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Abstract. Orthogonality is a fundamental theme in representation theory and Fourier analysis. An orthogonality relation for characters of finite abelian groups (now recognized as an orthogonality relation on $\text{GL}(1)$) was used by Dirichlet to prove infinitely many primes in arithmetic progressions. Orthogonality relations for $\text{GL}(2)$ and $\text{GL}(3)$ have been worked on by many researchers with a broad range of applications to number theory. We present here, for the first time, very explicit orthogonality relations for the real group $\text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ with a power savings error term. The proof requires novel techniques in the computation of the geometric side of the Kuznetsov trace formula.
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1. Introduction

Let \( q > 1 \) be an integer and let \( \chi : (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^\times \to \mathbb{C}^\times \) be a Dirichlet character (mod \( q \)). The classical orthogonality relation for Dirichlet characters states that for integers \( m, n \) coprime to \( q \),

\[
\frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \chi(m)\overline{\chi(n)} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } m \equiv n \pmod{q}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

This orthogonality relation is the basis for Dirichlet’s proof that there are infinitely many primes \( p \equiv a \pmod{q} \) if \( (a,q) = 1 \). It has played an essential role in the modern development of analytic number theory.

When they are lifted to the adele ring \( \mathbb{A} \) over \( \mathbb{Q} \), Dirichlet characters can be realized as automorphic representations of \( \text{GL}(1) \) (see chapter 2 in [GH11]). It is then very natural to try to generalize the above orthogonality relation to representations of higher rank reductive groups. When trying to do this, however, there is an immediate obstacle. In the case of \( \text{GL}(1) \), there are only finitely many characters (mod \( q \)) for any fixed \( q > 1 \). In higher rank, on the other hand, there will be infinitely many cuspidal automorphic representations. It then becomes necessary to introduce a test function with rapid decay and define the orthogonality relation as an absolutely convergent weighted sum over the automorphic representations.

The first successful attempt at obtaining an orthogonality relation for \( \text{GL}(2) \) was made by R. Bruggeman in 1978 (see [Bru78]) who considered the orthonormal basis \( \{\phi_j\}_{j=1,2,...} \). of
Maass forms for $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ where

$$
\phi_j(z) = \sum_{n \neq 0} a_j(n) \sqrt{2\pi y} K_{it_j}(2\pi |n|y) \cdot e^{2\pi i n x}, \quad (z = x + iy \in \text{upper-half plane}),
$$

and $K_{it_j}$ is the modified $K$-Bessel function of the second kind while $a_j(n) \in \mathbb{C}$ are the Fourier coefficients of $\phi_j$. The Maass form $\phi_j$ has Laplace eigenvalue $\lambda_j = 1/4 + t_j^2$. Each such Maass form is associated to a unique irreducible cuspidal automorphic representation of $\text{GL}(2)$. Then Bruggeman proved the following orthogonality relation for non-zero integers $m, n$:

$$
\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{4\pi^2}{T} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_j(m) \overline{a_j(n)}}{\cosh(\pi t_j)} \cdot e^{-\lambda_j/T} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } m = n, \\
0 & \text{if } m \neq n.
\end{cases}
$$

Other versions of $\text{GL}(2)$ type orthogonality relations were later obtained by P. Sarnak [Sar87], and, for the case of holomorphic Hecke modular forms, by Conrey-Duke-Farmer [CDF97] and J.P. Serre [Ser97].

An orthogonality relation for Maass forms on $\text{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ was first proved independently by Goldfeld–Kontorovich [GK13] and Blomer [Blo13] in 2013. Further results on orthogonality relations for $\text{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ were obtained by Blomer-Buttcane-Raulf [BBR14] and Guerreiro [Gue15]. In his 2013 thesis (see [Zho13], [Zho14]) Fan Zhou conjectured a very general orthogonality relation for $\text{GL}(n)$ for $n \geq 2$. We now describe Zhou's conjecture.

Fix $n \geq 2$. A Maass form for $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ is a smooth function $\phi : \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{C}$ which satisfies $\phi(gkr) = \phi(g)$ for all $g \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$, $k \in K = O(n, \mathbb{R})$, and $r \in \mathbb{R}^\infty$. In addition $\phi$ is square integrable and is an eigenfunction of the Laplacian. If $\lambda$ denotes the Laplace eigenvalue of $\phi$ then $\lambda$ can be expressed in terms of Langlands parameters $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, where $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \cdots + \alpha_n = 0$. The precise relation is given (see §6 in [Mil02]) by

$$
\lambda = \left( \frac{n^2 - n}{24} - \frac{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \cdots + \alpha_n^2}{2} \right).
$$

The Maass form $\phi$ is said to be tempered at $\infty$ if the Langlands parameters $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ are all pure imaginary.

Let $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ denote an orthogonal basis of Maass cusp forms for $\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ with associated Langlands parameters $\alpha^{(j)} = (\alpha_1^{(j)}, \ldots, \alpha_n^{(j)})$ and $M^{th}$ Fourier coefficient $A_j(M)$ where $M = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{n-1})$ with $m_1 m_2 \cdots m_{n-1} \neq 0$. We assume each Maass form $\phi_j$ is normalized so that its first Fourier coefficient $A_j(1,1,\ldots,1) = 1$. Let

$$
\mathcal{L}_j := \text{Res}_{s=1} L(s, \phi_j \times \overline{\phi_j})
$$

be the residue, at the edge of the critical strip, of the Rankin-Selberg $L$-function attached to $\phi_j \times \overline{\phi_j}$ which is the value at $s = 1$ of the adjoint $L$-function $L(s, \text{Ad } \phi_j)$.

For $T \to \infty$, and Langlands parameters $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, let $h_T(\alpha)$ denote a good test function with exponential decay as $\sum_{k=1}^{n} |\alpha_k|^2 \to \infty$. Here “good” means that $h_T$ is smooth, invariant under permutation of the Langlands parameters, real valued and positive, and has support on the Laplace eigenvalues of $\phi$ which are less than $T$. 
Conjecture 1.0.1. (Orthogonality relation for $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$) Let $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ denote an orthogonal basis of of Maass cusp forms for $SL(n, \mathbb{Z})$ as above. Set $M = (m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1})$ and $M' = (m'_1, \ldots, m'_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}_+$. Let $h_T$ denote a good test function as above. Then

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{A_j(M)A_j(M')}{L_j} \frac{h_T(\alpha(j))}{L_j} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } M = M', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For applications it is important to determine the rate of convergence as $T \to \infty$ in the above asymptotic relation. With this in mind, we reformulate Conjecture 1.0.1 with an error term.$^\dagger$ In this case, the orthogonality relation is expected to take the form:

Conjecture 1.0.2. For some constant $0 < \theta < 1$, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(M)A_j(M') \frac{h_T(\alpha(j))}{L_j} = \delta_{M,M'} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_T(\alpha(j))}{L_j} + O_{M,M'} \left( \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_T(\alpha(j))}{L_j} \right)^{\theta}.$$ 

Here $\delta_{M,M'}$ is 1 or 0 depending on whether $M = M'$ or not.

In the above, since $\theta < 1$, the error term gives a power savings in the main term. This conjecture was proved in [GK13] with Langlands parameters $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$, and the following choice of test function:

$$h_{T,R}(\alpha) := e^{-\left(\frac{R+\alpha_1-\alpha_2}{2}\right)^2} \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 3} \Gamma \left( \frac{2R+\alpha_1-\alpha_k}{4} \right)^2 \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 3} \Gamma \left( \frac{1+\alpha_j-\alpha_k}{2} \right), \quad (R \geq 10 \text{ fixed}).$$

More precisely, it was shown in [GK13] that $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{h_{T,R}(\alpha(j))}{L_j} \sim cT^{5+3R}$ and $\theta = \frac{3+3R+\varepsilon}{5+3R}$, for some constant $c > 0$, and any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ as $T \to \infty$. Similar results were independently obtained by Blomer [Blo13] and improved later in [BBR14], and more recently in [BZ16] where an interesting technique is developed to remove the arithmetic weight $L_j$.

Conjecture 1.0.2 has many important applications to low lying zeros, Katz–Sarnak conjectures on symmetry types of families of automorphic $L$-functions, Sato–Tate conjectures, etc. Such applications, for the special case of $GL(3, \mathbb{R})$, are a major main theme in [Blo13], [BBR14], [BZ16], [GK13], [Gue15], [Zho13], [Zho14]. See also [ST16] where asymptotic results for these problems are obtained for very general families of cohomological automorphic representations over connected split reductive groups over $\mathbb{Q}$. Shin–Templier [ST16] obtain their results by an application of the Arthur-Selberg trace formula, but without a power savings in the error term. In this paper we focus only on the orthogonality conjecture as the techniques to obtain the above type applications from Conjecture 1.0.2 are very well established.

$^\dagger$We adopt the standard convention that the constant implied by $O_{M,M'}$ depends at most on $M$ and $M'$. 


Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \in \mathbb{C}^4$ and let $S_4$ denote the symmetric group on a set of size four. The main result of this paper is a proof of Conjecture $1.0.2$ for $\text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ for the test function $h_{T,R}(\alpha)$ given by

$$e^{\frac{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2 + \alpha_4^2}{T^2}} \left( \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right) \right)^2 \prod_{\sigma \in S_4} \left( 1 + \alpha_{\sigma(1)} - \alpha_{\sigma(2)} - \alpha_{\sigma(3)} + \alpha_{\sigma(4)} \right) \right)^{\frac{R}{T^2}},$$

where $T$ is a large positive number and $R$ (sufficiently large) is a fixed positive integer.

**Theorem 1.0.3. (Main Theorem)** Let $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1,2,\ldots}$ denote an orthogonal basis of even Maass cusp forms for $\text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z})$ (assumed to be tempered at $\infty$) with associated Langlands parameters $\alpha^{(j)} = (\alpha_1^{(j)}, \alpha_2^{(j)}, \alpha_3^{(j)}, \alpha_4^{(j)}) \in (i \cdot \mathbb{R})^4$ and $L^\text{th}$ Fourier coefficient $A_j(L)$ (as in (2.8.1)) where $L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$. We assume each Maass form $\phi_j$ is normalized so that its first Fourier coefficient $A_j(1, 1, 1) = 1$. Let $\ell, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\ell m \neq 0$. Then, for $T \to \infty$,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(\ell, 1, 1) A_j(m, 1, 1) \frac{h_{T,R}(\alpha^{(j)})}{\mathcal{C}_j} = \delta_{\ell,m} \cdot \left( c_1 T^{9+8R} + c_2 T^{8+8R} + c_3 T^{7+8R} \right) + \mathcal{O}_{\varepsilon,R}\left( |\ell|^2 + |m|^2 + |\ell m|^3 + \varepsilon \cdot T^6 + R^{8+\varepsilon} \right),$$

where $\delta_{\ell,m}$ is the Kronecker symbol and $c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0$ are absolute constants which depend at most on $R$.

**Remark 1.0.4.** For $s \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\text{Re}(s) > 5/2$, the L-function associated to $\phi_j$ is given by

$$L(s, \phi_j) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} A_j(m, 1, 1)m^{-s} = \prod_p \left( 1 - \frac{A_j(p, 1, 1)}{p^s} + \frac{A_j(1, p, 1)}{p^{2s}} - \frac{A_j(1, 1, p)}{p^{3s}} + \frac{1}{p^{4s}} \right)^{-1}.$$ 

This shows that Theorem $1.0.3$ gives the orthogonality relation on $\text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ for coefficients of cuspidal $L$-functions. It is possible, using the Hecke relations, to obtain a more general version of Theorem $1.0.3$ involving $A_L, A_M$ for arbitrary $A_L, A_M$ where $\prod_{i=1}^{3} \ell_i m_i \neq 0$, but the formulas get quite complex and messy, so are omitted.

The proof of Conjecture $1.0.2$ for $\text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ has resisted all attempts up to now. Theorem $1.0.3$ is the first orthogonality relation for $\text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ obtained which has a power savings error term. Many of the techniques used in the proof of the $\text{GL}(3, \mathbb{R})$ conjecture do not generalize in an obvious way and new difficulties arise for the first time. We now point out the obstacles that we faced in the last 7 years work on this paper with some indications of how we overcame them.

- The canonical generalization of the test function for $\text{GL}(3)$ appearing in [GK13] does not work on $\text{GL}(4)$. It is necessary to modify the test function by a highly non-obvious polynomial in the Langlands parameters.
• In the methods developed in [GK13] the Whittaker transform of a test function is estimated by first taking the Mellin transform of the Whittaker function and then taking the inverse Mellin transform to go back. This leads to multiple integrals involving ratios of Gamma functions which can be estimated by Stirling’s asymptotic formula. When moving to \(GL(4, \mathbb{R})\), however, the Mellin transform of the Whittaker function is much more complex and does not satisfy a simple recurrence relation as on \(GL(3, \mathbb{R})\). The polynomials which appear in the recurrence formula in [FG93] are of large degree, and it did not seem possible to get good estimates for Mellin transforms of Whittaker functions via recurrence relations.

• The recent work of Stade-Trinh (see Appendix C) gave precise control of the polynomials that appear in the recurrence formulae for Mellin transforms of shifted Whittaker functions allowing us to overcome the problem discussed in the previous bullet.

• Unlike \(GL(3, \mathbb{R})\) (where only trivial bounds were needed for the Kloosterman sums), in this case we need a power savings over the trivial bound. In Appendix B in this paper Huang obtains power savings bounds for Kloosterman sums for \(GL(4, \mathbb{R})\) using Deligne’s deep theorems from algebraic geometry [Del77].

• The classical Perron’s formula allows one to obtain asymptotic formulae for the sum of coefficients of an \(L\)-function by computing a certain integral transform of that \(L\)-function and then evaluating the integral transform by shifting the contour of integration. An important tool in the proof of Theorem 1.0.3 is a novel higher dimensional version of Perron’s formula that gives asymptotic formulae for sums of terms arising in the cuspidal contribution to the trace formula. In the case of \(GL(4, \mathbb{R})\), the Perron type formula we develop involves a triple integral which requires shifting contours in 3 directions. It was necessary to generalize the method of Goldfeld-Kontorovich for finding the “exponential zero set” which gets repeatedly used for each shifted term. We also introduce a very precise bound for elementary integrals (see Appendix A) which turns out to be critical for accurately estimating the integrals over the shifted contours.

• Another difficulty is that the Langlands spectral decomposition is much more complex on \(GL(4, \mathbb{R})\) with many more types of Langlands \(L\)-functions involving twists by Maass forms of lower rank in the Levi components of the relevant parabolic subgroups. In order to obtain precise power savings error terms in the contribution of the continuous spectrum to the trace formula, it is necessary to have very explicit forms of the Fourier coefficients of the Eisenstein series. Although the Fourier coefficients are known in great generality (see, for example, Shahidi’s book [Sha10]) the archimedean factors do not seem to have been worked out explicitly in the published literature. In §3.2 we review [GMW] where Borel Eisenstein series are used as a template to explicitly determine the non-constant Fourier coefficients of general Langlands Eisenstein series on \(GL(4, \mathbb{R})\).

Roadmap for the proof of the Main Theorem:

The proof of Theorem 1.0.3 is based on the Kuznetsov trace formula for \(GL(4, \mathbb{R})\) which is worked out in §3. The trace formula is the identity \(C = M + K - E\) where

\[
C = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(\ell, 1, 1) A_j(m, 1, 1) \frac{h_{T,R}(\alpha^{(j)})}{\mathcal{L}_j}
\]
is the cuspidal contribution. The main term $\mathcal{M}$ is computed in Proposition 3.5.1 and is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \delta_{L,M} \cdot \left( c_1 T^{9+8R} + c_2 T^{8+8R} + c_3 T^{7+8R} + \mathcal{O}(T^{6+8R}) \right).$$

The bounds for the Kloosterman contribution $\mathcal{K}$ is worked in Proposition 6.0.3, while the bound for the continuous spectrum $\mathcal{E}$ is given in Theorem 7.0.7. Combining these bounds with the main term $\mathcal{M}$ completes the proof. \qed
2. Whittaker functions, Maass forms, and Poincaré series for $\text{SL}(4,\mathbb{Z})$

We review basic notation and the definitions of Whittaker functions, Maass forms, and Poincaré series following \cite{Goldfeld2006}.

2.1. Iwasawa Decomposition. Fix $n \geq 2$ and let $g \in \text{GL}(n,\mathbb{R})$. We have the Iwasawa decomposition

\begin{equation}
(2.1.1) \quad g = utkr
\end{equation}

where $u \in U_n(\mathbb{R})$ and $k \in K = O(n,\mathbb{R})$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}^\times$ and $t \in T$, the subgroup of diagonal matrices with positive entries. Then $t = t(g)$ can be uniquely chosen to take the form

\begin{equation}
(2.1.2) \quad t = \begin{pmatrix}
y_1y_2 & y_1y_3 & \cdots & y_1y_{n-1} \\
y_2 & \ddots & & \\
y_n & & \ddots & \\
y_1 & & \cdots & y_1
\end{pmatrix}
\end{equation}

for some $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{n-1})$ with $y_i > 0$ ($i = 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1$).

2.2. The $I_v$-function. Let $g \in \text{GL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ (with toric element given by \eqref{2.1.2}). Consider $s = (s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. Then we define

\[ I_s(g) = I_v(utkr) := \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} y_i^{b_{i,j}s_j}, \quad b_{i,j} = \begin{cases} ij & \text{if } i + j \leq n, \\ (n-i)(n-j) & \text{if } i + j \geq n. \end{cases} \]

Note that the powers of the $y_i$ are chosen to simplify later formulae.

For example, when $n = 4$ let $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$. Then

\[ I_s(g) := y_1^{s_1+2s_2+3s_3} y_2^{2s_1+4s_2+2s_3} y_3^{3s_1+2s_2+s_3}. \]

2.3. Spectral and Langlands parameters. Let

\[ v = \frac{1}{n} + (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}) := \left( \frac{1}{n} + v_1, \frac{1}{n} + v_2, \ldots, \frac{1}{n} + v_{n-1} \right) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \]

determine $I_v$ which is an eigenfunction of all $\text{GL}(n,\mathbb{R})$ invariant differential operators. The complex $(n-1)$-tuples $v$ are termed spectral parameters. Then the Langlands parameters $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n)$ associated to $v$ are defined by

\[ \alpha_i := \begin{cases} B_{n-1}(v) & \text{if } i = 1, \\ B_{n-i}(v) - B_{n-i+1}(v) & \text{if } 1 < i < n, \\ -B_1(v) & \text{if } i = n, \end{cases} \]

where $B_j(v) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} b_{i,j}v_i$.

In the special case of $\text{SL}(4,\mathbb{Z})$, the Langlands parameters $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4)$ associated to $v = \frac{1}{4} + (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ are defined by

\[ \alpha_1 = 3v_1 + 2v_2 + v_3, \quad \alpha_2 = -v_1 + 2v_2 + v_3, \quad \alpha_3 = -v_1 - 2v_2 + v_3, \quad \alpha_4 = -v_1 - 2v_2 - 3v_3; \]

\[ v_1 = \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{4}, \quad v_2 = \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{4}, \quad v_3 = \frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_4}{4}. \]

Note that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 0$. 

\[ \]
2.4. Additive character of $U_n(\mathbb{R})$. Assume $n \geq 2$. Fix $M = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n-1}$. Let $g \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ with Iwasawa decomposition $g = utkr$, where

$$u = \begin{pmatrix} u_{1,1} & u_{1,2} & \cdots & u_{1,n} \\ u_{2,1} & u_{2,2} & \cdots & u_{2,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{n,1} & u_{n,2} & \cdots & u_{n,n} \end{pmatrix}. $$

Then associated to the vector $M$ we have an additive character $\psi_M : U_n(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ defined by

$$(2.4.1) \quad \psi_M(g) := \psi_M(u) := e^{2\pi i (m_1 x_1 + m_2 x_2 + \cdots + m_{n-1} x_{n-1})}.$$ 

2.5. Jacquet’s Whittaker Function. Assume $n \geq 2$. Let $v = \frac{1}{n} + (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ with associated Langlands parameters $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n)$.

