) + \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p} - \frac{4(1 - F(p))}{p^2} + \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^3}
= 1 - \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2F(p)}{p^3}
= 1 - \frac{1}{p^3}.
\]

If \( n = 2 \),
\[
M_p(F, \overline{F}, d) = 2 \sum_{a=0}^{1} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\Re(F \ast \mu(p^i)F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^i} \right)
= 1 - \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2F(p)}{p^3} + \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^2)|^2}{p^2} + 2F \ast \mu(p^2) F \ast \mu(p^3)
= 1 - \frac{2(1 - F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{1}{p^3} + 2(1 - F(p)) \frac{1}{p^3}
= 1 - \frac{1}{p^3}.
\]

If \( n = 3 \),
\[
M_p(F, \overline{F}, d) = 3 \sum_{a=0}^{2} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\Re(F \ast \mu(p^i)F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^i} \right)
= 1 - \frac{2}{p^3} + \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^3)|^2}{p^3} = 1 - \frac{1}{p^3}.
\]

If \( n \geq 4 \),
\[
M_p(F, \overline{F}, d) = 3 \sum_{a=0}^{3} \left( \frac{|F \ast \mu(p^a)|^2}{p^a} + 2 \sum_{i=a+1}^{\infty} \frac{\Re(F \ast \mu(p^i)F \ast \mu(p^i))}{p^i} \right)
= 1 - \frac{1}{p^3}.
\]
As

\[ v(d) = \prod_{p|q} M_p(F, F, d) = \prod_{p|d} M_p(F, F, d) \prod_{p^n||d} M_p(F, F, d) \]

\[ = \prod_{p|q} h(p) \prod_{p^n||d} \frac{1}{h(p)} M_p(F, F, d), \]

we obtain that \( v(d) = C g(d) \), where \( g \) is the multiplicative function given by \( g(p^n) = 1 \) if \( p|q \), and if \( \gcd(p, q) = 1 \):

\[
g(p^n) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2F(p)}{p^3} - h(p) \right), & \text{if } n = 1, \\
\frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p^3} \right), & \text{if } n = 2 \\
\frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^3} \right), & \text{if } n \geq 3.
\end{cases}
\]

Let \( u = \mu \ast g \). Then \( u(p^k) = g(p^k) - g(p^{k-1}) \). Thus, clearly \( u(p^k) = 0 \) if \( k \geq 1 \) and \( p|q \). Now, if \( \gcd(p, q) = 1 \), we have that \( u(p^k) = 0 \) for \( k \geq 4 \), and for \( k \leq 3 \):

\[
u(p) = g(p) - 1 = \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2F(p)}{p^3} - h(p) \right)
= \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2F(p)}{p^3} - \left( 1 - \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p} + \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2}{p^3} \right) \right)
= \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p} - \frac{4(1-F(p))}{p^2} + \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p^3} \right)
= \frac{2(1-F(p))}{h(p)} \left( \frac{1}{p} - \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{1}{p^3} \right).
\]

\[
u(p^2) = \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p^3} - \left( 1 - \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2F(p)}{p^3} \right) \right)
= \frac{2(1-F(p))}{h(p)p^2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right).
\]

\[
u(p^3) = \frac{1}{h(p)} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^3} - \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p^3} \right) \right)
= \frac{1}{h(p)p^3}.
\]

Thus, we have that the sign of \( u(p^j) \) is dictated by \( h(p) \). Since

\[
h(p) = 1 - \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p} + \frac{2(1-F(p))}{p^2} - \frac{2}{p^3},
\]
we have that $0 < h(p) < 1$ in the case that $F(p) = 1$. In the case $F(p) = -1$, we have that

$$h(p) = 1 - \frac{4}{p} + 4 \frac{p}{p^2} - 2 \frac{p}{p^3} = \frac{p^3 - 4p^2 + 4p - 2}{p^3} \leq \frac{p^3 - 2}{p^3} < 1.$$ 

In this case, we have that $h(2) = -1/4$. Let $s(p) = p^3 - 4p^2 + 4p - 2$. Then $s'(p) = 3p^2 - 8p + 4 = 3(p - 2)(p - 1/3)$, and hence $s(p)$ is increasing for $p \geq 3$. Hence, for $p \geq 3$, $s(p) \geq s(3) = 1 > 0$.