For $\text{Re}(v_i) \geq 0 \ (i = 1, \ldots, n-1)$ and $w_{\text{long}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, we define the completed Whittaker function $W^\pm_{\alpha} : \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})/(O(n, \mathbb{R}) \cdot \mathbb{R}^\times) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by the absolutely convergent integral

$$W^\pm_{\alpha}(g) := \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq n} \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{1+\alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1+\alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)} \cdot \int_{U_n(\mathbb{R})} I_v(w_{\text{long}} u g) \psi_{1, \ldots, 1, \pm 1}(u) du,$$

where $du$ is the Haar measure on $U_n(\mathbb{R})$. The product of Gamma factors is added so that $W^\pm_{\alpha}$ is invariant under all permutations of the Langlands parameters $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n$.

Remark: If $g$ is a diagonal matrix in $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ then the value of $W^\pm_{\alpha}(g)$ is independent of sign, so we drop the $\pm$. We also drop the $\pm$ if the sign is $+1$.

Let $\mathcal{D}^n$ denote the algebra of $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$-invariant differential operators on

$$\mathfrak{b}^n := \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})/(O(n, \mathbb{R}) \cdot \mathbb{R}^\times).$$

It is well known that $I_v(g)$ is an eigenfunction of all $\delta \in \mathcal{D}^n$. In fact, if we let $v = \frac{1}{n} + (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ and $\delta = \Delta$ is the Laplacian then $\Delta I_v = \lambda_\Delta(\alpha) \cdot I_v$, where

$$\lambda_\Delta(\alpha) = \left( \frac{n^3 - n}{24} - \frac{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \cdots + \alpha_n^2}{2} \right).$$

Define $\lambda_\delta(\alpha) \in \mathbb{C}$ by the eigenfunction equation

$$\delta I_v(g) = \lambda_\delta(\alpha) \cdot I_v(g), \quad (\delta \in \mathcal{D}^n, \ g \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})).$$

Jacquet’s Whittaker function for $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ is characterized (up to scalars) by the following properties:

$$(2.5.1) \quad \begin{array}{l}
\bullet \quad \delta W^\pm_{\alpha}(g) = \lambda_\delta(\alpha) \cdot W^\pm_{\alpha}(g), \quad \text{ (for all } \delta \in \mathcal{D}^n, \ g \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})), \\
\bullet \quad W^\pm_{\alpha}(ug) = \psi(u)W^\pm_{\alpha}(g), \quad \text{ (for all } u \in U_n(\mathbb{R}), \ g \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})), \\
\bullet \quad W^\pm_{\alpha}(\text{diag}(y_1 y_2 \cdots y_{n-1}, \ldots, y_1, 1)) \text{ has exponential decay as } y_i \rightarrow \infty, \ (1 \leq i \leq n - 1), \\
\bullet \quad W^\pm_{\alpha} \text{ has holomorphic continuation to all } \alpha \in \mathbb{C}^n, \text{ for all } g \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{R}), \\
\bullet \quad W^\pm_{\alpha} = W^\pm_{\alpha'} \text{ where } \alpha' \text{ is any permutation of } \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n). \end{array}$$
2.6. **Whittaker Transform.** Assume \( n \geq 2 \). Let \( v = \frac{1}{n} + (v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \) with the associated Langlands parameters \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n) \). Set

\[
y := (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_{n-1}), \quad t(y) := \begin{pmatrix} y_1 y_2 \cdots y_{n-1} \\ \vdots \\ y_1 y_2 y_1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

Let \( f : \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1} \to \mathbb{C} \) be an integrable function. Then we define the Whittaker transform

\[
f^\# : \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1} \to \mathbb{C}
\]

provided the above integral converges absolutely and uniformly on compact subsets of \( \mathbb{R}_+^{n-1} \). Assume that \( \alpha \) is tempered, i.e., \( v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-1} \) are all pure imaginary. The Whittaker transform was studied in \([GK12]\) and the following explicit inverse Whittaker transform was obtained:

\[
f(y) = \frac{1}{\pi^{n-1}} \int_{\text{Re}(v_1) = 0} \cdots \int_{\text{Re}(v_{n-1}) = 0} f^\#(\alpha) W_\alpha(t(y)) \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{dy_k}{y_k^{(n-k)+1}},
\]

provided the above integral converges absolutely and uniformly on compact subsets of \((i\mathbb{R})^n\).

2.7. **The inner product of two Whittaker functions.** Assume \( n \geq 2 \). Suppose that \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \) and \( \beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n) \) are Langlands parameters for which \( \text{Re}(\alpha_j) = \text{Re}(\beta_k) = 0 \) \((1 \leq j, k \leq n)\). Then

\[
\int_{y_1=0}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{y_{n-1}=0}^{\infty} W_\alpha(y) W_\beta(y) \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j^{(n-j)s} \frac{dy_k}{y_k^{(n-k)+1}} = \prod_{j=1}^{n} \prod_{k=1}^{n} \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s+\alpha_j-\beta_k}{2} \right)}{2\pi^{n(n-1)/2} \Gamma \left( \frac{ns}{2} \right)}.
\]

This is given in \([Sta02]\).

2.8. **Fourier-Whittaker expansion of Maass forms.** Assume \( n \geq 2 \). Fix Langlands parameters \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \). Let \( \phi : \mathfrak{h}^n \to \mathbb{C} \) be a Maass form\footnote{This includes the constant function, which is the only Maass form which is not cuspidal, i.e., vanishes at the cusps.} for \( SL(n, \mathbb{Z}) \) which satisfies \( \delta \phi(g) = \lambda_\alpha(\delta) \cdot \phi(g) \) for all \( \delta \in \mathcal{D}^n \), and \( g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R}) \) as in \([2.5.1]\). Then for \( g \in GL(n, \mathbb{R}) \), a non-constant Maass form \( \phi \) has the following Fourier-Whittaker expansion:

\[
\phi(g) = \sum_{\gamma \in U_{n-1}(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus SL_{n-1}(\mathbb{Z})} \sum_{m_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{m_{n-2}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{m_{n-1} \neq 0} A_\phi(M) \frac{1}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} \vert m_k \vert^{k(\alpha-k)/2}} W^{\text{sgn}(m_{n-1})} \alpha \left( M \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} g \right),
\]

where \( M = \text{diag}(m_1 m_2 \cdots m_{n-1}, \ldots, m_1 m_2, m_1) \). Here \( A_\phi(M) \) is the \( M^{th} \) Fourier coefficient of \( \phi \) and \( \alpha \) is the Langlands parameter. This is proved in §9.1 of \([Gol13]\).
2.9. First Fourier-Whittaker coefficient of a Maass form. For \( n \geq 2 \), consider a non-constant Maass form \( \phi \) for \( \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) \) with Fourier Whittaker expansion given by 2.8.1. Assume \( \phi \) is a Hecke eigenform. Let \( A_\phi(1) := A_\phi(1, \ldots, 1) \) denote the first Fourier-Whittaker coefficient of \( \phi \). Then we have

\[
A_\phi(M) = A_\phi(1) \cdot \lambda_\phi(M)
\]

where \( \lambda_\phi(M) \) is the Hecke eigenvalue (see §9.3 in [Gol15]), and \( \lambda_\phi(1) = 1 \).

Recall also the definition of the adjoint L-function: \( L(s, \text{Ad} \ \phi) := L(s, \phi \times \overline{\phi})/\zeta(s) \) where \( L(s, \phi \times \overline{\phi}) \) is the Rankin-Selberg convolution L-function as in §12.1 of [Gol15].

**Proposition 2.9.1.** Assume \( n \geq 2 \). Let \( \phi \) be a Maass form for \( \text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) \) with Langlands parameters \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \). Then the first coefficient \( A_\phi(1) \) is given by

\[
|A_\phi(1)|^2 = \frac{\mathfrak{c}_n \cdot \langle \phi, \phi \rangle}{L(1, \text{Ad} \ \phi) \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq n} \Gamma \left( \frac{1+\alpha_j-\alpha_k}{2} \right)}
\]

where \( \mathfrak{c}_n \neq 0 \) is a constant depending on \( n \) only.

**Proof.** We follow the Rankin-Selberg computations in §12.1 of [Gol15].

\[
\langle \phi, \phi \rangle = \int_{\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathfrak{h}^n} |\phi(g)|^2 \, d^* g
\]

\[
= \text{vol}(\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathfrak{h}^n) \cdot \text{Res}_{s=1} \int_{\text{SL}(n, \mathbb{Z}) \backslash \mathfrak{h}^n} \phi(g) \overline{\phi(g)} E(g, s) \, d^* g
\]

where \( E(g, s) \) is the maximal parabolic Eisenstein series. After unfolding and replacing \( \phi \) with its Fourier-Whittaker expansion, we obtain

\[
\langle \phi \cdot E(*, s), \phi \rangle = \frac{|A_\phi(1)|^2 L(s, \phi \times \overline{\phi})}{\zeta(ns)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} W_{\alpha(y)} W_{\alpha(y)} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} y_j^{(n-j)s} \frac{dy_k}{y_k^{k(n-k)+1}}
\]

The proposition follows immediately from the formula (2.7.1) after taking residues at \( s = 1 \), since \( L(1, \text{Ad} \ \phi) = \text{Res}_{s=1} L(s, \phi \times \overline{\phi}) \). \( \square \)

2.10. Vector or Matrix notation depending on context. Given a vector \( a = (a_1, a_2, a_3) \) in \( \mathbb{R}^3 \), we shall define the toric element \( t(a) := \text{diag}(a_1a_2a_3, a_1a_2, a_1, 1) \).

Given a function \( f : \mathbb{R}^3 \to \mathbb{C} \) we define \( f(a) := f(a_1, a_2, a_3) \). On the other hand, if \( f : \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{C} \) is a function defined on the group then we let \( f(a) := f(t(a)) \), and more generally, for any \( g_1, g_2 \in \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R}) \) we define \( f(g_1a_2) := f(g_1t(a)g_2) \). In other words, we may consider \( a \) as a vector or a diagonal matrix depending on the context.

2.11. Poincaré Series for \( \text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z}) \). Let \( H : \mathfrak{h}^4 \to \mathbb{C} \) be a smooth test function satisfying \( H(\text{utkr}) = H(t) \) (see 2.11). We assume that \( H \) has sufficient decay properties so that the series defining the Poincaré series (given below) converges absolutely. For \( g \in \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R}) \), \( M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^3 \), and \( s = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \), with \( \text{Re}(s_j) \) sufficiently large, the \( \text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z}) \)
Poincaré series is defined by
\begin{equation}
(2.11.1) \quad P^M(g, s) := \sum_{\gamma \in U_4(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z})} \psi_M(\gamma g) H(M \gamma g) I_s(\gamma g).
\end{equation}

**Remark:** Following [2.10] for \( \psi_M \) we take \( M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \). On the other hand, we take \( M \) to be the diagonal matrix for \( H(M \gamma g) \).

2.12. **Inner product of the Poincaré Series with a Maass form.** Let \( \phi \) be a Maass form for \( \text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z}) \) with Fourier expansion (2.8.1). Let \( P^M \) denote the Poincaré series (2.11.1). The inner product is defined by
\begin{equation}
\langle P^M(*, s), \phi \rangle := \int_{\text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathbb{H}^4} P^M(g, s) \overline{\phi(g)} \, dg.
\end{equation}

It follows that
\begin{align*}
\langle P^M(*, s), \phi \rangle &= \int_{U_4(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathbb{H}^4} \psi_M(x) H(My) I_s(y) \overline{\phi(xy)} \, dx \, dx_1 \, dx_2 \, dx_3 \, dx_4 \, dy_1 \, dy_2 \, dy_3 \\
&= \frac{A_\phi(M)}{m_1^2 m_2^2 m_3^2} \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} H(My) I_s(y) \cdot \frac{H(My)}{W_\alpha(My)} \frac{dy_1 \, dy_2 \, dy_3}{y_1^4 y_2^4 y_3^4}.
\end{align*}

We see that the above inner product picks out the \( M^{th} \) Fourier coefficient of \( \phi \) multiplied by a certain Whittaker transform of \( H(My) \cdot I_s(y) \). Letting \( s \to 0 \), it follows from (2.6.1) that
\begin{equation}
(2.12.1) \quad \lim_{s \to 0} \langle P^M(*, s), \phi \rangle = \frac{A_\phi(M)}{m_1^2 m_2^2 m_3^2} \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} \int_0^{\infty} H(My) \cdot \frac{W_\alpha(My)}{y_1^4 y_2^4 y_3^4} \frac{dy_1 \, dy_2 \, dy_3}{y_1^4 y_2^4 y_3^4} \\
= m_1^2 m_2^2 m_3^2 \cdot A_\phi(M) \cdot H^\#(\alpha).
\end{equation}

2.13. **Fourier-Whittaker expansion of the Poincaré Series.** Let \( W_4 \cong S_4 \) denote the Weyl group of \( \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R}) \). For \( w \in W_4 \), we define
\[ \Gamma_w := \left( w^{-1} \cdot {}^tU_4(\mathbb{Z}) \cdot w \right) \cap U_4(\mathbb{Z}), \]
where \( {}^tU_4 \) denotes the transpose of \( U_4 \).

We have the Bruhat decomposition
\[ \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R}) = \bigcup_{w \in W_4} G_w, \quad \left( G_w = U_4(\mathbb{R}) \cdot w \cdot T_4(\mathbb{R})U_4(\mathbb{R}) \right), \]
where \( T_4(\mathbb{R}) \) is the subgroup of diagonal matrices in \( \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R}) \).

**Definition 2.13.1. (Twisted Character)** Let
\[ V_4 := \left\{ v = \begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_2 \\ v_3 & v_4 \end{pmatrix} \mid v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4 \in \{ \pm 1 \}, \ v_1 v_2 v_3 v_4 = 1 \right\}. \]

Let \( M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \), and consider \( \psi_M \) an additive character of \( U_4 \). Then for \( v \in V_4 \), we define the twisted character \( \psi_M^v: U_4(\mathbb{R}) \to \mathbb{C} \) by
\[ \psi_M^v(g) := \psi_M \left( v^{-1} g v \right). \]
Definition 2.13.2. (Kloosterman Sum) Fix \( L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) \), \( M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \). Let \( \psi_L, \psi_M \) be additive characters of \( U_4(\mathbb{R}) \). Let \( w \in W_4 \) where \( W_4 \) is the Weyl group of \( GL(4) \).

Let \( c = \begin{pmatrix} 1/c_3 \\ c_3/c_2 \\ c_2/c_1 \\ c_1 \end{pmatrix} \). Then the Kloosterman sum is defined as

\[
S_w(\psi_L, \psi_M, c) := \sum_{\gamma \in U_4(\mathbb{Z}) \cap \Gamma \cap \Gamma_w} \psi_L(\beta_1) \psi_M(\beta_2),
\]

with notation as in Definition 11.2.2 of [Gol06].

It follows from Theorem 11.5.4 of [Gol06] that the \( M \)-th Fourier coefficient of the Poincaré series \( P^L(g, s) \) is given by

\[
(2.13.3) \quad \int_{U_4(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus U_4(\mathbb{R})} P^L(ug, s) \psi_M(u) d^* u = \sum_{w \in W_4} \sum_{w \in \Gamma} \sum_{c_1 = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_2 = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_3 = 1}^{\infty} S_w(\psi_L, \psi_M, c) J_w(g; s, \psi_L, \psi_M, c) c_1^{4s_1} c_2^{4s_2} c_3^{4s_3},
\]

where

\[
J_w(g; s, \psi_L, \psi_M, c) = \int_{U_w(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus U_w(\mathbb{R})} \int_{\overline{U_w}(\mathbb{R})} \psi_L(wug) H(Lcwug) I_s(wug) \psi_M(u) d^* u,
\]

\( U_w(\mathbb{R}) = \left( w^{-1} \cdot U_4(\mathbb{R}) \cdot w \right) \cap U_4(\mathbb{R}) \), \( \overline{U_w}(\mathbb{R}) = \left( w^{-1} \cdot U_4(\mathbb{R}) \cdot w \right) \cap U_4(\mathbb{R}) \), and \( ^t m \) denotes the transpose of a matrix \( m \).

3. Kuznetsov Trace Formula for \( SL(4, \mathbb{R}) \)

3.1. Choice of test function. Let \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \in (i\mathbb{R})^4 \) with \( \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 0 \). Let \( T > 1 \) with \( T \to \infty \) and \( R \geq 14 \) with \( R \) fixed. We consider the test function

\[
(3.1.1) \quad p^\sharp_{T,R}(\alpha) := e^{\frac{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2 + \alpha_4^2}{2 R^2}} \cdot \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right),
\]

where

\[
(3.1.2) \quad \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) := \left( \prod_{\sigma \in S_4} \left( 1 + \alpha_{\sigma(1)} - \alpha_{\sigma(2)} - \alpha_{\sigma(3)} + \alpha_{\sigma(4)} \right) \right)^{\frac{R}{4}}
\]

\[
= \left( \left( 1 + |\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4|^2 \right) \left( 1 + |\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4|^2 \right) \left( 1 + |\alpha_1 + \alpha_4 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3|^2 \right) \right)^{\frac{R}{4}}.
\]

The function \( p^\sharp_{T,R}(\alpha) \) defined in (3.1.1) generalizes the similar function defined in [GK13]. As before, the choice is motivated by the fact that we need \( p^\sharp_{T,R} \) to be invariant under the Weyl group, and have meromorphic continuation in \( \alpha \in \mathbb{C}^4 \), while also requiring it to have enough exponential decay to kill the exponential growth of certain Gamma factors appearing in the denominator of the Kuznetsov trace formula. The new feature is the introduction of the polynomial \( \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) \). We were unable to get good bounds for later integrals without the introduction of this polynomial.
By the inverse Lebedev-Whittaker transform (see [GK12]), we see that $p_{T,R}$ is given by

$$p_{T,R}(y) = p_{T,R}(y_1, y_2, y_3) = \frac{1}{\pi^3} \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)$$

(3.1.3)

3.2. Setting up the trace formula.

Set $L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3), M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ where we assume $\prod_{i=1}^3 \ell_i m_i \neq 0$. Consider the Poincaré series $P^L, P^M$, as defined in (2.11.1) with the test function $H = p_{T,R}$.

**Definition 3.2.1. (Normalization factor $C_{L,M}$)** Let $c_4$ be as Proposition 2.9.1. Then we define $C_{L,M} := c_4 \cdot (\ell_1 m_1)^3 (\ell_2 m_2)^4 (\ell_3 m_3)^3$.

With the normalization factor $C_{L,M}$ defined above, the Kuznetsov trace formula is obtained by evaluating the inner product

$$C_{L,M}^{-1} \lim_{s \to 0} \left\langle P^L(*, s), P^M(*, s) \right\rangle = C_{L,M}^{-1} \lim_{s \to 0} \int_{\text{SL}(4,\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathbb{H}^4} P^L(g, s) P^M(g, s) \ dg$$

in two different ways. The first approach is to use spectral theory while the second uses geometry. The spectral theory approach (see [Lan76], [Art79]) makes use of the fact that the space $L^2(\text{SL}(4,\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathbb{H}^4)$ decomposes into Maass forms, and residues of Eisenstein series. We let $A_j(L), A_j(M)$ denote the $L^{th}$, $M^{th}$ Fourier coefficients, respectively, of the $j^{th}$ Maass form $\phi_j$.

In particular since $P^L, P^M \in L^2(\text{SL}(4,\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathbb{H}^4)$, the inner product can be computed with the spectral expansion of the Poincaré series. The geometric approach utilizes the Fourier Whittaker expansion of the Poincaré series which involve Kloosterman sums.