In particular, in any case we have $h(p) > 0$ and $u(p^3)p^3 \geq 1$ for all $p \geq 3$. Similarly to Lemma 2.8, we can show that $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |u(n)| < \infty$ and that $\sum_{n \leq H} |u(n)|/n = o(H)$. Let $\tilde{u}$ be the multiplicative function such that $\tilde{u}(p^k) = 1_{k=3}\sum_{\gcd(p,2^k)=1}$. Thus $\tilde{U}(s) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{u}(n)/n^{s} = \prod_{p \not| 2^3}(1 + p^{-3s})$. Thus the Dirichlet series $\tilde{U}(s)\zeta(3s) = \prod_{p \not| 2^3}(1 - p^{-3s}) \prod_{p | 2^3}(1 - p^{3s})$ converges absolutely for all $Re(s) > 1/6$. Hence $\sum_{n \leq H} \tilde{u}(n) \gg H^{1/3}$.

Now observe that

$$\sum_{n \leq H} u(n)n\sum_{\gcd(n,2)=1} \geq \sum_{n \leq H} \tilde{u}(n) \gg H^{1/3}.$$ 

□

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.** Let $f = \mu_2^2g$, where $g : \mathbb{N} \to \{-1, 1\}$ is a completely multiplicative function. Similarly as in the squarefree case, we can show that if $f$ has bounded partial sums, then

$$(12) \quad \Sigma(H) := \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) \sum_{\gcd(R)=1} \mu_2^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^n} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \frac{|Hg/dR|}{d} \ll 1,$$

where $\kappa = 1$ if $g$ is even, or 0 otherwise. Recall that the inner sum $\sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^n}$ is non-negative.

By Lemma 2.8, either $u(2^l) \geq 0$ for $l = 1, 2, 3$, or $u(2^l) < 0$ for $l = 1, 2, 3$. Consider first the case that all $u(2^l) \geq 0$. In this case

$$\Sigma(H) \geq \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^n} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \frac{|Hg/d|}{d}.$$ 

Let $d_1, \ldots, d_M$ be the first $M$ odd integers, and let $H = \frac{1}{2}\text{lcm}(d_1, \ldots, d_M)$. Thus for each $d_i$, we have that $|Hg/d| = 1/2$. Hence, by Lemma 2.8

$$\Sigma(H) \gg \sum_{d \leq 2M} u(d) d \gg M^{1/3},$$

which is a contradiction for sufficiently large $M$. Suppose now that $u(2) < 0$. A simple calculation shows that $u(2)2 = -4$, $u(4)4 = -8$ and $u(8)8 = -4$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}(H) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d) \sum_{\gcd(d,2)=1} \mu_2^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^n} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \frac{Hg/dR}{dR}.$$
Then $\Sigma(H) = \mathcal{M}(H) - 4\mathcal{M}(H/2) - 8\mathcal{M}(H/4) - 4\mathcal{M}(H/8)$. Let $T = \sup_H |\Sigma(H)|$. Then for all $H \gg 1$
\begin{equation}
\mathcal{M}(4H) \geq 4\mathcal{M}(2H) + 8\mathcal{M}(H) + 4\mathcal{M}(H/2) - T \geq 4\mathcal{M}(2H) + 8\mathcal{M}(H) - T.
\end{equation}

let $H_0 = H_0(M) = \frac{1}{4} \text{lcm}(d_1, ..., d_M)$. Since $g|\text{rad}(q)/2^e$, $\|2H_0g/d_i\| = 1/2$. On the other hand write $\text{lcm}(d_1, ..., d_M)g/d_i = 2l + 1$. Then $\|H_0g/d_i\| = (2l + 1)/4 = 1/4$ if $l$ is even, otherwise, if $l = 2l' + 1$, $\|(2l + 1)/4\| = \|(2l' + 1)/2 + 1/4\| = 3/4 = 1/4$. Thus,
\[
\mathcal{M}(2H_0) \geq \sum_{d=1 \atop \gcd(d,2)=1}^{\infty} u(d)d \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)/2^e} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \frac{2H_0g}{d} \gg \sum_{d\leq 2M} u(d)d \gg M^{1/3}.
\]