The trace formula takes the following form

$$C + \mathcal{E} = \mathcal{M} + \mathcal{K}.$$  

(3.2.2)

Here $\mathcal{C}$ is the cuspidal contribution, $\mathcal{M}$ is the main term coming from the identity element. Further, $\mathcal{E} = $ Eisenstein contribution, $\mathcal{K} = $ Kloosterman sum contribution. These will be small with the special choice of the test function $p_{T,R}$. In the subsections that follow, we explicitly evaluate $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{E}, \mathcal{M}$, and $\mathcal{K}$.

3.3. Cuspidal contribution $\mathcal{C}$ to the Kuznetsov trace formula.

**Proposition 3.3.1. (Cuspidal contribution to the trace formula)** Fix $L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ and $M = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$, where $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, m_1, m_2, m_3$ are non-zero rational integers. Let $\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots$ denote an orthogonal basis of Maass forms for $\text{SL}(4,\mathbb{Z})$ with spectral parameters $\alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)}, \ldots$ respectively, ordered by Laplace eigenvalue. Let $A_j(L)$ and $A_j(M)$ denote the $L^{th}$ and $M^{th}$ Fourier coefficients of $\phi_j$ and assume that $A_j(1, 1, 1) = 1$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Let $\mathcal{L}_j = L(1, \text{Ad} \phi_j)$. Then the cuspidal contribution to the trace formula (3.2.2) is given by

$$\mathcal{C} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} A_j(L) A_j(M) \cdot \left| p_{T,R}^\# \left( \frac{\alpha^{(j)}}{2} \right) \right|^2$$

$$\mathcal{L}_j \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)$$

where $p_{T,R}^\#$ is is given by (3.1.1).
Proof. By the spectral theorem for $\text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z})$ we can decompose the Poincaré series $P_L$ into Maass forms, Eisenstein series, and residues of Eisenstein series. In particular for $g \in \text{GL}(4, \mathbb{R})$ we have

$$P_L(g, 0) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle P_L(\ast, 0), \phi_j \rangle \cdot \frac{\phi_j(g)}{\langle \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle} + \{ \text{Eisenstein contribution} \}.$$ 

Now, since $A_j(1, 1, 1) = 1$, Proposition 2.9.1 implies that

$$\langle \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle = c_4^{-1} \cdot L_j \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right).$$

The cuspidal contribution to the trace formula is given by

$$C := C^{-1}_{L,M} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\langle P_L(\ast, 0), \phi_j \rangle \cdot \langle P_M(\ast, 0), \phi_j \rangle}{\langle \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle}.$$ 

The proposition immediately follows from the inner product formula (2.12.1). □

### 3.4. Geometric side of the Kuznetsov trace formula.

Next we consider the geometric side of the trace formula (3.2.2). This is computed with the Fourier-Whittaker expansion of the Poincaré series given in (2.13.3).

**Proposition 3.4.1. (Geometric side of the trace formula)** Fix $L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ and $M = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ with $C_{L,M} \neq 0$. Then

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \langle P_L(\ast, s), P_M(\ast, s) \rangle = \sum_{w \in W_4} I_w$$

where we have

$$(3.4.2)$$

$$I_w := \sum_{v \in V_4} \sum_{c_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_2=1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_3=1}^{\infty} S_w(\psi_L, \psi_M^v, c) \int_{y_1=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_2=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_3=0}^{\infty} \int_{U_4(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus U_4(\mathbb{R}) \setminus U_4(\mathbb{R})} \psi_L(uy) \psi_M^v(u) p_{T,R}(Lc uy) p_{T,R}(My) d^* u \frac{dy_1}{y_1^4} \frac{dy_2}{y_2^4} \frac{dy_3}{y_3^4}.$$ 

Proof. We compute the inner product

$$\lim_{s \to 0} \langle P_L(\ast, s), P_M(\ast, s) \rangle = \lim_{s \to 0} \int_{\text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathbb{H}^4} P_L(g, s) \cdot \overline{P_M(g, s)} \, dg$$

$$= \lim_{s \to 0} \int_{U_4(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \mathbb{H}^4} P_L(g, s) \cdot \overline{\psi_M(g) p_{T,R}(Mg) I_s(g)} \, dg$$

$$= \lim_{s \to 0} \int_{y_1=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_2=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_3=0}^{\infty} \left( \int_{U_4(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus U_4(\mathbb{R})} P_L(uy, s) \cdot \overline{\psi_M(u)} \, du \right) \cdot p_{T,R}(My) I_s(y) \frac{dy_1}{y_1^4} \frac{dy_2}{y_2^4} \frac{dy_3}{y_3^4}.$$
It follows from (2.13.3) that
\[
\lim_{s \to 0} \langle P^L (\ast, s), P^M (\ast, s) \rangle
\]
\[
= \lim_{s \to 0} \sum_{w \in W_4} \sum_{v \in V_4} \sum_{c_1=1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_2=1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_3=1}^{\infty} \sum_{y_1=0}^{\infty} \sum_{y_2=0}^{\infty} \sum_{y_3=0}^{\infty} \int_{U_w(Z) \setminus U_w(\mathbb{R})} \psi_L(wuy) \psi_M(wu) d^* u \frac{dy_1 dy_2 dy_3}{y_1^4 y_2^5 y_3^4}
\]
\[
= \sum_{w \in W_4} I_w. \tag*{\square}
\]

3.5. Main term \( \mathcal{M} \) in the Kuznetsov trace formula. Let \( w_1 \) denote the \( 4 \times 4 \) identity matrix. The main term \( \mathcal{M} = I_{w_1} \) in the trace formula (3.2.2) can now be easily computed.

**Proposition 3.5.1. (Main term in the trace formula)** There exist fixed constants \( c_1, c_2, c_3 > 0 \) (depending only on \( R \)) such that the main term \( \mathcal{M} \) in the trace formula (3.2.2) is given by
\[
\mathcal{M} = \delta_{L,M} \cdot \left( c_1 T^{9+8R} + c_2 T^{8+8R} + c_3 T^{7+8R} + \mathcal{O} (T^{6+8R}) \right).
\]

**Proof.** Consider the Kloosterman sum in Definition 2.13.2 for the special case of the trivial Weyl group element \( w_1 \). The Kloosterman sum is identically zero unless \( c = (1, 1, 1) \) in which case \( S_{w_1}(\psi_M, \psi_L, (1, 1, 1)) = 1 \). It follows from (3.4.2) and the normalization (by \( C_{L,M} \)) of the cuspidal contribution \( \mathcal{C} \) that
\[
\mathcal{M} = C_{L,M}^{-1} \cdot I_{w_1}
\]
\[
= C_{L,M}^{-1} \cdot \int_{y_1=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_2=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_3=0}^{\infty} \psi_L(u) \psi_M(u) d^* u \frac{dy_1 dy_2 dy_3}{y_1^4 y_2^5 y_3^4}.
\]

Next
\[
\mathcal{M} = \delta_{L,M} \cdot c_4 \int_{y_1=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_2=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_3=0}^{\infty} |p_{T,R}(y)|^2 \frac{dy_1 dy_2 dy_3}{y_1^4 y_2^5 y_3^4} = \langle p_{T,R}, p_{T,R} \rangle
\]
\[
= \delta_{L,M} \cdot c_4 \cdot \langle p_{T,R}, p_{T,R} \rangle.
\]

where the second representation of \( \mathcal{M} \) in terms of the norm of \( p_{T,R}^\# \) follows from the Plancherel formula in Corollary 1.9 of [GK12].
It now follows from (3.1.1) that

\[ M = \delta_{L,M} \cdot c_4 \int_{\Re(\alpha_j) = 0} \left| \frac{e^{\frac{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2 + \alpha_4^2}{2T^2}} \cdot F_R(\alpha)}{\prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma \left( \frac{2R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right)} \right|^2 \int_{\Re(\alpha_j) = 0} d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3. \]

Let \( \alpha_j = i \cdot \tau_j \) with \( \tau_j \in \mathbb{R} \), where \( \tau_4 = -\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3 \). We see that

\[ |F_R(\alpha)|^2 := (1 + |1 + \tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3 - \tau_4|) (1 + |1 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 - \tau_3 - \tau_4|) (1 + |1 + \tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3 + \tau_4|) \]

It follows from Stirling’s asymptoticformula \(|\Gamma(\sigma + it)|^2 \sim 2\pi \cdot |t|^{2\sigma-1} e^{-\pi|t|} \) that

\[ M \sim \delta_{L,M} \cdot c_4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\frac{\tau_1^2 - \tau_2^2 - \tau_3^2 - \tau_4^2}{2T^2}} \left( (1 + |\tau_1 + \tau_2 - \tau_3 - \tau_4|) (1 + |\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 - \tau_4|) (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3 + \tau_4|) \right)^{1+R} d\tau_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3. \]

Next, make the change of variables

\( \tau_1 \rightarrow \tau_1 T, \quad \tau_2 \rightarrow \tau_2 T, \quad \tau_3 \rightarrow \tau_3 T. \)

It follows that as \( T \to \infty \) we have \( M \sim c_1 \cdot \delta_{L,M} T^{8R+9} \) where

\[ c_1 = c_4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} e^{-\frac{\tau_1^2 - \tau_2^2 - \tau_3^2 - \tau_4^2}{2T^2}} \left( (1 + |\tau_1 + \tau_2 - \tau_3 - \tau_4|) (1 + |\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 - \tau_4|) (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3 + \tau_4|) \right)^{\frac{R}{3}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^3} d\tau_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3. \]

This method of proof can be extended by using additional terms in Stirling’s asymptotic expansion for the Gamma function to obtain additional terms in the asymptotic expansion of \( M \).

3.6. Kloosterman term \( K \) in the Kuznetsov trace formula. It immediately follows from Proposition 3.4.1 that

\[ K = C_{L,M}^{-1} \cdot \sum_{w \in W_4} I_w. \]
3.7. Eisenstein contribution $E$ to the Kuznetsov trace formula. This section is based on [GMW]. There are 4 standard non-associate parabolic subgroups on $GL(4)$ corresponding to the partitions

$$4 = 3 + 1 = 2 + 2 = 2 + 1 + 1 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1.$$

Consider the minimal parabolic subgroup

$$P_{\text{Min}} := \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cccc} * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \end{array} \right) \subset GL(4, \mathbb{R}) \right\}$$

associated to the partion $4 = 1+1+1+1$. Let $s = \frac{1}{4} + (s_1, s_2, s_3)$ with $s \in \mathbb{C}^3$. The minimal parabolic Eisenstein series for $\Gamma = SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$ is defined by

$$E_{P_{\text{Min}}}(g, s) := \sum_{\gamma \in (P_{\text{Min}} \cap \Gamma) \backslash \Gamma} I_s(\gamma g), \quad (g \in GL(4, \mathbb{R}), \ Re(s) \gg 1).$$

For the other 3 partitions $4 = 3 + 1 = 2 + 2 = 2 + 1 + 1$, consider the parabolic subgroups

$$P_{3,1} := \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cccc} * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \end{array} \right) \right\}, \quad P_{2,2} := \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cccc} * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \end{array} \right) \right\}, \quad P_{2,1,1} := \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cccc} * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & * \end{array} \right) \right\},$$

respectively. For each of these parabolic subgroups (denoted $P$) we may define an infinite family of Eisenstein series $E_{P,\Phi}$ (as defined in [GMW]) given by

$$E_{P,\Phi}(g, s) := \sum_{\gamma \in (P \cap \Gamma) \backslash \Gamma} \Phi(\gamma g) \cdot |\gamma g|_P^s, \quad (g \in GL(4, \mathbb{R}), \ Re(s) \gg 1),$$

where $\Phi$ runs over cusp forms on the Levi components of the parabolic subgroups and $|\cdot|_P^s$ is a toric character as defined in [GMW].

**Definition 3.7.1.** The cusp forms $\Phi$ and complex $s$ values associated to Eisenstein series $E_{P,\Phi}(g, s)$ for $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$ are given as follows.

- Let $P = P_{3,1}$, then $\Phi$ runs over Maass forms for $SL(3, \mathbb{Z})$ and $s = (s_1, s_2)$ with $3s_1 + s_2 = 0$.
- Let $P = P_{2,2}$, then $\Phi$ runs over pairs $\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ where $\phi_1, \phi_2$ are Maass forms for $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and $s = (s_1, s_2)$ with $2s_1 + 2s_2 = 0$.
- Let $P = P_{2,1,1}$, then $\Phi$ runs over Maass forms for $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$ with $2s_1 + s_2 + s_3 = 0$.

**Theorem 3.7.2.** (Langlands spectral decomposition for $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$) Let $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \ldots$ denote an orthogonal basis of Maass forms for $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$. Assume that $F, G \in L^2(SL(n, \mathbb{Z}) \backslash h^n)$ are orthogonal to the residual spectrum. Then for $g \in GL(4, \mathbb{R})$ we have

$$F(g) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \langle F, \phi_j \rangle \frac{\phi_j(g)}{\langle \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle} + \sum_P \sum_{\Phi} c_P \int \ldots \int \left\langle F, E_{P,\Phi}(\ast, s) \right\rangle E_{P,\Phi}(g, s) \cdot ds_1 \cdots ds_{r-1};$$

$$\langle F, G \rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{\langle F, \phi_j \rangle \langle \phi_j, G \rangle}{\langle \phi_j, \phi_j \rangle} + \sum_P \sum_{\Phi} c_P \int \ldots \int \left\langle F, E_{P,\Phi}(\ast, s) \right\rangle \left\langle E_{P,\Phi}(\ast, s), G \right\rangle \cdot ds_1 \cdots ds_{r-1};$$
where the sum over $\mathcal{P}$ ranges over parabolics associated to partitions $4 = \sum_{k=1}^r n_k$, and the sum over $\Phi$ (see Definition 3.7.7) ranges over an orthonormal basis of Maass forms associated to $\mathcal{P}$. Here $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_r)$ where $\sum_{k=1}^r n_k s_k = 0$ for the partition $4 = \sum_{k=1}^r n_k$. Furthermore, $c_\mathcal{P}$ is a fixed non-zero constant for each parabolic subgroup $\mathcal{P}$.

**Proof.** For proofs see [Art79], [Lan76], and [MW95].

Now $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}$ will have a Fourier-Whittaker expansion similar to (2.8.1). If $M = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ with $m_1, m_2, m_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then the $M^{th}$ Fourier-Whittaker coefficient of $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}(\ast, s)$ is given by

$$
\int_{U_4(\mathbb{Z})/U_4(\mathbb{R})} E_{\mathcal{P}}(uy, s) \psi_M(u) \, du = \frac{A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(M, s)}{|m_1|^2|m_2|^2|m_3|^2} W_\alpha(My),
$$

where $\alpha$ denotes the Langlands parameter of $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}(g, s)$. Here

$$A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(M, s) = A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}((1, 1, 1), s) \cdot \lambda_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(M, s)$$

and $\lambda_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(M, s)$ is the $M^{th}$ Hecke eigenvalue of $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}$.

**Proposition 3.7.3.** (Inner product of the Poincaré series $P^M$ with $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}$) Consider an Eisenstein series $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}$ for $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$. Fix $M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^3$. Let $P^M$ be the Poincaré series defined in (2.11.1) with test function $p_{T,R} : \mathfrak{h}^4 \to \mathbb{C}$ (as in (3.1.1)). Then

$$
\lim_{\delta \to 0} \left\langle P^M(\ast, \delta), E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}(\ast, s) \right\rangle = m_1^2 m_2^2 m_3^2 \cdot A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(M, s) \cdot p_{T,R}^\#(\overline{\tau}).
$$

**Proof.** The proof is similar to the proof of (2.12.1). □

**Theorem 3.7.4.** (Spectral decomposition for the inner product of Poincaré series)

Fix $L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$, $M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^3$ with $C_{L,M} \neq 0$.

Let $\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \ldots$ denote a basis of Maass forms for $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$ with spectral parameters $\alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)}, \alpha^{(3)}, \ldots$, respectively, ordered by Laplace eigenvalue and normalized so that the first Fourier coefficient $A_j(1, 1, 1) = 1$ for all $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Set $L_j = L(1, \text{Ad} \phi_j)$.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ range over parabolics associated to partitions $4 = n_1 + \cdots + n_r$, and $\Phi$ range over an orthonormal basis of Maass forms associated to $\mathcal{P}$. Let $E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}(s)$ denote the Langlands Eisenstein series for $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$ with Langlands parameter $\alpha_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}(s)$ and $L^{th}$, $M^{th}$ Fourier coefficients $A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(L, s)$, $A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(M, s)$, respectively. Then

$$
C_{L,M}^{-1} \cdot \lim_{\delta \to 0} \left\langle P^L(\ast, \delta), P^M(\ast, \delta) \right\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^r \frac{A_j(L)A_j(M)}{L_j \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma \left( \frac{1+\alpha_j-\alpha_k}{2} \right)} \left| p_{T,R}^\#(\alpha^{(j)}) \right|^2
$$

$$
+ \sum_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{\Phi} c_\mathcal{P} \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} \cdots \int_{\text{Re}(s_{r-1})=0} A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(L, s) A_{E_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}}(M, s) \left| p_{T,R}^\#(\alpha_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}(s)) \right|^2 \, ds_1 \cdots ds_{r-1},
$$

for constants $c_\mathcal{P} > 0$.

**Proof.** This follows immediately from (3.3.1), Theorem 3.7.2, and Proposition 3.7.3. Note that the Poincaré Series $P^L, P^M$ are orthogonal to the constant function, so the sum over $j$ does not include the constant function. □
Proposition 3.7.5. (Eisenstein term $\mathcal{E}$ in the Kuznetsov trace formula) With the notation of Theorem 3.7.4, the Eisenstein term $\mathcal{E}$ in the Kuznetsov trace formula is given by

$$\mathcal{E} = \sum_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{\Phi} c_{\mathcal{P}} \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} \cdots \int_{\text{Re}(s_{r-1})=0} A_{E,\Phi}(L, s) A_{E,\Phi}(M, s) \left| p^\#_{T,R}(\alpha_{(\mathcal{P},\Phi)}(s)) \right|^2 \, ds_1 \cdots ds_{r-1}. $$

Proof. The proof follows from Proposition 3.7.4. \hfill \square

4. Mellin transforms of GL(4) Whittaker functions

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \in (\mathbb{R})^4$ with $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 0$. Let $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$ with $\text{Re}(s_j) > \varepsilon$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Define the Mellin transform (denoted $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$) of the GL(4) Whittaker function $W_\alpha$ defined in Section 2.6 by the absolutely convergent integral

$$\tilde{W}_\alpha(s) := \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty y_1^{s_1-\frac{1}{2}} y_2^{s_2-\frac{1}{2}} y_3^{s_3-\frac{3}{2}} W_\alpha(y) \frac{dy_1 dy_2 dy_3}{y_1 y_2 y_3}. $$

4.1. Formulas for Mellin transforms of Whittaker functions. Here we present an expression for $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$ as an integral, over an additional variable $t \in \mathbb{C}$, of a ratio of Gamma functions involving $s$ and $\alpha$.

In the context of GL(4), this expression was first given in [Sta95]; that result was later generalized to $GL(n)$, in Theorem 3.1 of [Sta01]. The formula for $n = 4$ takes the form

$$\tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = 2^{-3} \pi^{-s_1-s_2-s_3} \tilde{W}_\alpha \left( \frac{s}{2} \right), $$

where, assuming that $\text{Re}(s_j) \geq \varepsilon > 0$ for each $j = 1, 2, 3$,

$$\tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \Gamma(s_1 + \alpha_1) \Gamma(s_1 + \alpha_2) \Gamma(s_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) \Gamma(s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \Gamma(s_3 - \alpha_1) \Gamma(s_3 - \alpha_2) \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\text{Re}(t)=-\varepsilon'} \Gamma(-t + \alpha_3) \Gamma(-t + \alpha_4) \Gamma(t + s_1) \Gamma(t + s_2 + \alpha_1) \Gamma(t + s_2 + \alpha_2) \Gamma(t + s_3 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \Gamma(t + s_2 + s_3) \, dt, $$

assuming that $0 < \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$.