Hence, by making $M \gg T^3$, we can make $\mathcal{M}(2H_0), \mathcal{M}(H_0) \geq 10T$. Iterating and using induction in (13), we conclude that $\mathcal{M}(2^kH_0) \geq 4^k2T$. Defining $H_k = 2^kH_0$, we obtain that $\mathcal{M}(H_k) \gg H_k^2$. However, as in the proof of Theorem 1.1, we have that $\mathcal{M}(H_k) \ll H_k$, and hence we again obtain a contradiction. 

2.4. Proof of Theorem 1.3

Proof. Consider first the squarefree case. Since $f_1(p) = \chi(p)$ for all $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, we have, by Lemma 2.4 that $u(d)d$ is always non-negative, and moreover, it is supported on the perfect squares coprime with $q$, and $u(p^2)p^2 = \frac{1}{h(p)}$, where $h(p) = 1 - \frac{2}{p^2}$. Consider, then, the Dirichlet series $U(s) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{u(d)d}{d^s}$. Let $F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a(n)n^{-s} := U(s)\zeta(2s)^{-1}$. Thus
\[
F(s) = \prod_{p|q} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^{2s}} \right) \prod_{p|q} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{p^2h(p)p^{2s}} - \frac{1}{h(p)p^{4s}} \right).
\]

Clearly, from the Euler product above, we have that $F(s)$ converges absolutely for all $Re(s) > 1/4$, and hence $\sum_{n \leq x} a(n) \ll x^{1/4+\epsilon}$, for any $\epsilon > 0$. Now define $\zeta(2s) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{2s}}$. Then $\sum_{n \leq x} 1^{(2)}(n) = \sum_{n \leq \sqrt{x}} 1 = \lfloor \sqrt{x} \rfloor$. Thus, since $u(d)d = 1^{(2)} * a(d)$, we have
\[
\sum_{d \leq H} u(d)d = \sum_{d \leq H} a(d) \left[ \sqrt{\frac{H}{d}} \right] = \sqrt{H} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} a(d) d \sqrt{d} + O(H^{1/4+\epsilon}) := D\sqrt{H} + O(H^{1/4+\epsilon}).
\]

On the other hand, we have that
\[
H \sum_{d > H} u(d)d = H \int_{H+}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x} \left( \sum_{n \leq x} u(n)n \right) dx = -\sum_{d \leq H} u(d)d + H \int_{H}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{n \leq x} u(n)n \right) \frac{dx}{x^2}
\]
\[
= -D\sqrt{H} + 2D\sqrt{H} + O(H^{1/4+\epsilon}) = D\sqrt{H} + O(H^{1/4+\epsilon}).
\]

Now recall formula (6):
\[
\Lambda(H) = C \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} u(d)d \sum_{\text{rad}(R)} \mu^2(R) \sum_{g|\text{rad}(q)} \frac{\mu(g)}{g^2} \Delta \left( \frac{Hg}{qdR} \right),
\]
where $\Delta(t) = \{t\} - \{t\}^2 \leq \{t\}$. As $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \mu^2(R) < \infty$, we split the sum $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} d^2 \alpha H$ and $\sum_{d>\alpha H}$, where $\alpha$ is such that: If $d > \alpha H$, then $Hg \mu(R) < 1$, for all $g | \text{rad}(q)$. Thus we obtain that

$$\Lambda(H) \ll \sum_{d \leq \alpha H} u(d) d + H \sum_{d > \alpha H} u(d) \ll \sqrt{H}.$$ 

Now we consider the cubefree case. Since $f_2(p) = \chi(p)$ for all $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, by Lemma 2.8, we have that $u$ has support on the perfect cubes coprime with $q$, and $u(p^3)p^3 = \frac{1}{h(p)}$, where $h(p) = 1 - \frac{2}{p^3}$. Thus we can proceed as in the same way as above. □