4.2. Poles and residues of $\tilde{W}_\alpha$. Following [Sta01], we introduce the sets

$$P_1 := \{-\alpha_1, -\alpha_2, -\alpha_3, -\alpha_4\}, $$

$$P_2 := \{\pm(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2), \pm(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3), \pm(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3)\}, $$

$$P_3 := \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_2, \alpha_4\}, $$

which determine the poles of $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$.

Let $s = (s_1, s_2, s_3)$. In [Sta01] Theorem 3.2, it was proved that the Mellin transform $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$ has poles at $s_1 \in P_1$, $s_2 \in P_2$, $s_3 \in P_3$. Moreover, the residues at these poles are given by

$$\text{Res}_{s_1=\alpha_1} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^4 \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_j+\alpha_1}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_2+\alpha_1+\alpha_j}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_j}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{s_2+s_3+\alpha_1}{2})}, $$

and

$$\text{Res}_{s_2=\pm(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2)} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \frac{\prod_{j=3}^4 \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_j+\alpha_1+\alpha_2}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_2+\alpha_1+\alpha_2+\alpha_j}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_j}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{s_2+s_3+\alpha_1}{2})}, $$

and

$$\text{Res}_{s_3=\pm(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3)} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^4 \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_j+\alpha_1+\alpha_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_2+\alpha_1+\alpha_3+\alpha_j}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_j}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{s_2+s_3+\alpha_1}{2})}, $$

and

$$\text{Res}_{s_2=\pm(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3)} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^4 \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_j+\alpha_2+\alpha_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_2+\alpha_2+\alpha_3+\alpha_j}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_j}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{s_2+s_3+\alpha_1}{2})}. $$
\[ \text{(4.2.2)} \quad \text{Res}_{s_2=-(\alpha_1+\alpha_2)} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \left( \prod_{j=1}^{2} \prod_{k=3}^{4} \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_k-\alpha_j}{2} \right) \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_1+\alpha_j}{2} \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_1+\alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3-\alpha_1}{2} \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3-\alpha_4}{2} \right), \]

and

\[ \text{(4.2.3)} \quad \text{Res}_{s_3=\alpha_1} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^{4} \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_1-\alpha_j}{2} \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_2-\alpha_1-\alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3-\alpha_1}{2} \right)}{\Gamma\left( \frac{s_1+s_2-\alpha_1}{2} \right)}. \]

The formulas for the remaining residues are found from each of the above by permuting \( \alpha \) (i.e., applying Weyl group transformations).

As proved in [ST], there are additional poles of \( \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \) at \( s = p \) for any \( p \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( 2n + p \in P_j \) for some \( n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \) and \( j = 1, 2, 3 \). We refer to Appendix C for the residues at the points \( 2n + p \in P_j \) which will be needed in the sequel.

4.3. Shift equations. We would like to have an expression similar to (1.11) for \( \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \) in the region where \( \text{Re}(s) < 0 \). Although we cannot use the right hand side of (1.11) directly when \( \text{Re}(s) < 0 \), we can use the fact that \( \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \) satisfies the following shift equation which (as will be shown) is a direct corollary of Propositions 4 and 6 from [ST].

**Proposition 4.3.1.** Let \( s = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3 \). Let \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \in \mathbb{C}^4 \) with \( \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4 = 0 \). Suppose that \( r_1, r_2, r_3 \geq 0 \) are integers. Then

\[ \left| \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1, s_2, s_3) \right| \ll \sum_{\ell=0}^{r_1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_2} \sum_{j=0}^{r_3} \left| \frac{Q_{j,k,\ell}^{r_1,r_2,r_3}}{B_1^{r_1}B_2^{r_2}B_3^{r_3}} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1 + 2(r_1 + j + k), s_2 + 2r_2, s_3 + 2(r_3 + \ell)) \right|, \]

where

\[ B_1 := B_1(\alpha, s) := (s_1 + \alpha_1)(s_1 + \alpha_2)(s_1 + \alpha_3)(s_1 + \alpha_4), \]

\[ B_2 := B_2(\alpha, s) := (s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_3)(s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4) \]

\[ \cdot \left( s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 \right)(s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_4)(s_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4), \]

\[ B_3 := B_3(\alpha, s) := (s_3 - \alpha_1)(s_3 - \alpha_2)(s_3 - \alpha_3)(s_3 - \alpha_4), \]

and \( Q_{j,k,\ell}^{r_1,r_2,r_3} \) is a polynomial in \( \alpha \) and \( s \) with combined degree \( 2(r_1 + 2r_2 + r_3 - j - k - \ell) \).

**Proof.** We begin with Proposition 4(a) of [ST] which states that

\[ \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \frac{g_0(\alpha, s)}{B_1(\alpha, s_1)} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1 + 2, s_2, s_3) + \frac{q_1(\alpha, s)}{B_1(\alpha, s_1)} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1 + 2, s_2, s_3 + 2), \]

where \( \deg(q_i) = 2 - 2i \). Iterating this formula \( r_1 \) times gives

\[ \text{(4.3.2)} \quad \left| \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1, s_2, s_3) \right| \ll \sum_{\ell=0}^{r_1} \left| \frac{Q_{1,r_1}(\alpha, s)}{B_1(\alpha, s_1)^{r_1}} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1 + 2r_1, s_2, s_3 + 2\ell) \right|. \]

In order to have an equality here, we would need to keep track of various shifts of the polynomial \( B_1(\alpha, s_1) \), but since we are only interested in bounds, the version presented here suffices. It is easy to show that

\[ \deg(Q_{1,r_1}^{(\ell)}) = (r_1 - \ell) \deg(g_0) + \ell \deg(q_1) = 2(r_1 - \ell). \]
Similarly, Proposition 6 of [ST] states that
\[
\widetilde{W}_\alpha(s_1, s_2, s_3) = \frac{p_0(\alpha, s)}{B_2(\alpha, s_2)} \widetilde{W}_\alpha(s_1 + 2, s_2 + 2, s_3) + \frac{p_1(\alpha, s)}{B_2(\alpha, s_2)} \widetilde{W}_\alpha(s_1 + 2, s_2 + 2, s_3),
\]
where \(\deg(p_k) = 4 - 2k\). Iterating this formula \(r_2\) times gives
\[
(4.3.3) \quad \left| \widetilde{W}_\alpha(s_1, s_2, s_3) \right| \leq \sum_{k=0}^{r_2} \left| \frac{Q_{2,r_2}(\alpha, s)}{B_2(\alpha, s_2)^{r_2}} W_\alpha(s_1 + 2k, s_2 + 2r_2, s_3) \right|,
\]
and
\[
\deg(Q_{2,r_2}^{(k)}) = (r_2 - k) \deg(p_0) + k \deg(p_1) = 4(r_2 - k) + 2k = 4r_2 - 2k.
\]
Via the change of variables \((s_1, s_3, \alpha) \mapsto (s_3, s_1, -\alpha)\) which preserves \(\widetilde{W}_\alpha\) applied to \((4.3.2)\), we have
\[
(4.3.4) \quad \left| \widetilde{W}_\alpha(s_1, s_2, s_3) \right| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{r_3} \left| \frac{Q_{1,r_3}^{(j)}(-\alpha, s)}{B_3(\alpha, s_3)^{r_3}} W_\alpha(s_1 + 2j, s_2, s_3 + 2r_3) \right|.
\]
Applying equations \((4.3.2), (4.3.3)\) and \((4.3.4)\) in succession gives the desired result with
\[
\deg(Q_{j,k,\ell}^{(r_1,r_2,r_3)}) = \deg(Q_{1,r_1}^{(j)}) + \deg(Q_{2,r_2}^{(k)}) + \deg(Q_{1,r_3}^{(\ell)}) = 2(r_1 + 2r_2 + r_3 - \ell - k - j),
\]
as claimed. \(\Box\)

4.4. **Expressing \(W_\alpha\) as the inverse Mellin transform of \(\widetilde{W}_\alpha\).** Given the equation \((4.0.1)\) for the Mellin transform of \(W_\alpha\), we find by Mellin inversion that
\[
W_\alpha(y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^3} \int \int \int_{\Re(s)=u} y_1^{\frac{3}{2}-s_1} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}-s_3} \widetilde{W}_\alpha(s) \, ds,
\]
provided that \(u = (u_1, u_2, u_3)\) satisfies \(u_j > 0\) \((j = 1, 2, 3)\).

As a matter of notation, for \(u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3\) define
\[
W_\alpha(y; u) := \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^3} \int \int \int_{\Re(s)=u_j} y_1^{\frac{3}{2}-s_1} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}-s_3} \widetilde{W}_\alpha(s) \, ds,
\]
and if \(I\) is a nonempty subset of \(\{1, 2, 3\}\) of cardinality \(r\) and \(p_I = (p_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}^r\) define
\[
\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{p_I}(y; u) := \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^{3-r}} \int \prod_{j \notin I} \text{Res}_{s_i=p_i} y_1^{\frac{3}{2}-s_1} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}-s_3} \widetilde{W}_\alpha(s) \, ds_j,
\]
where \(\text{Res}_{s_i=p_i}\) is the operator which evaluates the iterated residue at each of the points \(s_i = p_i\) with \(i \in I\), i.e.,
\[
\text{Res} := \text{Res}_{s_i=p_i} \circ \cdots \circ \text{Res}_{s_i=p_i}, \quad (I = (i_1, \ldots, i_q)).
\]
We call \(\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{p_I}\) a single residue term if \(q = 1\), a double residue term if \(q = 2\), and a triple residue term if \(q = 3\). For \(a = (a_1, a_2, a_3)\) with \(a_j > 0\), we call \(W_\alpha(y; -a)\) the shifted main term.

Note that if \(\text{Re}(u_j) > 0\) \((j = 1, 2, 3)\), then \(W_\alpha(y) = W_\alpha(y; u)\). We now shift the lines of integration in the \(s\)-variable to the left passing poles at \(\Re(s_j) = 0\). By the Cauchy Residue
Theorem, this allows us to write $W_\alpha(y)$ in terms of $R_\alpha^\alpha$. For example, if $a = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ with $0 < a_j < 2$ for each $j = 1, 2, 3$, then

$$W_\alpha(y) = W_\alpha(y; -a) + \sum_{p \in P_j} \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p)}(y; -a) + \sum_{p \in P_j} \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p,q)}(y; -a) + \sum_{p \in P_j} \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p,q,r)}(y; -a).$$

Because $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$ is invariant under the Weyl group action on $\alpha$ and under the involution $(\alpha, s_1, s_2, s_3) \mapsto (-\alpha, s_3, s_2, s_1)$, letting $p_1 := -\alpha$, $p_2 := -\alpha_1 - \alpha_2$ and $p_3 := -\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3$, every nonzero single residue term is equivalent (up to a constant) to either

$$(4.4.2) \quad \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p_1)}(y; -a) = \int \int_{\text{Re}(s_j) = -a_j} y_1^{3+p_1} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{3-s_3} \prod_{j=2}^4 \frac{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_j}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_2+\alpha_1+\alpha_j}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_j}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_j + s_1 + \alpha_k}{2})} ds_2 ds_3,$$

or

$$(4.4.3) \quad \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p_2)}(y; -a) = \int \int_{\text{Re}(s_j) = -a_j} y_1^{3-s_1} y_2^{2+p_2} y_3^{3-s_3} \left(\prod_{j=1}^4 \prod_{k=j+1}^4 \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2})\right) \Gamma(\frac{s_1+\alpha_1}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_1}{2}) ds_1 ds_3.$$

Every double residue term is equivalent to either

$$(4.4.4) \quad \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p_1,p_2)}(y; -a) = \int_{\text{Re}(s_3) = -a_3} y_1^{3+p_1} y_2^{2+p_2} y_3^{3-s_3} \left(\prod_{j=1}^4 \prod_{k=j+1}^4 \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2})\right) \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_3}{2}) ds_3,$$

or

$$(4.4.5) \quad \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p_1,p_3)}(y; -a) = \int_{\text{Re}(s_2) = -a_3} y_1^{3+p_1} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{3+p_3} \Gamma(\frac{s_1+\alpha_1+\alpha_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_1+\alpha_1}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_2-\alpha_1}{2}) ds_2;$$

and every triple residue term is equivalent to

$$(4.4.6) \quad \mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(p_1,p_2,p_3)}(y) = \int y_1^{3/2+p_1} y_2^{2+p_2} y_3^{3/2+p_3} \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2}).$$

It turns out that the bounds obtained from applying our methods to the shifted integral $W_\alpha(y; -a)$ when $0 < a_j < 2$ are not sufficient for our needs. To overcome this, we repeat the process above of shifting the integral for each of the above terms (and all of their residues) past the poles located at $\text{Re}(s_j) = -2$. Doing so, we arrive at the following result.
Proposition 4.4.7. Let

\[ P_1 = \{-\alpha_j \mid j = 1, \ldots, 4\}, \quad P_2 = \{-\alpha_j - \alpha_k \mid 1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4\}, \quad P_3 = \{\alpha_j \mid j = 1, \ldots, 4\}. \]

Let \( r > 1 \) be a fixed rational integer. Then the GL(4)-Whittaker function is given by

\[ W_\alpha(y) = W_\alpha(y; -a) + \sum_{\substack{p_j \in P_1 - \delta_j \delta, \ 1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4, \ \\ \delta_j \in \{0, 1, \ldots, r\}}} R^{(p_j)}_\alpha(y; -a) + \sum_{\substack{p_k \in P_1 - 2\delta_k \delta, \ 1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4, \ \\ \delta_j, \delta_k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, r\}}} R^{(p_j, p_k)}_\alpha(y), \]

where for each term on the right hand side we may make any choice of parameters \( a = (a_1, a_2, a_3) \) satisfying \( 2 < a_j < 2r \) for every \( j = 1, 2, 3 \).

The (nonzero) formulas for the cases in which \( \delta_j = 0 \) are each equivalent via a transformation under the Weyl group action and/or the involution \( (\alpha, s_1, s_2, s_3) \mapsto (-\alpha, s_3, s_2, s_1) \) to one of the formulas (4.4.2) – (4.4.6). The formulas for the case that \( \delta_j \neq 0 \) for some \( j \) are given in Appendix C.

5. Bounds for the test function \( p_{T,R} \)

Recall (see (3.1.3)) that \( p_{T,R} \) is given by

\[ p_{T,R}(y) = p_{T,R}(y_1, y_2, y_3) = \frac{1}{\pi^3} \int \int \int p^\#_{T,R} (\alpha) W_\alpha(y) \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \frac{d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3}{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_k}{2} \right)}. \]

Note that in (GK12) instead of \( W_\alpha(y) \) one actually has its complex conjugate \( \overline{W}_\alpha(y) \). However, one arrives at the formula here by noting that \( \alpha \) is purely imaginary and, therefore, \( \overline{W}_\alpha(y) = W_{-\alpha}(y) \). Hence, the change of variables \( \alpha \mapsto -\alpha \) which leaves \( p^\#_{T,R} (\alpha) \) and the measure \( \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \frac{d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3}{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_k}{2} \right)} \) invariant, leads to the given formula.

5.1. Decomposition of \( p_{T,R} \) in terms of poles and residues of \( \overline{W}_\alpha \). We now replace \( W_\alpha(y) \) (on the right side of (5.0.1)) by the expression given in Proposition 4.4.7. It follows from the definition of the test function \( p^\#_{T,R} \) given in (3.1.1), that in doing so, we obtain a shifted \( p_{T,R} \) term

\[ p^\#_{T,R}(y; -a) := \int \int \int e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \gamma^2}{2y^2}} W_\alpha(s; -a) \prod_{\sigma \in S_4} \left( 1 + \alpha_\sigma(1) + \alpha_\sigma(2) - \alpha_\sigma(3) - \alpha_\sigma(4) \right)^\frac{\beta}{2} \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_\sigma - \alpha_m}{2} \right) d\alpha, \]

where

\[ \prod_{1 \leq \ell \neq m \leq 4} \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_\ell + \alpha_m}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_\ell - \alpha_m}{2} \right)} \]

single residue terms of the type

\[ p_{T,R}^\#(y) := \int \int \int e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \gamma^2}{2y^2}} F_R(\alpha) R^{p_j-2\delta}(y; -a) \Gamma_R(\alpha) d\alpha, \]
double residue terms of the type

\[ p_{T,R}^{jk,\delta}(y) := \int_0 \int_0 e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \cdots + \alpha^2}{2t^2}} F_R(\alpha) \mathcal{R}_{\alpha}(p_j - 2\delta, p_k - 2\delta) (y, -a) \Gamma_R(\alpha) \, d\alpha, \]

and triple residue terms of the type

\[ p_{T,R}^{123,\delta}(y) := \int_0 \int_0 e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \cdots + \alpha^2}{2t^2}} F_R(\alpha) \mathcal{R}_{\alpha}(p_1 - 2\delta_1, p_2 - 2\delta_2, p_3 - 2\delta_3) (y, -a) \Gamma_R(\alpha) \, d\alpha. \]

where \( p_1 = -\alpha_1, p_2 = -\alpha_1 - \alpha_2, p_3 = -\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 \) and \( \delta_j \in \{0,1,\ldots,r-1\} \). Also, note that we use the notation \( d\alpha := d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3 \). In particular, by equations (4.4.2)–(4.4.6), we see that

\[ p_{T,R}^{0}(y) = \int_0 \int_0 \int_0 e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \cdots + \alpha^2}{2t^2}} y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + p_1} y_2^{-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} - s_3} \Gamma_R(\alpha) \cdot F_R(\alpha) \cdot \prod_{j=2}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j + \alpha_1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_3}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j + \alpha_3}{2}\right) ds_2 ds_3 d\alpha, \]

\[ p_{T,R}^{1}(y) = \int_0 \int_0 \int_0 e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \cdots + \alpha^2}{2t^2}} y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + p_1} y_2^{-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} - s_3} \left(\prod_{j=1}^2 \prod_{k=3}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k + \alpha_j}{2}\right) \right) \Gamma_R(\alpha) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_3}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j + \alpha_3}{2}\right) ds_1 ds_3 d\alpha, \]

\[ p_{T,R}^{2}(y) = \int_0 \int_0 \int_0 e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \cdots + \alpha^2}{2t^2}} y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + p_1} y_2^{-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} - s_3} \left(\prod_{j=1}^2 \prod_{k=3}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k + \alpha_j}{2}\right) \right) \Gamma_R(\alpha) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_3}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j + \alpha_3}{2}\right) ds_1 ds_2 d\alpha, \]

\[ p_{T,R}^{3}(y) = \int_0 \int_0 \int_0 e^{\frac{\alpha^2 + \cdots + \alpha^2}{2t^2}} y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + p_1} y_2^{-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} - s_3} \left(\prod_{j=1}^2 \prod_{k=3}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k + \alpha_j}{2}\right) \right) \Gamma_R(\alpha) \cdot \prod_{j=1}^4 \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_3}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j + \alpha_3}{2}\right) ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 d\alpha, \]

Since we are integrating over \( \alpha \) on the right hand side of (3.1.3) and the integrand (and measure) is invariant under the action of the Weyl group, there are explicitly computable constants \( c_1, c_{12}, c_{123} \) such that
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Through this process, we can replace the ratio of all of the Gamma factors by a rational

\[ \tilde{\varepsilon}(5.2.4) \]

$\varepsilon$ to see that (up to a constant) for

\[ \sum_{j,k \leq 3} \sum_{\delta \in \{0,1\}} \sum_{\delta \in \{0,1\}^3} \sum_{\delta \in \{0,1\}^3} p_{T,R}(y; -a). \]

5.2. Statement of the bound for $p_{T,R}$ and preliminary lemmas. In the subsequent

sections, we will establish the following result.

**Theorem 5.2.1.** Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. There exists $R$ sufficiently large such that for each

of the choices

\[ (r_1, r_2, r_3) \in \{ (r, 0, 0), (0, r, 0), (0, 0, r), (r, r, 0), (0, r, r), (r, r, r) \}, \]

and any values of $a_1, a_2, a_3$ satisfying

\[ 2r_j - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_j \leq 2r_j - \varepsilon, \quad j = 1, 2, 3, \]

we have the bound

\[ p_{T,R}(y) \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 10 + \sum_{j=1}^3 (\delta_{0,j} - r_j)}. \]

Here, $\delta_{0,j}$ is equal to 1 if $r_j = 0$ and is zero otherwise. The implicit constant depends on $\varepsilon$ and $R$.

**Remark 5.2.2.** For $a_j$ in the given range, it’s obviously true that $\min \{ \frac{1 + a_j}{2}, a_j \} = \frac{1 + a_j}{2}$. We prefer, however, to write the result in this form, because it continues to hold true if $\varepsilon < a_j < 2 - \varepsilon$ or if $\varepsilon < a_j$ for each $j = 1, 2, 3$. For our application, the stated bounds on $a_j$ give the best overall result.

Before giving the proof, we first describe the strategy and prove an important lemma. We then prove bounds for each of $p_{T,R}^0$, $p_{T,R}^1$, $p_{T,R}^{2,\delta}$, $p_{T,R}^{12,\delta}$, $p_{T,R}^{23,\delta}$, and $p_{T,R}^{123,\delta}$ for each possible choice of $\delta$ in Sections 5.3–5.6 respectively.

The basic idea of the proof is to insert the formula (4.1.1) into (4.4.1) to get an expression for $W_\alpha(y)$ as an integral of the ratio of many Gamma-functions. We then insert this into (3.1.3) and estimate each Gamma-function using Stirling’s approximation, which for fixed $\sigma$ and $|t| \to \infty$ says that

\[ \Gamma(\sigma + it) \sim \sqrt{2\pi} \cdot |t|^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2} |t|.} \]

We call $|t|^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}$ the polynomial factor of $\Gamma(\sigma + it)$, and $e^{-\frac{\pi}{2} |t|}$ is called the exponential factor. Through this process, we can replace the ratio of all of the Gamma factors by a rational function $P$ obtained as the product of the polynomial factors of the individual Gamma functions times $e^{-C(s,\alpha)}$ which is the product of the exponential factors.

To be completely explicit, after making a simple change of variables in (4.1.1), it is easy to see that (up to a constant) for $\varepsilon' > 0$ sufficiently small

\[ \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \int_{\Re(t) = -\varepsilon'} \Gamma_0(t, \alpha) \Gamma_1(t, s_1, \alpha) \Gamma_2(t, s_2, \alpha) \Gamma_3(t, s_3, \alpha) \Gamma_{\text{den}}(t, s, \alpha) \ dt \]
where

\[
\Gamma_0(t, \alpha) := \Gamma \left( \frac{-t + \alpha_3}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{-t + \alpha_4}{2} \right),
\]

\[
\Gamma_1(t, s_1, \alpha) := \Gamma \left( \frac{s_1 + \alpha_1}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_1 + \alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_1 + t}{2} \right),
\]

\[
\Gamma_2(t, s_2, \alpha) := \Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + t}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + t}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4}{2} \right),
\]

\[
\Gamma_3(t, s_3, \alpha) := \Gamma \left( \frac{s_3 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + t}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_3 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_3 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4}{2} \right),
\]

\[
\Gamma_{den}(t, s, \alpha) := \Gamma \left( \frac{s_1 + s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + t}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + s_3 + t}{2} \right).
\]

Thus by combining (4.4.1) and (5.2.4) into (3.1.3) as described above, we find that

\[
(5.2.5) \quad p_{T,R}(y) = \int_{\text{Re}(s) = \varepsilon} e^{\frac{s_1}{2} + \frac{s_2}{2} + \frac{s_3}{2}} \int_{\text{Re}(t) = \varepsilon} \int_{\text{Re}(r) = 0} y_1^{\frac{s_1}{2} - s_1} y_2^{\frac{s_2}{2} - s_2} y_3^{\frac{s_3}{2} - s_3} \left[ \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) \cdot \frac{\Gamma_0(t, \alpha) \Gamma_1(t, s_1, \alpha) \Gamma_2(t, s_2, \alpha) \Gamma_3(t, s_3, \alpha)}{\Gamma_{den}(t, s_1, s_2, s_3, \alpha)} \Gamma_R(\alpha) \right] dt \, ds \, d\alpha.
\]

Applying Stirling’s bound to each of the Gamma functions in (5.2.5) we see that (up to a constant factor depending on \(\alpha_j, R, \varepsilon\))

\[
p_{T,R}(y) \ll y_1^{\frac{s_1}{2} + a_1} y_2^{\frac{s_2}{2} + a_2} y_3^{\frac{s_3}{2} + a_3} \int_{\text{Re}(s) = -a} \int_{\text{Re}(t) = \varepsilon} \int_{\text{Re}(r) = 0} \mathcal{P}(s, \alpha) \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) \exp \left( -\frac{\pi}{\varepsilon} \xi(s, \alpha) \right) dt \, ds \, d\alpha,
\]

where, for \(\alpha_j = \kappa_j + i\tau_j \quad (j = 1, 2, 3, 4),\)

\[
\mathcal{R}_T(\kappa) := \left\{ (i\tau_1 + \kappa_1, i\tau_2 + \kappa_2, i\tau_3) \mid -\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3 \leq \tau_3 \leq \tau_2 \leq \tau_1 \leq T^{1+\varepsilon} \right\}.
\]

The Weyl group is isomorphic to \(S_4\) and acts by permutations on the set \(\{\alpha_j\}_{j=1}^4\) leaving the integrand for \(p_{T,R}(y)\) invariant. Hence it suffices to restrict the integration over \(\alpha\) to the set \(\mathcal{R}_T(0)\).

We will prove below (see Lemma 5.2.7) that the integration in \(s\) and \(t\) can also be restricted to a finite volume set \(\mathcal{R}\) which we call the exponential zero set. As \(s\) and \(t\) vary within this set, most of the polynomial terms can be uniformly bounded by a power of something of the form \((1 + \tau_k - \tau_j)\) where \(j < k\). We prove a very strong bound on the remaining terms (see Lemma A.0.3) which shows that it too is bounded by a product of similar factors. This implies that

\[
\int_{(s,t) \in \mathcal{R}} \mathcal{P}(s, \alpha) \, dt \, ds \ll \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} (1 + \tau_j - \tau_k)^{b_{j,k}}
\]

where each \(b_{j,k} > 0\). Then the integration in \(\alpha\) over the set \(\mathcal{R}_T(0)\) can be estimated trivially. The main difference between this outline and the actual proof is that instead of using (5.2.4) directly as above, we replace it by the expression on the right hand side of the result of Proposition 4.3.1. Also, instead of dealing with \(p_{T,R}\) itself as given in (5.0.1), we individually bound each term on the right hand side of (5.1.7).
In order to describe the exponential zero set, note that since \( \tau_1 \geq \tau_3 \geq \tau_4 \), if we let \( \mathrm{Im}(s_j) =: \xi_j \) and \( \mathrm{Im}(t_1) =: \rho \), the exponential term takes the simplified form

\[
\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}(s, \alpha) = -6 \tau_1 - 4 \tau_2 - 2 \tau_3 + |\rho - \tau_4| + |\rho - \tau_3| + |\xi_1 + \tau_1| + |\xi_1 + \tau_2| + |\xi_1 + \rho| + |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2| + |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \rho| + |\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \rho| + |\xi_2 + \tau_3 + \tau_4| + |\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho| + |\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 + \tau_4| + |\xi_3 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 + \tau_4| - |\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho| - |\rho + \xi_2 + \xi_3|.
\]

An important observation is the fact that \( p_{T,R}(y) \) has been defined in such a way that there is at worst polynomial growth in the integrand. This means that the exponential factor is never negative, i.e., \( \mathcal{E}(s, \alpha) \geq 0 \) for all \( s \). Since there will be exponential decay for any choice of \( s \) such that \( \mathcal{E}(s, \alpha) > 0 \), for the purposes of bounding \( p_{T,R}(y) \), we need only determine when \( \mathcal{E} = 0 \). Note that this set depends only on the imaginary parts of \( s \) and \( \alpha \).

The expression for \( \mathcal{E} \) above involves 14 absolute value terms. We can remove each of the 14 absolute values by replacing \( |x| \) with \( \pm x \) depending on whether \( x \) is positive or negative. This leads to an expression of the form

\[
0 = -6 \tau_1 - 4 \tau_2 - 2 \tau_3 + \varepsilon_{t,1}(\rho - \tau_4) + \varepsilon_{t,2}(\rho - \tau_3) + \varepsilon_{1,0}(\xi_1 + \tau_1) + \varepsilon_{1,1}(\xi_1 + \tau_2) + \varepsilon_{1,2}(\xi_1 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{2,0}(\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2) + \varepsilon_{2,1}(\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{2,2}(\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{2,3}(\xi_2 + \tau_3 + \tau_4) + \varepsilon_{3,0}(\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{3,1}(\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 + \tau_4) + \varepsilon_{3,2}(\xi_3 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 + \tau_4) - \varepsilon_{2,\frac{1}{2}}(\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho) - \varepsilon_{2,\frac{3}{2}}(\rho + \xi_2 + \xi_3),
\]

where each of the 14 \( \varepsilon \)'s is equal to \( \pm 1 \). For a particular choice of \( \varepsilon \)'s either the sum on the right hand side of \( \mathcal{E} \) vanishes identically or not. If it does vanish, each \( \varepsilon \) determines an inequality, and the set of \( \tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3, \rho, \xi_1, \xi_3 \) which satisfy all of these inequalities simultaneously is contained in the exponential zero set. The following lemma shows that there are three such choices of signs and each choice explicitly determines an exponential zero set.

**Lemma 5.2.7.** Every solution \( \varepsilon = (\varepsilon_{t,1}, \varepsilon_{t,2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{2,\frac{1}{2}}, \varepsilon_{2,\frac{3}{2}}) \in (\pm 1)^{14} \) to (5.2.6) is of the form

\[
\mathcal{E}_{t,1} = +1, \quad \mathcal{E}_{t,2} = +1,
\]

\[
\mathcal{E}_{1,0} = +1, \quad \mathcal{E}_{1,1} = \mathcal{E}_{2,\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{1,2} = -1,
\]

\[
\mathcal{E}_{2,0} = +1, \quad \mathcal{E}_{2,1} = \mathcal{E}_{2,\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{2,2} = \mathcal{E}_{2,\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{2,3} = +1,
\]

\[
\mathcal{E}_{3,0} = +1, \quad \mathcal{E}_{3,1} = \mathcal{E}_{2,\frac{3}{2}}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{3,2} = -1,
\]

and \( \mathcal{E}_{2,\frac{1}{2}} \geq \mathcal{E}_{2,\frac{3}{2}} \).

In particular, there are three possible exponential zero sets, which we denote as \( \mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3 \). The first corresponds to the case of \( (\varepsilon_{2,\frac{1}{2}}, \varepsilon_{2,\frac{3}{2}}) = (+1,+1) \):

\[
\mathcal{R}_1 : \quad \tau_1 \leq \rho \leq \tau_3 \quad -\tau_2 \leq \xi_1 \leq -\rho, \quad -\tau_2 - \rho \leq \xi_2 \leq \tau_1 + \tau_2 \quad \tau_2 \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_1,
\]
the second corresponds to \((\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}, \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}) = (+1, -1)\):

\[
\mathcal{R}_2 : \quad \tau_4 \leq \rho \leq \tau_3 \\
-\tau_2 \leq \xi_1 \leq -\rho, \\
-\tau_1 - \rho \leq \xi_2 \leq -\tau_2 - \rho \\
-(\tau_1 + \tau_2) - \rho \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_2,
\]

and the third corresponds to \((\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}, \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}) = (-1, -1)\):

\[
\mathcal{R}_3 : \quad \tau_4 \leq \rho \leq \tau_3 \\
-\tau_1 \leq \xi_1 \leq -\tau_2, \\
-(\tau_1 + \tau_2) \leq \xi_2 \leq -\tau_1 - \rho \\
-(\tau_1 + \tau_2) - \rho \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_2.
\]

**Proof.** Suppose that \(\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_{t,1}, \varepsilon_{t,2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}) \in (\pm 1)^{14}\) is a solution to (5.2.6). If we replace every instance of \(\tau_4\) in (5.2.6) with \(-\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3\), notice that the coefficient of \(\tau_3\) is \((\varepsilon_{t,3} - \varepsilon_{t,2} - 2)\). This immediately implies (5.2.8), or equivalently, \(\tau_4 \leq \rho \leq \tau_3\).

Recall that we are assuming that \(\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \tau_3 \geq \tau_4\). This, together with the fact that \(\tau_4 \leq \rho \leq \tau_3\), implies that

\[
\xi_1 + \tau_1 \geq \xi_1 + \tau_2 \geq \xi_1 + \rho.
\]

Since \(\varepsilon_{1,0} = -1\) implies that \((\xi_1 + \tau_1) \leq 0\), it follows that this would also imply that \(\varepsilon_{1,1} = \varepsilon_{1,2} = -1\). But it can’t be the case that all three \(\varepsilon_{1,\overline{k}}\) are \(-1\) because if so, the coefficient of \(\xi_1\) in (5.2.6) will not be zero. The same argument implies that \(\varepsilon_{1,3} = -1\), and that the same relations hold for \(\varepsilon_{3,j}\). Similarly, \(+1 = \varepsilon_{2,0} \geq \varepsilon_{2,1} \geq \varepsilon_{2,2} \geq \varepsilon_{2,3} = -1\).

Using this information, we now rewrite (5.2.6) as

\[
0 = -5\tau_1 - 3\tau_2 + (\tau_1 + \rho + \varepsilon_{1,1}(\xi_1 + \tau_2)) \\
+ 2(\tau_1 + \tau_2) + \varepsilon_{2,1}(\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{2,2}(\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \rho) \\
+ (2\tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{3,1}(\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 + \tau_4) \\
- \varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}(\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}(\rho + \xi_2 + \xi_3) \\
= \varepsilon_{1,1}(\xi_1 + \tau_2) + \varepsilon_{2,1}(\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \rho + \varepsilon_{2,2}(\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \rho) + \varepsilon_{3,1}(\xi_3 - \tau_2) \\
- \varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}(\xi_1 + \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho) - \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}(\xi_2 + \xi_3 + \rho).
\]

Since the coefficient of \(\xi_1\) is \((\varepsilon_{1,1} - \varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}})\), we see that (5.2.9) is satisfied. By similarly looking at the coefficient of \(\xi_3\), we see that (5.2.10) holds. Using this, (5.2.12) simplifies further to

\[
0 = (\varepsilon_{2,2} - \varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}})(\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \rho) + (\varepsilon_{2,3} - \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}})(\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \rho),
\]

which is obviously true if and only if \(\varepsilon_{2,2} = \varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}\) and \(\varepsilon_{2,3} = \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}\). This proves (5.2.10). Since it must be the case that \(\varepsilon_{2,1} \geq \varepsilon_{2,2}\), it follows that \(\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}} \geq \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}\), as claimed.

Suppose that \(\varepsilon\) corresponds to one of the three admissible solutions to (5.2.12). Considering only the inequalities that are determined by the \(\varepsilon_{j,k}\), the stated inequalities of the three solutions are immediate. So, in order to complete the proof, we must show that the inequalities imposed by \(\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}\) and \(\varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}\) are superfluous, i.e., they do not impose any further restriction on \(\xi_1, \xi_2 \) or \(\xi_3\).
We check this first in the case that \((\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}, \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}) = (+1, +1)\), for which
\[
-\tau_2 \leq \xi_1 \leq -\rho, \\
-\tau_2 - \rho \leq \xi_2 \leq \tau_1 + \tau_2, \\
-\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \rho \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_2.
\]
Combining the first and second sets of inequalities, we see that
\[
0 \leq \tau_1 - \tau_2 = (-\tau_2) + (-\tau_2 - \rho) + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho \leq \xi_1 + \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho.
\]
That is to say that \(\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}\) must be +1. In other words, the condition cut out by \(\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}\) is already a consequence of the fact that \(\varepsilon_{1,1} = \varepsilon_{2,1} = \varepsilon_{2,2} = +1\). In like manner, we see that the inequality required by \(\varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}} = +1\) is already true by combining the second and third inequalities above.

In each of the other two cases \((\varepsilon_{2-\frac{1}{2}}, \varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}) = (+1, -1)\) or \((-1, -1)\), one similarly shows that the inequalities imposed by \(\varepsilon_{2+\frac{1}{2}}\) are already satisfied given those imposed by \(\varepsilon_{j,k}\). □

Lemma 5.2.7 allows us to restrict the integration in (5.2.5) to the three possible bounded subsets in the \(s\)-variables.

5.3. Bounds for the shifted \(p_{T,R}\) term.

Recall that
\[
(5.3.1) 
\quad p_{T,R}^\#(\alpha) := e^{\frac{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2 + \alpha_4^2}{2T^2}} \cdot \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq n} \Gamma\left(\frac{2+R+\alpha_j-\alpha_k}{4}\right),
\]
where
\[
\mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) := \left(\prod_{\sigma \in S_4} \left(1 + \alpha_{\sigma(1)} - \alpha_{\sigma(2)} - \alpha_{\sigma(3)} + \alpha_{\sigma(4)}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{24}}.
\]

By the inverse Lebedev-Whittaker transform (see [GK12]), we see that \(p_{T,R}\) is given by
\[
(5.3.2) 
\quad p_{T,R}(y) = p_{T,R}(y_1, y_2, y_3) = \frac{1}{\pi^3} \iiint_{\text{Re}(\alpha_j) = 0} p_{T,R}^\#(\alpha) W_\alpha(y) \frac{d\alpha_1 \ d\alpha_2 \ d\alpha_3}{\prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2}\right)}.
\]

To obtain a sharp bound for \(p_{T,R}(y)\) we replace the Whittaker function \(W_\alpha(y)\) on the right hand side of (5.3.2) by its inverse Mellin transform
\[
W_\alpha(y) = \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^3} \iiint_{\text{Re}(s_j) = \varepsilon} y_1^{\frac{3-s_1}{2}} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3-s_3}{2}} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \ ds.
\]
Following (5.1.7), we can then shift the lines of integration \(\text{Re}(s) = \varepsilon\) to the left to \(\text{Re}(s) = -a = (-a_1, -a_2, -a_3)\) (with \(a_1, a_2, a_3 > 0\)) and express \(p_{T,R}(y)\) as a sum of residues plus a shifted \(p_{T,R}\) integral given by
\[
(5.3.3) 
\quad p_{T,R}(y, -a) := \frac{1}{(2\pi^2 i)^3} \iiint_{\text{Re}(s) = -a} y_1^{\frac{3-s_1}{2}} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3-s_3}{2}} \iiint_{\text{Re}(\alpha_j) = 0} p_{T,R}^\#(\alpha) \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \frac{d\alpha_1 \ d\alpha_2 \ d\alpha_3}{\prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4} \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2}\right)} \ ds.
\]
Proposition 5.3.4. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $R$ sufficient large be fixed. Let $r_1, r_2, r_3 \geq 0$ be integers. Given any choice of parameters $2r_i - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_i \leq 2r_i - \varepsilon$. Then

$$|p_{T,R}(y, -a)| \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} \cdot T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 10 + \delta_{0,r_1} + \delta_{0,r_2} + \delta_{0,r_3} - (r_1 + r_2 + r_3)},$$

where $\delta_{0,r} = 1$ if $r = 0$ and zero otherwise. The implicit constant depends on $r, \varepsilon$ and $R$. In particular

$$|p_{T,R}(y, -a)| \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} \cdot \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 10 - 3r} & \text{if } r_1 = r_2 = r_3 = r, \\
T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 11 - 2r} & \text{if } r_1 + r_3 = r_2 = r,
\end{array} \right.$$

for an integer $r \geq 1$.