**APPENDIX A.**

**A.1. Proposition 2.1.**

**Proof.** Let $A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} f^2(n)$. Let $y$ be large such that $A(t) \geq ct/2$ for all $t \geq y$. Then, for $x \geq y^{4/c}$:

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f^2(n) = \int_1^x t^{-1} dA(t) = x^{-1} A(x) + \int_1^x t^{-2} A(t) dt$$

$$\geq \int_y^\infty t^{-2} A(t) dt \geq \frac{c}{2} (\log x - \log y)$$

$$\geq \frac{c}{4} \log x.$$

Consider

$$\Lambda(H) = \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+H} f(k) \right)^2.$$

Expanding the square above, we have that the diagonal contribution is

$$\frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+H} f^2(k) = \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{H} f^2(n + k) = \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{k=1}^{H} \sum_{n \leq x} f^2(n + k)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{k=1}^{H} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{f^2(n + k)}{n + k} + O \left( \frac{H^2}{\log x} \right)$$

$$= \frac{H}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{f^2(n)}{n} + O \left( \frac{H^2}{\log x} \right)$$

$$\geq \frac{cH}{4} + O \left( \frac{H^2}{\log x} \right),$$

provided that $x$ is large enough. Suppose now that the partial sums of $f$ are bounded by $C$. Hence, by the triangular inequality, $\Lambda(H) \leq 8C^2$. Let

$$S_h = S_h(x) := \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{f(n)f(n + h)}{n}.$$
Suppose, by contradiction, that for fixed $H$, there exists arbitrarily large values of $x > 0$, such that for each $h \leq H$, $|S_h| \leq \frac{c}{20H}$. Thus, for these values of $x$, the non-diagonal terms in $\Lambda(H)$ are

\[
\frac{2}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \not\equiv h \mod D} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+H} \sum_{l=k+1}^{k+H} f(k)f(l) = \frac{2}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \not\equiv h \mod D} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=n+1}^{n+H} \sum_{h=1}^{H-k} f(k)f(k+h)
\]

\[
= \frac{2}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{H-k} f(n+k)f(n+k+h)
\]

\[
= \frac{2}{\log x} \sum_{h=1}^{H-h} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{H-h} f(n+k)f(n+k+h)
\]

\[
= \frac{2}{\log x} \sum_{h=1}^{H-h} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{H-h} f(n+k)f(n+k+h) + O\left(\frac{H^2 \log H}{\log x}\right)
\]

\[
= \frac{2}{\log x} \sum_{h=1}^{H-h} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{H-h} f(n+k)f(n+k+h) + O\left(\frac{H^3 \log H}{\log x} + \frac{H^3}{x \log x}\right)
\]

\[
= 2 \sum_{h=1}^{H} (H-h)S_h + O\left(\frac{H^2 \log H}{\log x} + \frac{H^3}{x \log x}\right)
\]

\[
\geq -2 \frac{c}{20H} \sum_{h=1}^{H-h} + O\left(\frac{H^2 \log H}{\log x} + \frac{H^3}{x \log x}\right)
\]

\[
\geq -\frac{cH}{20} + O\left(\frac{H^2 \log H}{\log x} + \frac{H^3}{x \log x}\right).
\]

Thus,

\[
\Lambda(H) \geq \frac{cH}{5} + O\left(\frac{H^2 \log H}{\log x} + \frac{H^3}{x \log x}\right),
\]