Proof. In order to obtain good bounds for $p_{T,R}(y, -a)$ when

$$2r_i - 1 + \varepsilon < a_i < 2r_i - \varepsilon, \quad (i = 1, 2, 3),$$

it is necessary to have sharp bounds for the growth of $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$ on the lines $\text{Re}(s_i) = -a_i$. Such bounds are known when $\text{Re}(s_i) > 0$, and we can backtrack to this situation by use of the shift equation for $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$ given in Proposition 4.3.1

(5.3.5)

$$|\tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1, s_2, s_3)| \ll \sum_{\ell=0}^{r_1} \sum_{k=0}^{r_2} \sum_{l=0}^{r_3} \frac{Q_{r_1,r_2,r_3}^{j,k,\ell}}{B_1^{r_1} B_2^{r_2} B_3^{r_3}} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s_1 + 2(r_1 + j + k), s_2 + 2r_2, s_3 + 2(r_3 + \ell)),
$$

where $\text{deg}(Q_{r_1,r_2,r_3}^{j,k,\ell}) = 2(r_1 + 2r_2 + r_3 - j - k - \ell)$.

Recall that

(5.3.6) $B_1 := B_1(\alpha, s) := (s_1 + \alpha_1)(s_1 + \alpha_2)(s_1 + \alpha_3)(s_1 + \alpha_4),$

(5.3.7) $B_2 := B_2(\alpha, s) := (s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2)(s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_3)(s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4)$

$\cdot (s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3)(s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_4)(s_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4),$

(5.3.8) $B_3 := B_3(\alpha, s) := (s_3 - \alpha_1)(s_3 - \alpha_2)(s_3 - \alpha_3)(s_3 - \alpha_4).$

Using this, we see that for $a = (a_1, a_2, a_3)$ with $2r_i - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_i \leq 2r_i - \varepsilon$ ($1 \leq i \leq 3$),

$$p_{T,R}(y, -a) = \sum_{j=0}^{r_3} \sum_{k=0}^{r_2} \sum_{l=0}^{r_1} p_{T,R}^{(j,k,\ell)}(y, -a),$$

where

$$\left| p_{T,R}^{(j,k,\ell)}(y, -a) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} \int_{\text{Re}(\alpha_j) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s) = -a} \frac{Q_{j,k,\ell}^{r_1,r_2,r_3}}{B_1^{r_1} B_2^{r_2} B_3^{r_3}} \cdot |\Gamma_R(\alpha)| \cdot \left| \frac{\Gamma_0(t, \alpha) \Gamma_1(t, s_1 + 2(r_1 + j + k), \alpha) \Gamma_2(t, s_2 + 2r_2, \alpha) \Gamma_3(t, s_3 + 2(r_3 + \ell), \alpha)}{\Gamma_{\text{den}}(t, (s_1 + 2(r_1 + j + k), s_2 + 2r_2, s_3 + 2(r_3 + \ell)), \alpha)} \right| dt \, ds \, d\alpha.$$
It follows that

\[(5.3.9)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
p\mathcal{T}_{R}^{(j,k,\ell)}(y,-a) & \ll y^{2+\alpha_1}y_2^{2+\alpha_2}y_3^{2+\alpha_3} \cdot \mathcal{I}^{\varepsilon+2(r_1+2r_2+r_3-j-\ell)} \int_{\text{Re}(s)=-\varepsilon} \int_{\text{Re}(\alpha_j)=0} \int_{\text{Re}(\rho)=-a} \left| \mathcal{B}_1^{-r_1} \mathcal{B}_2^{-r_2} \mathcal{B}_3^{-r_3} \right| \\
& \cdot \int_{\text{Re}(t)=-\varepsilon'} \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{-t+\alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{-t+\alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_1+2r_1+2j+2k+\alpha_1}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_1+2(r_1+j+k)+\alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_1+2(r_1+j+k)+t}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_1+s_2+2(r_1+r_2+j+k)+\alpha_1+\alpha_2+t}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_2+s_3+2(r_2+r_3+j+k)+t}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_3+2(r_3+j+k)+\alpha_3+\alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_3+2(r_3+j+k)+t}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{s_3+2(r_3+j+k)+2\alpha_3+\alpha_4}{2} \right)} \\
& \cdot \prod_{\sigma \in S_4} \left( 1 + \alpha_{\sigma(1)} + \alpha_{\sigma(2)} - \alpha_{\sigma(3)} - \alpha_{\sigma(4)} \right) \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} \left| \frac{\pi}{\Gamma \left( \frac{2+\alpha_4-\alpha_k}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_4-\alpha_k}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2+\alpha_4-\alpha_k}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_4-\alpha_k}{2} \right)} \right|^2 \, ds \, ds' \, d\alpha.
\end{align*}
\]

where \(-\varepsilon' = \text{Re}(t)\) is such that the real part of the arguments of all of the Gamma-functions appearing here are positive. Hence 0 < \(\varepsilon' < \varepsilon\).

Note that besides the presence of the additional polynomials \(\mathcal{B}_i^{\varepsilon}\), the Gamma factors occurring in \((5.3.9)\) are the same as that of \((5.2.5)\). In any event, the exponential zero set is precisely the same as that which was determined in Lemma 5.2.7 and can be any one of the three exponential zero sets \(\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3\) as given in Lemma 5.2.7.

Note that we can get from \(\mathcal{R}_2\) to \(\mathcal{R}_1\) by making the change of variables

\[(\xi_2, \xi_3) \mapsto (-\xi_3 - \rho, \xi_2 - \tau_1)\]

Similarly, to go from \(\mathcal{R}_2\) to \(\mathcal{R}_3\), one makes the change of variables

\[(\xi_1, \xi_2) \mapsto (\xi_2 - \tau_1, -\xi_1 + \rho)\]

Either of these transformations result in no change in \((1.4.1)\) because it leaves both the measure \(ds\) and the region over which we are integrating \(\text{Re}(s) = -a\) invariant. This implies any bound obtained for a given \(\mathcal{R}_i\) holds for each of the other choices as well.

Recall the exponential zero set \(\mathcal{R}_2\) given by

\[
\tau_4 \leq \rho \leq \tau_3, \quad -\tau_2 \leq \xi_1 \leq -\rho, \\
-\tau_1 - \rho \leq \xi_2 \leq -\tau_2 - \rho, \quad -(\tau_1 + \tau_2) - \rho \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_2.
\]

Recall, also, that \(\text{Im}(\alpha_j) = \tau_j\) (for \(j = 1, 2, 3, 4\) with \(\tau_4 = -\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3\), \(\text{Im}(t) = \rho\), and \(\text{Im}(s_i) = \xi_i\) (for \(i = 1, 2, 3\)). Accordingly, we write \(s = -a + i\xi, \, \alpha = i\tau\) with \(\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)\) and \(\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)\).

We now replace each Gamma-factor in the integral \((5.3.9)\) using the Stirling bound \((5.2.3)\). A bound for the integral is given by integrating over \(\mathcal{R}_2\) (the exponential zero set) and just using the polynomial bound coming from the Stirling bound \((5.2.3)\). It follows (up to a
constant dependant on $a_k$, $R$ and $\varepsilon > 0$) that $p_{T,R}^{(j,k,\ell)}(y,-a)$ is bounded by

$$y_1^\gamma + a_2^2 y_2^\beta + a_3^3 y_3^\alpha . T^{\varepsilon+2(r_1+2r_2+r_3-j-k-\ell)}$$

The following holds:

$$\left| B_1^{-\tau_1} B_2^{-\tau_2} B_3^{-\tau_3} \right| (1+|\tau_3-\rho|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1+|\tau_4-\rho|)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1+|\xi_2+\xi_3+\rho|)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\ell+r_3-\frac{a_1+1}{2}} (1+|\xi_2+\xi_3+\rho|)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\ell+r_3-\frac{a_3+1}{2}}$$

for each of the cases $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $f(\tau,\rho)$ appearing above.

In a similar manner, one sees that

$$(1+|\xi_1+\xi_2+\tau_1+\tau_2|)^{\frac{1}{2}-j-k-r_1+a_1^{-1}+\frac{a_2+a_3}{2}} \ll (1+|\xi_1+\xi_2+\tau_1+\tau_2|)^{\frac{1}{2}-j-k}$$

and

$$(1+|\xi_2+\xi_3+\rho|)^{\frac{1}{2}-\ell-r_3+a_1^{-1}+\frac{a_2+a_3}{2}} \ll (1+|\xi_2+\xi_3+\rho|)^{\frac{1}{2}-\ell}$$

Putting this together, we obtain the bound

It is convenient to introduce the notation

$$a_i := 2r_i - a'_i \quad \text{(for } i = 1, 2, 3).$$

This allows us to simplify many of the exponents. For example,

$$K_R(\tau) := \left(1+|\tau_1+\tau_2-\tau_3-\tau_4|\right)^{\frac{R}{3}} \left(1+|\tau_1+\tau_3-\tau_2-\tau_4|\right)^{\frac{R}{3}} \left(1+|\tau_1+\tau_4-\tau_2-\tau_3|\right)^{\frac{R}{3}} \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} \left(1+\tau_j-\tau_k\right)^{1+\frac{R}{3}}.$$
\[
\left| p_{T,R}^{(j,k,\ell)}(y,-a) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T^{e+1+2(r_1+2r_2+r_3-j-k-\ell)} \\
\cdot \int_{\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \tau_3} \int_{|\tau_1|,|\tau_2|,|\tau_3|,|\tau_4| \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}} \int_{\rho=\tau_4} (-\rho \tau_1 - \rho \tau_2 - \rho \tau_3 - \rho \tau_4} \int_{\xi_1=-\tau_2} (-\rho \xi_1 - \rho \xi_2 - \rho \xi_3 - \rho \xi_4} \int_{\tau_2} (-\rho \tau_2) \\
\cdot \left(1 + |\tau_3 - \rho| \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\tau_4 - \rho| \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_1| \right)^{j+k} \left(1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_2| \right)^{j+k} \left(1 + |\xi_1 + \rho| \right)^{j+k} \left(1 + |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho| \right)^{j+k} \\
\cdot \left[ (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_1|) (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_2|) (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_3|) (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_4|) \right]^{-r_1} \\
\cdot \left[ (1 + |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2|) (1 + |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3|) (1 + |\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \tau_3|) (1 + |\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \tau_4|) \right]^{-r_2} \\
\cdot \left[ (1 + |\xi_2 + \tau_2 + \tau_4|) (1 + |\xi_2 + \tau_3 + \tau_4|) \right]^{-r_2} \\
\cdot \left[ (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_1|) (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_2|) (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_3|) (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_4|) \right]^{-r_3} \\
\cdot \left[ (1 + |\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \rho|) \frac{\ell}{4} (1 + |\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 + \tau_4|) \right]^{\ell} \left(1 + |\xi_3 + \tau_2 + \tau_3 + \tau_4| \right)^{\ell} \left(1 + |\xi_3 + \xi_2 + \rho| \right)^{\ell} \\
\cdot K_R(\tau) d\xi_3 d\xi_2 d\xi_1 d\rho d\tau_3 d\tau_2 d\tau_1.
\]

Next, we successively make the change of variables

\[
\xi_1 \mapsto \xi_1 - \tau_2, \quad \xi_2 \mapsto \xi_2 - \tau_1 - \rho, \quad \xi_3 \mapsto \xi_3 - \tau_2 - \rho, \quad \rho \mapsto \rho + \tau_4,
\]

and the substitutions

\[
T_1 = \tau_1 - \tau_2, \quad T_2 = \tau_2 - \tau_3, \quad T_3 = \tau_3 - \tau_4 = \tau_1 + \tau_2 + 2\tau_3.
\]

Then by abuse of notation we may replace \(K_R(\tau)\) by \(K_R(T_1, T_2, T_3)\) where

\[
(5.3.14) \quad K_R(T_1, T_2, T_3) := \left(1 + T_1 + 2T_2 + T_3\right)^\frac{\mu}{3} \left(1 + T_1 + T_3\right)^\frac{\mu}{3} \left(1 + |T_1 - T_3|\right)^\frac{\mu}{3} \\
\cdot \left(1 + T_1\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \left(1 + T_2\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \left(1 + T_3\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \\
\cdot \left(1 + T_1 + T_2\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \left(1 + T_2 + T_3\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \left(1 + T_1 + T_2 + T_3\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \\
\ll T^{e+3+\frac{11\mu}{6}} \left(1 + |T_1 - T_3|\right)^\frac{\mu}{3} \left(1 + T_1\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \left(1 + T_2\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}} \left(1 + T_3\right)^{1+\frac{\mu}{2}}.
\]
It follows that
\[ p_{T,R}^{(j,k,\ell)}(y,-a) \ll \frac{1}{y_1^{\frac{1}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{1}{2}+a_3}} T^\varepsilon 4 + 4 + 2(r_1 + 2r_2 + r_3 - j - k - \ell) \]
\[ \cdot \int_{0 \leq T_1, T_2, T_3 \leq T^{1+\varepsilon}} \int_{\rho = 0} \int_{\xi_1 = 0} \int_{\xi_2 = 0} \int_{\xi_3 = 0} (1 + T_3 - \rho)^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} (1 + \rho)^{-\frac{\ell}{2}} \]
\[ \cdot \frac{(1 + T_1 + \xi_1)^{j+k} (1 + \xi_1)^{j+k} (1 + T_2 + T_3 - \rho - \xi_1)^{j+k}}{(1 + \xi_1 + \xi_2)^{j+k}} \]
\[ \cdot \left[ (1 + \xi_1 + T_1) (1 + \xi_1) (1 + |\xi_1 - T_2|) (1 + T_2 + T_3 - \xi_1) \right]^{-r_1} \]
\[ \cdot \left[ (1 + \xi_2 + T_2 + T_3 - \rho) (1 + \xi_2 + T_3 - \rho) (1 + |\xi_2 - \rho|) \right]^{-r_2} \]
\[ \cdot \left[ (1 + |\xi_2 - T_1 + T_3 - \rho|) (1 + T_1 + \rho - \xi_2) (1 + T_1 - \xi_2 + T_2 + \rho) \right]^{-r_2} \]
\[ \cdot \left[ (1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3) (1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3) (1 + |\xi_3 - \rho|) (1 + \xi_3 + T_3 - \rho) \right]^{-r_3} \]
\[ \cdot \frac{(1 + |\xi_3|)^{\ell} (1 + |\xi_3 - T_2 - \rho|)^{\ell} (1 + |\xi_3 - T_1 - T_2 - \rho|)^{\ell}}{(1 + |\xi_2 + \xi_3 - T_1 - T_2 - \rho|)^{\ell}} d\xi_3 d\xi_2 d\xi_1 d\rho \]
\[ \cdot (1 + |T_1 - T_3|)^{\frac{\beta}{3}} (1 + T_1)^{\frac{\beta}{3}} (1 + T_2)^{\frac{\beta}{3}} (1 + T_3)^{\frac{\beta}{3}} dT_3 dT_2 dT_1. \]

Now for 0 \leq \xi_1 \leq T_2 + T_3 - \rho, 0 \leq \xi_2 \leq T_1, 0 \leq \xi_3 \leq T_2 + \rho and 0 \leq \rho \leq T_3,
\[ 1 + \xi_1 + T_1 \geq 1 + T_1 \]
\[ 1 + T_2 + T_3 - \rho + \xi_2 \geq 1 + T_2 + T_3 - \rho \geq 1 + T_2 \]
\[ 1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_2 \geq 1 + T_2 + \rho \geq 1 + T_2 \]
\[ 1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3 \geq 1 + T_1. \]

Hence, we have the bounds
\[ (1 + \xi_1 + T_1)^{-r_1} \leq (1 + T_1)^{-r_1} \]
\[ (1 + T_2 + T_3 - \rho + \xi_2)^{-r_2} \leq (1 + T_2)^{-r_2} \]
\[ (1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_2)^{-r_2} \leq (1 + T_2)^{-r_2} \]
\[ (1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3)^{-r_3} \leq (1 + T_1)^{-r_3}, \]
and since 0 \leq j, k and 0 \leq T_i \leq T^{1+\varepsilon} for all i = 1, 2, 3,
\[ \frac{(1 + T_1 + \xi_1)^{j+k} (1 + \xi_1)^{j+k} (1 + T_2 + T_3 - \rho - \xi_1)^{j+k}}{(1 + \xi_1 + \xi_2)^{j+k}} \ll T^{\varepsilon + 2(j+k)}, \]
and
\[ \frac{(1 + \xi_3)^{\ell} (1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3)^{\ell} (1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3)^{\ell}}{(1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3)^{\ell}} \leq (1 + \xi_3)^{\ell} (1 + T_1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3)^{\ell} \ll T^{\varepsilon + 2\ell}. \]
Inserting these bounds, we see that

\[(5.3.15)\]

\[
\left| p_{T,R}^{(j,k,l)}(y,-a) \right| \ll y^{\frac{4}{4}+a_1} y_2^{a_2} y_3^{a_3} T^{\varepsilon+\frac{11}{6}+\frac{1}{2}+4+2(r_1+2r_2+r_3)}
\]

\[
\cdot \int_{0 \leq t_1, t_2, t_3 \leq t^{1+\varepsilon}} \left(1 + T_1 \right)^{-r_1-r_3} \left(1 + T_2 \right)^{-2r_2} \int_{\rho=0} \left(1 + T_3 - \rho \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1 + \rho)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\]

\[
\cdot \int_{\xi_1=0}^{T_1} (1 + \xi_1)^{-r_1} (1 + |\xi_1 - T_2|)^{-r_1} (1 + T_2 + T_3 - \xi_1)^{-r_1} d\xi_1
\]

\[
\cdot \int_{\xi_2=0}^{T_2+\rho} (1 + \xi_2 + T_3 - \rho)^{-r_2} (1 + |\xi_2 - \rho|)^{-r_2} (1 + |\xi_2 - T_1 + T_3 - \rho|)^{-r_2} d\xi_2
\]

\[
\cdot \int_{\xi_3=0}^{T_2+\rho} (1 + T_2 + \rho - \xi_3)^{-r_3} (1 + |\xi_3 - \rho|)^{-r_3} (1 + \xi_3 + T_3 - \rho)^{-r_3} d\xi_3 d\rho
\]

\[
\frac{1}{\rho} \left(1 + T_1\right)^{1+r_1} \frac{1}{\rho} \left(1 + T_2\right)^{1+r_2} \frac{1}{\rho} \left(1 + T_3\right)^{1+r_3} dT_1 dT_2 dT_3.
\]

Let us denote the integral in \(\xi_i\) (1 \leq i \leq 3), in \((5.3.15), by \mathcal{I}_i(r_i). We have

Lemma 5.3.16. For each \(i = 1, 2, 3, \mathcal{I}_i(0) \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}. Otherwise, if \(r \geq 1\), we have the following bounds:

\[
\mathcal{I}_1(r), \mathcal{I}_3(0) \ll (1 + T_2)^{-r} (1 + T_3)^{-r},
\]

\[
\mathcal{I}_2(r) \ll \left( (1 + T_3)^{-2r} + (1 + T_1)^{-2r} \right) (1 + |T_1 - T_3|)^{-r}.
\]

Proof. The case of \(r = 0\) is clear given that \(0 \leq T_1 \leq T^{1+\varepsilon}\). Thus, we may assume now that \(r \geq 1\). By expanding the region of integration, since the integrand is positive, we have that

\[
\mathcal{I}_1 \ll \int_{\xi_1=0}^{T_1+T_3} (1 + \xi_1)^{-r} (1 + |\xi_1 - T_2|)^{-r} (1 + T_2 + T_3 - \xi_1)^{-r} d\xi_1
\]

\[
= \int_{\xi_1=B_1}^{B_3} (1 + |\xi_1 - B_1|)^{-r} (1 + |\xi_1 - B_2|)^{-r} (1 + |\xi_1 - B_3|)^{-r} d\xi_1,
\]

where

\[
B_1 = 0, \quad B_2 = T_2, \quad B_2 = T_2 + T_3.
\]

Applying Lemma A.0.3 it follows that

\[
\mathcal{I}_1 \ll (1 + T_1)^{-r} (1 + T_2)^{-r} (1 + T_3)^{-r}.
\]

Replacing \(\rho\) by \(T_3 - \rho\) in \(\mathcal{I}_1\), one finds that \(\mathcal{I}_3 = \mathcal{I}_1\), and hence the same bound holds for \(i = 3\).
To bound $I_2$, we also expand the region of integration, whence
\[
I_2(r) \ll \int_{\xi_2 = \rho - T_3}^{T_1 + \rho} (1 + \xi_2 + T_3 - \rho)^{-r} (1 + |\xi_2 - \rho|)^{-r} d\xi_2
\]
\[
\cdot (1 + |\xi_2 - T_1 + T_3 - \rho|)^{-r} (1 + T_1 + \rho - \xi_2)^{-r} d\xi_2
\]
\[
= \int_{\xi_2 = 0}^{T_1} \prod_{\ell = 1}^{4} (1 + |\xi_2 - B_\ell|)^{-r} d\xi_2,
\]
where
\[
B_1 = \rho - T_3, \quad B_2 = \rho, \quad B_3 = \rho + T_1 - T_3, \quad B_4 = \rho + T_1.
\]
Note that
\[
B_2 \leq B_3 \iff T_3 \leq T_1.
\]
In either event, using Lemma \[A.0.3\] gives claimed bound. □

Inserting these bounds into (5.3.15), the integral in the $\rho$-variable is
\[
\int_{\rho + 0}^{T_3} \left(1 + \rho\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + T_3 - \rho\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} d\rho \ll 1,
\]
where this bound is obtained via a direct application of Lemma \[A.0.1\].