and selecting $H \geq 500C^2/c$, we obtain a contradiction for sufficiently large $x$. Thus, for fixed $H \geq 500C^2/c$, for all $x > 0$ sufficiently large, there exists $h_x \leq H$ such that $|S_{h_x}| \geq \frac{c}{20H}$. Thus, for a sequence $x_n \to \infty$, there exists a fixed $h \leq H$, such that $S_h(x_n) \geq \frac{c}{20H}$. Now, as in Lemma 4.3 of [3], or Proposition 1.11 of [7], we conclude that there exists $A = A(H) \geq 0$ such that for any sufficiently large $x$, there exists $t_x \leq Ax$ and a primitive character $\chi$ of modulus $D \leq A$ such that $\mathbb{D}(f(n), \chi(n)n^{it}; x) \leq A$. Now, as in Lemma 2.5 of [4], we conclude that there is a primitive character $\chi$ of modulus $q$ and a real number $t$ such that $\mathbb{D}(f(n), \chi(n)n^{it}) < \infty$. Since for each prime $p$, $f(p)^2 = 1$, we can argue as in the same line of reasoning of Lemma 5.1 of [4] to conclude that $\mathbb{D}(f(n), \chi(n)) < \infty$. Finally, $\chi$ must be real. To see that this is true, suppose that $\chi$ is not real. Then we can select $1 \leq k \leq q$, $\gcd(k,q) = 1$, and $|Re(\chi(k))| = |\cos(\theta)| < 1$. For each prime $p \mid q$, $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, let $\chi(p) = e^{i\theta_p}$. Thus, $1 - Re(f(p)\overline{\chi(p)}) = 1 - f(p)\cos(\theta_p) \geq 1 - |\cos(\theta)|$. Thus, by standard estimates for the number of primes in arithmetic progressions, we obtain a contradiction: $\mathbb{D}(f, \chi)^2 \geq \sum_{p \mid q} \frac{1 - |\cos(\theta_p)|}{p} \geq (1 - |\cos(\theta)|) \sum_{p \equiv k \mod q} \frac{1}{p} = \infty$. ☐
A.2. Lemma 2.5.

Proof. Let \( d = md' \), where \( \gcd(d', q) = 1 \) and \( m \in \mathbb{N}(q) \). Thus, for any function \( \lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \), \nexists \( \sum_{ R \mid d } \frac{ \lambda(R) }{ \rad(R)q } = \sum_{ R \mid m } \frac{ \lambda(R) }{ \rad(R)q } \). If \( R \mid m \), we have that \( \frac{ d }{ R } = \frac{ m }{ R }d' \), and \( \frac{ m }{ R } \in \mathbb{N}(q) \). Notice that \( u(e) = 0 \) whenever \( \gcd(e, q) > 1 \). Hence, \( \sum_{ e \mid d/R } u(e) = \sum_{ e \mid d'R/mR } u(e) = \sum_{ e \mid d'R } u(e) = (1 * u)(d') = \frac{ 1 }{ q } v(d') \). Next, we recall that, by Lemma 2.3, \( v(d') = v(md') = v(d) \). Thus,

\[
C \frac{ q }{ q } \sum_{ R \mid m } \frac{ |f(R)|^2 }{ R } \sum_{ a = 1 }^{ q } \chi(a) \chi(a + d/R) \sum_{ e \mid d/R } u(e) = v(d) \frac{ q }{ q } \sum_{ R \mid m } \frac{ |f(R)|^2 }{ R } \sum_{ a = 1 }^{ q } \chi(a) \chi(a + d/R).
\]

In \([4]\), pg. 685, \( \sum_{ a = 1 }^{ q } \chi(a) \chi(a + md'/R) \) is calculated with great detail:

\[
\sum_{ a = 1 }^{ q } \chi(a) \chi(a + md'/R) = q \prod_{ p \mid q } \left( 1_{ p^{|m/R} } - \frac{ 1 }{ p } 1_{ p^{-1}|m/R } \right).
\]

Thus, we wish to prove that

\[
\sum_{ R \mid m } \frac{ |f(R)|^2 }{ R } \prod_{ p \mid q } \left( 1_{ p^{|m/R} } - \frac{ 1 }{ p } 1_{ p^{-1}|m/R } \right) = \prod_{ p \mid q } M_p(f, \overline{d}, m),
\]

where \( M_p(f, \overline{d}, m) \) is given by Theorem 2.2. We are going to do that by induction on the number \( \omega(q) \). Suppose, then, that \( \omega(q) = 1 \), i.e., \( q = p^l \) for some prime \( p \) and some power \( l \geq 1 \).

We have, then, that \( m = p^\alpha \) for some power \( \alpha \geq 0 \). Thus, if \( \alpha \leq l - 2 \):

\[
\sum_{ R \mid p^\alpha } \frac{ |f(R)|^2 }{ R } \left( 1_{ p^{|m/R} } - \frac{ 1 }{ p } 1_{ p^{-1}|m/R } \right) = 0.
\]

Now, if \( \alpha = l - 1 \):

\[
\sum_{ R \mid p^\alpha } \frac{ |f(R)|^2 }{ R } \left( 1_{ p^{|m/R} } - \frac{ 1 }{ p } 1_{ p^{-1}|m/R } \right) = -1.
\]

Now, if \( \alpha = l + k \), \( k \geq 0 \):

\[
\sum_{ R \mid p^{l+k} } \frac{ |f(R)|^2 }{ R } \left( 1_{ R|p^k } - \frac{ 1 }{ p } 1_{ R|p^{k+1} } \right) = \left( 1 - \frac{ 1 }{ p } \right) \sum_{ j=0 }^{ k } \frac{ |f(p^j)|^2 }{ p^j } - \frac{ |f(p^{k+1})|^2 }{ p^{k+1} }.
\]

Thus we have proved the statement in the case \( \omega(q) = 1 \). Suppose then that the statement is true for all \( q \) with \( \omega(q) \leq n \). Let \( q = q' \tilde{p}^l \), where \( \gcd(\tilde{p}, q') = 1 \) and \( \omega(q') = n \). We have, then, that \( m = m' \tilde{p}^\alpha \), where \( m' \in \mathbb{N}(q') \) and \( \alpha \geq 0 \). Hence,

\[
\sum_{ R \mid m } = \sum_{ \beta = 0 }^{ \alpha } \sum_{ \substack{ R \mid m' \tilde{p}^\beta \mid R \mid m \mid \gcd(\tilde{p}, R) = 1 } } = \sum_{ \beta = 0 }^{ \alpha } \sum_{ \substack{ R \mid m' \tilde{p}^\beta \mid R \mid m \mid \gcd(R, \tilde{p}) = 1 } }.
\]
Hence
\[
\sum_{R|m} \frac{|f(R)|^2}{R} \prod_{p' || q} \left( 1_{p'|m/R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{p'-1|m'/R} \right) = \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha} \sum_{R|m'} \frac{|f(\tilde{p}^\beta R)|^2}{\tilde{p}^\beta R} \prod_{p'||q'} \left( 1_{p'|m'/R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{p'-1|m'/R} \right) \left( 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta |m'\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta-1|m'\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha} \sum_{R|m'} \frac{|f(\tilde{p}^\beta R)|^2}{\tilde{p}^\beta R} \prod_{p'||q'} \left( 1_{p'|m'/R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{p'-1|m'/R} \right) \left( 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta |\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta-1|\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha} \frac{|f(\tilde{p}^\beta)|^2}{\tilde{p}^\beta} \left( 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta |\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta-1|\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} \right) \sum_{R|m'} \frac{|f(R)|^2}{R} \prod_{p'||q'} \left( 1_{p'|m'/R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{p'-1|m'/R} \right)
\]
\[
= \sum_{\beta=0}^{\alpha} \frac{|f(\tilde{p}^\beta)|^2}{\tilde{p}^\beta} \left( 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta |\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} - \frac{1}{p} 1_{\tilde{p}^\beta-1|\tilde{p}^\alpha /\tilde{p}^\beta R} \right) \prod_{p'||q'} M_{p'}(f, \bar{f}, m')

= M_{\bar{p}'}(f, \bar{f}, \tilde{p}^\alpha) \prod_{p' || q'} M_{p'}(f, \bar{f}, m'),
\]

where in the penultimate equality we used the induction hypothesis in the case \(\omega(q') = n\), and in the last equality we used the induction in the case that \(\omega(\tilde{p}^\beta) = 1\). Finally, we notice that, for each \(p'|q'\), \(M_{p'}(f, \bar{f}, m') = M_{p'}(f, \bar{f}, \tilde{p}^\alpha) = M_{p'}(f, \bar{f}, m) = M_{p'}(f, \bar{f}, md') = M_{p'}(f, \bar{f}, d)\). Similarly, \(M_{\bar{p}'}(f, \bar{f}, \tilde{p}^\alpha) = M_{\bar{p}'}(f, \bar{f}, d)\). \(\square\)
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