Plugging these bounds into (5.3.15), it follows that
\[
\cdot \left(1 + T_1\right)^{\frac{R}{2} - r_1 - r_3} \left((1 + T_3)^{-2r_2} + (1 + T_1)^{-2r_2}\right) (1 + T_3)^{\frac{R}{2} - r_1 - r_3}
\]
\[
\cdot (1 + |T_1 - T_3|) \frac{R}{3} - r_2 (1 + T_2)^{\frac{R}{2} - r_1 - 2r_2 - r_3} dT_3 dT_2 dT_1.
\]

Remark 5.3.18. As long as
\[
1 + \frac{R}{2} \geq r_1 + 2r_2 + r_3 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{R}{3} \geq r_2,
\]
each of the terms in the integrand of (5.3.17) is of the form
\[
(1 + \beta_1 T_1 + \beta_2 T_2 + \beta_3 T_3)^\alpha
\]
where $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \in \{0, \pm 1\}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\alpha \geq 0$. It follows, since the integral is over the domain $0 \leq T_1, T_2, T_3 \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}$, that each of these terms be replaced by $T^\alpha$. The fact that we are able to do this is a consequence of having the term $F_R(\alpha)$ included in our choice of test function. (See (3.1.1).)
In light of the above remark, we obtain the bound
\[ |p_{T,R}^{(j)}(y,-a)| \ll y_1^{\frac{3+a_1}{2}} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{3+a_3} \cdot T^{\varepsilon+4R+10+\delta_0,r_1+\delta_0,r_2+\delta_0,r_3-(r_1+r_2+r_3)}. \]

**Remark 5.3.19.** If we didn’t have the term \( (1 + |T_1 - T_3|)^{\frac{k}{2}} \), then the final bound would be \( T^{r_2} \) times that obtained above. Notice that in this case, the overall exponent of \( T \) would still be \( 4R + C - (r_1 + r_3) \) where \( C \) is some absolute constant. This may be good enough, in which case (even without the extra \(-r_2\)), it may not be necessary to introduce the modification \( F_R(\alpha) \) into the definition of the test function. However, based on the fact that the residue terms (as will be shown) have a savings in \( r_2 \) (independent of having \( F_R(\alpha) \) included or not), on some level this seems like the “correct” answer.

5.4. **Bounds for the single residue terms.** There are two types of single residue terms that we need to deal with. These are defined in equations (5.4.1) and (5.4.15). We show in Propositions 5.4.2 and 5.4.10 respectively that the bounds from each of these is small.

The first single residue term that we need to consider is
\[ p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2,-a_3)) = \int\int\int e^{\frac{a_1+\alpha_1}{2} y_1^{\frac{2+a_2}{2} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{3+a_3}}} \cdot F_R(\alpha) \cdot f_\delta(s, \alpha) \]
\[ \cdot \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2+R+\alpha_j-\alpha_k}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_j-\alpha_k}{2})} \]
\[ \int_{\alpha \in S_r} ds_2 ds_3 d\alpha, \]
where \( \deg f_\delta = 3\delta \) and \( p_1 = -\alpha_1 - 2\delta \) for \( \delta = 0, 1, \ldots, r_1 - 1 \), and
\[ F_R(\alpha) = \left( \prod_{\sigma \in S_r} (1 + \alpha_{\sigma(1)} - \alpha_{\sigma(2)} + \alpha_{\sigma(3)} - \alpha_{\sigma(4)}) \right)^{\frac{r_2}{2}}. \]

**Proposition 5.4.2.** Let \( r_1 \geq 1, r_2, r_3 \geq 0 \) be positive integers such that either \( r_2 + r_3 \geq r_1 \), or \( r_2 = r_3 = 0 \). Let \( 0 < \varepsilon \). If
\[ 0 \leq \delta_j \leq r_1 - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2r_j - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_j \leq 2r_j - \varepsilon \quad (1 \leq j \leq 3), \]
then
\[ |p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2,-a_3))| \ll y_1^{\frac{3+a_1}{2}} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{3+a_3} T^{\varepsilon+4R+9+\delta_0,r_1+\delta_0,r_2+\delta_0,r_3-(r_1+r_2+r_3)}. \]

In particular,
\[ |p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2,-a_3))| \ll y_1^{\frac{3+a_1}{2}} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{3+a_3} \begin{cases} T^{\varepsilon+4R+9-3r} & \text{if } r_1 = r_2 = r_3 = r, \\ T^{\varepsilon+4R+10-2r} & \text{if } r_1 = r_2 = r, r_3 = 0 \end{cases} \]
for any integer \( r \geq 1 \).

**Proof.** In order to bound \( p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2,-a_3)) \), we will need to shift the lines of integration in the \( \alpha_1 \) variable. In doing so, we will pick up residues. In other words, we may write
\[ p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2,-a_3)) = p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2,-a_3), \kappa) + \sum \text{Residues}, \]
As described above, in order for the exponent of $y_i$ to be correct, we need to shift in the variable $\alpha$ any one of the types of poles from Lemma 5.4.6. Having made a choice, we then show that one of the three types of poles is essentially the same as that at any of the other two up to a shift in the variable $\alpha$. We identify the poles that are passed in making this shift, of which there are three types.

and the residues that appear depend on the particular choice of $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3)$. For example, if $\kappa_j = 0$ for $j = 1, 2, 3$, then equations (5.4.1) and (5.4.5) are the same, meaning there are no residues.

Our goal will be for the given value of $2r_j - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_j \leq 2r_j - \varepsilon$ to shift the lines of integration of the $\alpha$ variables from $\text{Re}(\alpha) = 0$ to $\text{Re}(\alpha) = \kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3)$ with 

$$\text{Re}(\alpha_1 + 2\delta) = \kappa_1 + 2\delta = a_1, \quad \kappa_2 = 0 = \kappa_3.$$

To help clarify the structure of the proof, we now give a brief outline of what is to follow. As described above, in order for the exponent of $y_i$ to be correct, we need to shift the line of integration in the variable $\alpha_1$ from $\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = 0$ to $\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = \kappa_1 = a_1 - 2\delta$. In Lemma 5.4.6 we identify the poles that are passed in making this shift, of which there are three types.

After establishing this lemma, we bound the shifted integral (5.4.5). The residue at any one of the three types of poles is essentially the same as that at any of the other two up to a simple transformation which doesn’t affect the rest of the argument. Hence, it suffices to pick any one of the types of poles from Lemma 5.4.6. Having made a choice, we then show that it is, similar to before, necessary to shift in the variable $\alpha_2$ in order for the exponent of $y_1$ to be correct. Unlike before, however, we are able to show in Lemma 5.4.13 that in shifting $\alpha_2$, no further poles are encountered. Hence, it suffices to bound the shifted terms, which we then do. Since both (5.4.5) and the shifted residue term satisfy (5.4.4), taken together, this proves the proposition.

**Lemma 5.4.6.** In shifting the line of integration in $\alpha_1$ from $\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = 0$ to $\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = a_1 - 2\delta$, poles are crossed at $\alpha_1 = q$ for

$$q \in \left\{ \begin{array}{l} -s_2 - \alpha_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2), \\ -s_2 - \alpha_3 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2), \\ -s_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - 2(r_3 - \delta_3) \end{array} \right\} \quad \left\| \begin{array}{l} 1 \leq \delta_j \leq r_j - \delta, \\ \delta_j \leq r_1 - \delta \end{array} \right\}.

Proof. We first consider the ratios

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2} - \delta\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2}\right)},$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_3}{2} - \delta\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_3}{2}\right)},$$

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2} - \delta\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2}\right)}.$$
for $j = 2, 3, 4$. Since the shift in $\alpha_1$ is to the right (i.e., $a_1 - 2\delta \geq 1$), poles of the numerator are canceled by those in the denominator. In other words, the ratio is holomorphic in the region we are considering.

For each of the terms
$$\Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4}\right), \quad (1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4),$$
if $R$ is sufficiently large again no poles are crossed.

Examining the term $\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j + a_1}{2}\right)$ with $j = 2$ or $j = 3$, assuming that $\text{Re}(\alpha_j) = 0$ and $\text{Re}(s_2) = -a_2$, we see that poles occur at $\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = \kappa_1$ with $\kappa_1 = a_2 - 2k$ for non-negative integers $k$. Hence
$$0 \leq \text{Re}(\alpha_1) = a_2 - 2k < 2(r_2 - k) \implies k \leq r_2 - 1.$$  

On the other hand, since the shift in $\alpha_1$ is going from $\kappa_1 = 0$ to $\kappa_1 = a_1 - 2\delta$, we have that the poles crossed occur at
$$\alpha_1 = -s_2 - \alpha_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2)$$
for $\delta_2 = 1, \ldots, r_2$. (Note that we have chosen this notation because it enumerates the $\delta_2$-th pole that is crossed as one starts at $\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = 0$ and moves to $\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = a_1 - 2\delta$.) For a fixed choice of $\delta$, the largest of the values of $\delta_2$ that is needed is that for which
$$\text{Re}(\alpha_1) = a_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2) = -a_2' + 2\delta_2,$$
and
$$a_1 - 2\delta = -a_2' + 2(r_1 - \delta)$$
belong to adjacent intervals $(2n, 2n+2)$ and $(2n-2, 2n)$ respectively for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. This means that
$$\delta_2 = r_1 - \delta \implies 1 \leq \delta_2 \leq r_1 - \delta - 1.$$  

We remark that, for example, if $\delta = r_1 - 1$, then no poles are passed in moving $\text{Re}(\alpha_1)$ from 0 to $a_1 - 2\delta$. The details for evaluating the poles of $\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - a_3}{2}\right)$ are similar. We leave the details to the reader. □

**Step 1: Bounding the shifted integral $p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}$**

Before dealing with the residues, we first bound $p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2, -a_3), (\kappa_1, 0, 0))$. Notice that we may interchange $\tau_1, \tau_2$ and $\tau_3$ without affecting the integrand in (5.4.5). Therefore, we may assume
$$-\tau_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3 = \tau_4 \leq \tau_3 \leq \tau_2.$$  

It follows that the exponential factor is
$$\mathcal{E} = -2\tau_1 - 4\tau_2 - 2\tau_3 - |\xi_2 + \xi_3 + \tau_1| + |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2| + |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3|$$
$$+ |\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_4| + |\xi_3 - \tau_2| + |\xi_3 - \tau_3| + |\xi_3 - \tau_4|,$$

\(^3\)Come back to this later to determine exactly how big $R$ must be.
and using the method of Lemma 5.2.7, it is easy to show that there are two possible exponential zero sets:

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathcal{R}_+ &:= \left\{ (-a_2 + i\xi_2, -a_3 + i\xi_3) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid -\tau_1 - \tau_3 \leq \xi_2 \leq \tau_2 + \tau_3 \right. \\
&\quad \left. \tau_3 \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_2 \right\} \\
\mathcal{R}_- &:= \left\{ (-a_2 + i\xi_2, -a_3 + i\xi_3) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid -\tau_1 - \tau_2 \leq \xi_2 \leq -\tau_1 - \tau_3 \right. \\
&\quad \left. \tau_4 \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_3 \right\}
\end{align*}
\]

The change of variables \((\xi_2, \xi_3, \tau_2, \tau_4) \mapsto (\xi_3, \xi_2, \tau_4, \tau_2)\) relates \(\mathcal{R}_+\) and \(\mathcal{R}_-\), so it suffices to consider just the case of \(\mathcal{R}_+\).

We replace the Gamma factors with their corresponding polynomial terms to obtain

\[
(5.4.8)
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\left| p_{1,\delta}^{1,\delta}(y; -a, \kappa) \right| \\&\ll y_1^{\alpha_1^0 + \alpha_2^0 + 1} y_2^{\alpha_2^0 + \alpha_3^0} \cdot T^{\varepsilon R + 3\delta} \\
&\int \int \int \int \left( 1 + \left| \tau_1 - \tau_2 \right| \right)^{\frac{R_1 + 1 - \alpha_2^0}{2}} \left( 1 + \left| \tau_1 - \tau_3 \right| \right)^{\frac{R_1 + 1 - \alpha_3^0}{2}} d\tau_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\cdot \left( 1 + \left| \tau_2 - \tau_3 \right| \right)^{\frac{R_1 + 1 - \alpha_2^0}{2}} \left( 1 + \left| \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 \right| \right)^{\frac{1 - \alpha_2^0}{2}} \left( 1 + \left| \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 \right| \right)^{\frac{1 - \alpha_2^0}{2}} d\xi_2 d\tau_1 d\tau_2 d\tau_3
\end{align*}
\]

We first examine \((5.4.8)\) in the case \(r_2 = r_3 = 0\). In this case, by \((5.4.3)\), we have

\[
1 < 1 + \varepsilon \leq 2(\delta + 1) - 1 + \varepsilon \leq 2r_1 - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_1 \leq 2r_1 - \varepsilon,
\]

and \(-1 < -1 + \varepsilon \leq a_j \leq -\varepsilon < 0 \quad (2 \leq j \leq 3)\). If we now denote the integral in \(\xi_2\) and \(\xi_3\), in \((5.4.8)\), by \(I(\tau, a, \delta)\) (where \(\tau = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \tau_3)\) and \(a = (a_1, a_2, a_3)\)), then the above estimates on \(a_1, a_2, a_3\) imply that

\[
I(\tau, a, \delta) \ll \left| \int_{\xi_2 = -\tau_1 - \tau_3}^{\tau_2 + \tau_3} \int_{\xi_3 = \tau_3}^{\tau_2} \left( 1 + \left| \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 \right| \right)^{\frac{a_1}{2} - \delta} \left( 1 + \left| \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 \right| \right)^{\frac{a_2}{2} - \delta} d\xi_2 d\xi_3
\]

\[
\ll T^{\varepsilon + a_1 - 2\delta} \int_{\xi_2 = -\tau_1 - \tau_3}^{\tau_2 + \tau_3} \int_{\xi_3 = \tau_3}^{\tau_2} \left( 1 + \left| \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 \right| \right)^{\frac{a_1}{2} - \delta} d\xi_2 d\xi_3,
\]

since \(a_1/2 - \delta > 0\) and \((1 + \left| \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 \right|), (1 + \left| \xi_3 - \tau_4 \right|) \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}\). But

\[
\xi_2 + \xi_3 + \tau_1 \geq \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 \geq 0
\]

and \(1 - a_1 < 0\), so we find that

\[
I(\tau, a, \delta) \ll T^{\varepsilon + a_1 - 2\delta} \int_{\xi_2 = -\tau_1 - \tau_3}^{\tau_2 + \tau_3} \left( 1 + \left| \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3 \right| \right)^{\frac{1}{2} - \delta} d\xi_2 \ll T^{\varepsilon + \frac{1}{2} + a_1 - 2\delta}.
\]
Putting this back into (5.4.8) yields

\[ p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; -a, \kappa) \ll y_1^{\frac{a_1}{2}+a_2} y_2^{\frac{a_3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon+\frac{3}{2}+R+a_1+\delta} \]

\[ \cdot \int \int \int \left( 1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_2| \right)^{\frac{R+1}{2} - \frac{a_1}{2}} \left( 1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_3| \right)^{\frac{R+1}{2} - \frac{a_1}{2}} \left( 1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_4| \right)^{\frac{R+1}{2} - a_1 + \delta} \]

\[ \cdot \left( 1 + \tau_2 - \tau_3 \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2}} \left( 1 + \tau_2 - \tau_4 \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2}} \left( 1 + \tau_3 - \tau_4 \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2}} d\tau \]

\[ \ll y_1^{\frac{a_1}{2}+a_2} y_2^{\frac{a_3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon+10+4R-a_1+\delta} \ll y_1^{\frac{a_1}{2}+a_2} y_2^{\frac{a_3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon+10+4R+1-2r_1+r_1-1} \]

\[ \ll y_1^{\frac{a_1}{2}+a_2} y_2^{\frac{a_3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon+10+4R-r_1}. \]

So \( p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; -a, \kappa) \) satisfies the bound on \( p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y; (-a_2, -a_3)) \) given by (5.4.4), when \( r_2 = r_3 = 0 \).

We now demonstrate that this is true for \( r_2 + r_3 \geq r_1 \) as well. In (5.4.8), make the change of variables \( \xi_2 \mapsto \xi_2 - \tau_1 - \tau_3, \quad \xi_3 \mapsto \xi_3 + \tau_3, \) and \( T_j = \tau_j - \tau_{j+1} \). Then

\[ (5.4.10) \]

\[ p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y, (-a_1, -a_3), \kappa) \ll y_1^{\frac{a_1}{2}+a_2} y_2^{\frac{a_3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon+R+3\delta} \int \int \int \left( 1 + |T_1| \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2} - \frac{a_1+1}{2}} \left( 1 + T_2 \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2}} \]

\[ \cdot \left( 1 + |T_1 + T_2| \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2} - \frac{a_1+1}{2}} \left( 1 + |T_1 + T_2 + T_3| \right)^{\frac{R+3}{2} - (a_1 - 1) + \delta} \left( 1 + T_2 + T_3 \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2}} \left( 1 + T_3 \right)^{\frac{1+R}{2}} \]

\[ \cdot \int_{\xi_3 = 0}^{T_2} \int_{\xi_2 = 0}^{T_3} \left( 1 + \xi_2 + T_2 \right)^{-\frac{1+a_2 + a_1}{2} - \delta} \left( 1 + \xi_2 + T_3 \right)^{-\frac{1+a_3 + a_1}{2} - \delta} \left( 1 + \xi_3 + T_2 \right)^{-\frac{1+a_3}{2} - \delta} \left( 1 + \xi_3 + T_3 \right)^{-\frac{1+a_3}{2} - \delta} \]

\[ d\xi_2 d\xi_3 dT_1 dT_2 dT_3. \]

We have the bounds

\[ (1 + \xi_2 + T_2)^{-\frac{1+a_2 + a_1}{2} - \delta} \leq (1 + T_2)^{-r_2} (1 + T_2 + T_3)^{r_1 - \delta}, \]

\[ (1 + \xi_3 + T_3)^{-\frac{1+a_3 + a_1}{2} - \delta} \leq (1 + T_3)^{-r_3} (1 + T_2 + T_3)^{r_1 - \delta}, \]

\[ (1 + |\xi_j + f(T_2, T_3)|)^{-\frac{1+a_3}{2}} \leq (1 + |\xi_j + f(T_2, T_3)|)^{-r_j}, \]

\[ \frac{(1 + \xi_2)^{\frac{a_1}{2} + \frac{a_3}{2} - \delta}}{(1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3)^{\frac{a_1}{2} + \frac{a_3}{2} - \delta}} \ll (1 + \xi_2 + \xi_3)^{\frac{1+a_2+a_3}{2} - \delta} \ll T^{\varepsilon+\frac{3}{2}+r_2+r_3-\delta}, \]

so that, by (5.4.10) (with \( dT = dT_1 dT_2 dT_3 \)), we have
\begin{align*}
I(T) & \ll T^{\varepsilon + \frac{2\delta}{T} + 4 - 4r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + 3\delta} \int_0^T \int_0^{T \varepsilon + T_3} (1 + T_2)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} - r_2} (1 + T_2 + T_3)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} + 2r_1 - 2\delta} (1 + T_3)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} - r_3} \\
& \quad \cdot \int_{\xi_2=0}^{T_2} \int_{\xi_3=0}^{T_3} (1 + T_2 - \xi_2)^{-r_2} (1 + T_3 - \xi_2)^{-r_2} d\xi_2 \\
& \quad \cdot (1 + T_2 - \xi_3)^{-r_3} (1 + \xi_3)^{-r_3} d\xi_3 dT \\
& \ll T^{\varepsilon + 3R + 5 - 2r_1 + r_2 + r_3 + \delta} \int_0^T \int_0^{T \varepsilon + T_3} (1 + T_2)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} - r_2 + \delta_0 r_3} (1 + T_3)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} - r_3 + \delta_0 r_2} dT \\
& \ll T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 10 - \delta + \delta_0 r_2 + \delta_0 r_3 - (r_1 + r_2 + r_3) - (r_1 - \delta)}
\end{align*}

since \( \delta \leq r_1 - 1 \). So, in the case \( r_2 + r_3 \geq r_1 \), we again have a bound on \( p_{T,R}^{1,\delta}(y, (-a_1, -a_3), \kappa) \) that is consistent with the statement of Proposition 5.4.2.

**Step 2: Bounding the residue term at \( \alpha_1 = -s_2 - \alpha_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2) \)**

The next step of the proof is to show that all of the residues at the poles \( \alpha_1 = -s_2 - \alpha_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2) \) contribute smaller bounds. The residue we must bound is:

\begin{align*}
&\quad \left. \left( F_R(\alpha) \cdot f_\delta(s, \alpha) \right) \right|_{\alpha_1 = -s_2 - \alpha_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + s_2 - 2\alpha_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2) + 2(s_2 - \alpha_3 + 2(r_2 - \delta_2))}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_2 - 2(r_2 - \delta_2)}{4} \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + r_2 - \delta_2}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + r_2 - \delta}{2} \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{2} + r_2 - \delta_2 - \delta \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{2} + r_2 - \delta_2 \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{2} + (r_2 - \delta_2) \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{2} + r_2 - \delta_2 \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{2s_2 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 4(r_2 - \delta_2)}{2} - \delta \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{2s_2 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 4(r_2 - \delta_2)}{2} \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{2s_2 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 4(r_2 - \delta_2)}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{2s_2 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 4(r_2 - \delta_2)}{2} - \delta \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - s_3}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - s_3}{2} + r_2 - \delta_2 \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - s_3}{2} + r_2 - \delta_2 \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - s_3}{2} \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - s_3 + \alpha_3}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - s_3 + \alpha_3}{2} + r_2 + \delta \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - s_3 + \alpha_3}{2} + (r_2 + \delta) \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{s_2 - s_3 + \alpha_3}{2} \right)} \\
&\quad \cdot ds_2 \, ds_3 \, d\alpha.
\end{align*}
As before, we need to shift the line of integration in \( \alpha_2 \) so that the real part of the exponent of \( y_1 \) is \( a_1 \). That is, we require that

\[
2r_1 - a_1' = a_1 = a_2 - \text{Re}(\alpha_2) - 2(r_2 - \delta_2 - \delta) = a_2' - \text{Re}(\alpha_2) + 2(\delta_2 + \delta),
\]

where \( 0 < a_1', a_2' < 1 \). In other words, given the bounds from Lemma 5.4.6, we shift the line in \( \alpha_2 \) to

\[
(5.4.12) \quad \text{Re}(\alpha_2) = \kappa_2 := a_2' - a_1' - 2(r_1 - \delta - \delta_2) < -1.
\]

**Lemma 5.4.13.** In shifting the line of integration in (5.4.11) in the variable \( \alpha_2 \) from \( \text{Re}(\alpha_2) = 0 \) to \( \text{Re}(\alpha_2) = \kappa_2 \) as in (5.4.12), no poles are crossed.

**Proof.** As in the proof of Lemma 5.4.6, since \( R \) is sufficiently large, for each of the Gamma factors involving \( R \), no poles are crossed. For each of the terms

\[
\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2} - r_2 + \delta + \delta_2\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2} - r_2 + \delta + \delta_2\right)},
\]

(5.4.14)

\[
\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_2}{2} - r_2 + \delta_2\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_2}{2}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2}\right)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2} - r_2 - \delta_2\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2} + r_2 - \delta_2\right)\Gamma\left(-\frac{s_2 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{2} - r_2 + \delta_2\right)},
\]

The first of these, since \( r_2 - \delta - \delta_2 \geq 0 \), is holomorphic. We claim that the latter two cases are holomorphic as well. To prove the claim, note that if \( d \geq 0 \) then using the functional equation of the Gamma-function, it is easy to see that

\[
\frac{\Gamma(f(\alpha_2) - d)}{\Gamma(f(\alpha_2))} = \prod_{k=1}^{d} \frac{1}{f(\alpha_2) - k},
\]

which obviously has poles at \( f(\alpha_2) = k \) for \( k = 1, \ldots, d \). On the other hand, \( \Gamma(-f(\alpha_2)) \) has poles at \( f(\alpha) = k \) for all \( k \geq 0 \). In other words,

\[
\frac{\Gamma(f(\alpha_2) - d)}{\Gamma(f(\alpha_2))\Gamma(-f(\alpha_2))}
\]

is holomorphic. Each of the two terms from (5.4.14) is of this type. \( \square \)

In order to bound (5.4.11), we first remark that the exponential factor is

\[
\mathcal{E} = -|\xi_2 - 2\tau_3| + |\xi_3 - \tau_3| + |\xi_3 - \xi_2 + \tau_3|,
\]

and it follows that the exponential zero set is

\[
\tau_3 \leq \xi_3 \leq \xi_2 - \tau_3, \quad \text{or} \quad \xi_2 - \tau_3 \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_3.
\]
Using the first of these, it is not hard to see that the shifted version of (5.4.11) (to \(\text{Re}(\alpha_2) = \kappa_2 := \alpha_2 - \alpha_1 - 2(r_2 - \delta - \delta_2)\)) is bounded by

\[
\gamma_1^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3} \gamma_2^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + 3\delta} \int_{\gamma_2, \gamma_3 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(1 + |\gamma_2 - \gamma_3|\right)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} + r_1 - \gamma_2 - \delta} \int_{\xi_2 = 2\gamma_3}^{\xi_2 - \gamma_3} e^{-(\xi_2 + \gamma_3)^2 + r_2 + r_3 + (\xi_2 - \gamma_3)^2} \\
\cdot \left(1 + |\xi_2 - 2\gamma_3|\right)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} \left(1 + |\xi_2 + 2\gamma_2|\right)^{2+\frac{R}{2} - 2r_1 + \delta + \delta_2} \left(1 + |\xi_2 - \gamma_3|\right)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} + r_1 - r_2 - \delta - \delta_2} \\
\cdot \left(1 + |2\xi_2 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_3|\right)^{2+\frac{R}{2} - r_1 - \delta_2} \left(1 + |\xi_2 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3|\right)^{\frac{3+R}{2} - r_1} \\
\cdot \int_{\xi_3 = \gamma_3} \left(1 + |\xi_3 - \gamma_3|\right)^{r_2 - \delta - \delta_2} \left(1 + |\xi_3 - \gamma_3|\right)^{-r_3} \left(1 + |\xi_3 + \gamma_3|\right)^{-r_3 + \delta_2} d\xi_3 d\xi_2 d\tau_2 d\tau_3.
\]

Since \(r_2 - \delta - \delta_2, \delta_2 \geq 0\), using Lemma [A.0.1] we find that

\[
\int_{\xi_3 = \gamma_3} \left(1 + |\xi_3 - \gamma_3|\right)^{r_2 - \delta - \delta_2} \left(1 + |\xi_3 - \gamma_3|\right)^{-r_3} \left(1 + |\xi_3 + \gamma_3|\right)^{-r_3 + \delta_2} d\xi_3 \\
\ll T^{\varepsilon + r_2 - \delta} \cdot (1 + |\xi_2 - \gamma_3|)^{\delta_0, \gamma_3 - r_3}.
\]

Putting this bound back into the expression above, we find that this term is bounded by

\[
y_1^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3} y_2^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + r_2 + 2\delta} \int_{\gamma_2, \gamma_3 \in \mathbb{R}} \left(1 + |\gamma_2 - \gamma_3|\right)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} + r_1 - r_2 - \delta} \int_{\xi_2 = 2\gamma_3}^{\xi_2 - \gamma_3} e^{-(\xi_2 + \gamma_3)^2 + r_2 + r_3 + (\xi_2 - \gamma_3)^2} \\
\cdot \left(1 + |\xi_2 - 2\gamma_3|\right)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} \left(1 + |\xi_2 + 2\gamma_2|\right)^{2+\frac{R}{2} - 2r_1 + \delta + \delta_2} \left(1 + |\xi_2 - \gamma_3|\right)^{1 + \frac{R}{2} + r_1 - r_2 - \delta - \delta_2 + \delta_0, \gamma_3 - r_3} \\
\cdot \left(1 + |2\xi_2 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_3|\right)^{2+\frac{R}{2} - r_1 - \delta_2} \left(1 + |\xi_2 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3|\right)^{\frac{3+R}{2} - r_1} d\xi_2 d\tau_2 d\tau_3 \\
\ll y_1^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3} y_2^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3} y_3^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3} \cdot T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 11 + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_0, \gamma_3 - r_2 - r_3 - (r_1 - \delta) - \frac{\delta_2}{2}} \\
\ll y_1^{3} y_2^{3} y_3^{3} \cdot T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 9 + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_0, \gamma_3 - r_2 - r_3},
\]

where in the final step we have used that \(r_1 - \delta, \delta_2 \geq 1\).

The other type of single residue term that we have to consider is (5.4.15)

\[
p_{I, J}^{2, \delta}(y_1^{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3}) = \int_{\text{Re}(\alpha_j) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(\beta_j) = -\alpha_j} e^{\frac{\alpha_2 + \alpha_3}{2}} \int_{J = 1, 3} y_1^{\alpha_2 - s_1} y_2^{2 - p_2} y_3^{\beta_3 - s_3} \left(\prod_{j = 1}^{3} \prod_{k = 1}^{4} \Gamma \left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_2}{2} - \delta\right)\right) \\
\cdot \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) \Gamma_R(\alpha) g_\beta(s, \alpha) \Gamma \left(\frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2}\right) \Gamma \left(\frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_3}{2}\right) \Gamma \left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2}\right) \Gamma \left(\frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_2}{2}\right) d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3
\]

with \(p_2 = -\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 - 2\delta\).

\footnote{For the other exponential zero set the answer is virtually identical.}
Proposition 5.4.16. Suppose that $r_1, r_2, r_3$ are non negative integers with $r_2 \geq 1$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, $\delta \in \{0, 1, \ldots, r_2 - 1\}$, and

$$2r_j - 1 + \varepsilon < a_j < 2r_j - \varepsilon, \quad j = 1, 2, 3,$$

we have

$$\left| \mathcal{P}_{T,R}(y; (-a_1, -a_3)) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{a_1}{r_1}} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{a_3}{r_3}} e^{c + 5R + 8 + \delta_0 r_1 + \delta_0 r_3 - (r_1 + r_2 + r_3)}.$$

Proof. We first rearrange the terms on the right hand side of (5.4.15) as follows.

$$p_{T,R}^{2,\delta}(y; (-a_1, -a_3)) = \int_0^{Re(\alpha)} \int_{s_1 = -a_3} \int_{s_2 = -a_3} \int_{s_3 = -a_3} \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{R}}(\alpha) \cdot g_\delta(s, \alpha)$$

$$\cdot \left( \prod_{j=1}^4 \prod_{k=3}^4 \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{a_k - \alpha_j}{2} - \delta \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{a_k - \alpha_j}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right)} \right) \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_3 + \alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_3 + \alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_3 + \alpha_4}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \right)} \cdot \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2} \right)} ds_1 ds_3 d\alpha$$

The proof follows the very same outline as that of Proposition 5.4.12. First, in order for the exponent of $y_2$ to match that in the statement of the proposition, we will shift the integration in the $\alpha$ variables from real part zero to $Re(\alpha_j) = \kappa_j$, such that

$$a_2 = Re(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2\delta) = \kappa_1 + \kappa_2 + 2\delta$$

lies in the interval $(2r_2 - 1, 2r_2)$. We do this by defining

$$\kappa_1 := a_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_2 := 0 =: \kappa_3.$$

Let $\tau_j = Im(\alpha_j)$. Note that since the above integral is invariant under each of the change of coordinates

$$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \mapsto (\alpha_2, \alpha_1), \quad \text{and} \quad (\alpha_3, \alpha_4) \mapsto (\alpha_4, \alpha_3),$$

we may assume that $\tau_1 \geq \tau_2$ and $\tau_3 \geq \tau_4$.

As before, we now use Stirling’s formula to write the above integral as a product of linear and exponential terms. The exponential factor is $e^{\mathcal{E}(\xi, \tau)}$ where

$$\mathcal{E} = 2\tau_1 + 2\tau_3 - |\xi_1 + \tau_2| - |\xi_1 + \tau_1| - |\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3| - |\xi_3 - \tau_3|,$$

and from this we readily deduce that the exponential zero set is

$$\mathcal{R} = \{ (\xi_1, \xi_3) \mid -\tau_1 \leq \xi_1 \leq -\tau_2, \tau_4 \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_3 \}.$$

The polynomial factor is

$$\mathcal{P}(\xi, \tau) = (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_2|)^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} (1 + |\tau_3 - \tau_4|)^{1+\frac{\delta}{2}} \cdot \left( \prod_{j=1}^4 \prod_{k=3}^4 (1 + |\tau_k - \tau_j|)^{1+\frac{\delta}{2} - \left( \frac{\alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)} \right) \cdot (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_1|)^{1+\frac{\delta_1}{2}} \cdot (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_2|)^{1+\frac{\delta_2}{2}} \cdot (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_3|)^{1+\frac{\delta_3}{2}} \cdot (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_4|)^{1+\frac{\delta_4}{2}}.$$
Plugging in the values of $\kappa_j$ given above, and bounding the resulting terms as before we find that

\[(5.4.18)\]

\[
\left| p_{T, R}(y; (-a_1, -a_3), \kappa) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{4}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{4}{2} + a_3} T^\varepsilon + R + 3\delta \cdot \left(1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_3|\right)^{\frac{1 + 2\varepsilon - \delta}{2}} \cdot (1 + \tau_1 - \tau_2)^{1 + \frac{4}{2}} (1 + \tau_3 - \tau_4)^{1 + \frac{4}{2}} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_4|) \frac{3 + R}{2 - 2}\tau_2 + \delta
\]

\[
\cdot (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_3|) \frac{3 + R}{2 - r_2} (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_4|) \frac{3 + R}{2 - r_2} \int_{\xi_1 = -\tau_1}^{\tau_3} (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_1|) -r_1 - r_2 - \delta (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_2|) -r_1 \ d\xi_1
\]

\[
\cdot \int_{\xi_3 = \tau_1}^{\tau_3} (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_3|) -r_3 (1 + |\xi_3 - \tau_4|) -r_3 + r_2 - \delta \ d\xi_3 \ d\tau_2 \ d\tau_3.
\]

Note that the integral in $\xi_1$ is bounded by $T^{\varepsilon + r_2 - \delta} (1 + \tau_3 - \tau_4)^{\delta_0 - r_3}$, and the integral in $\xi_1$ is bounded by $T^{\varepsilon + r_2 - \delta} (1 + \tau_1 - \tau_2)^{\delta_0 - r_1}$. Plugging these bounds in, and simplifying we find that this shifted term is bounded by

\[
\left| p_{T, R}(y; (-a_1, -a_3), \kappa) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{4}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{4}{2} + a_3} T^\varepsilon + R + 2r_2 + \delta
\]

\[
\cdot \left(1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_3|\right)^{\frac{1 + 2\varepsilon - \delta}{2}} \cdot (1 + \tau_1 - \tau_2)^{1 + \frac{4}{2} + \delta_0 - r_1} (1 + \tau_3 - \tau_4)^{1 + \frac{4}{2} + \delta_0 - r_3}
\]

\[
\cdot (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_4|)^{\frac{3 + R}{2 - 2}\tau_2 + \delta} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_3|)^{\frac{3 + R}{2 - r_2}} (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_4|)^{\frac{3 + R}{2 - r_2}} \ d\tau_2 \ d\tau_3
\]

\[
\ll y_1^{\frac{4}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{4}{2} + a_3} T^\varepsilon + 4\delta_0 + 9 \delta_0 - r_1 - r_2 - r_3 - (r_2 - \delta)
\]

\[
\ll y_1^{\frac{4}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{4}{2} + a_3} T^\varepsilon + 4\delta_0 + 8 \delta_0 - r_1 - r_2 - r_3,
\]

since $r_2 - \delta \geq 1$.

In analogy to Lemma \[5.4.6\] it is easy to show that in shifting $\mathrm{Re}(\alpha_1)$ from zero to $\kappa_1$, poles are crossed at $\alpha_1 = q$ for

\[
q \in \left\{ -s_1 - 2(r_1 - \delta_1) \right\}
\]

\[
\left\{ -s_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - 2(r_3 - \delta_3) \right\}
\]

\[
\left\{ 1 \leq \delta_j \leq r_j - \delta \right\}
\]

\[
\delta_j \leq r_j - \delta
\]

\[
\right\}.
\]
In what follows, the method holds equally well for either of these two types of residues. For concreteness, we consider the residue at $\alpha_1 = -s_1 - 2(r_1 - \delta_1)$. This gives

$$\int_{\Re(\alpha_j) = \kappa_j} \int_{j=2,3} (s_1 + 2(r_1 - \delta_1))^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2 + (s_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + 2(r_1 - \delta_1))^2 \cdot \left(\mathcal{F}_R(s, \alpha)g_\delta(s, \alpha)\right)_{\alpha_1 = -s_2 - 2(r_1 - \delta)} \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2} - \delta\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{4}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2}\right)$$

$$\cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_1 + s_1 + r_1 - \delta_1 - \delta}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{2s_1 - 2r_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 2(r_1 - \delta)}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{2s_1 - 2r_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 + 2(r_1 - \delta)}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + s_1 - 2(r_1 - \delta_1) + 2s_1 + 2(r_1 - \delta)}{4}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{-s_1 + 2s_1 - 2r_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{4}\right)$$

$$\cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{-s_1 + 2s_1 - 2r_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{4}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + s_1 - 2(r_1 - \delta_1) + 2s_1 + 2(r_1 - \delta)}{4}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{-s_1 + 2s_1 - 2r_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{4}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + \alpha_2 - 2\alpha_3 + r_1 - \delta_1}{4}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + \alpha_2 - 2\alpha_3 + r_1 - \delta_1}{4}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + s_3 + 2\alpha_3}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + s_3 + 2\alpha_3}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + s_3 + 2\alpha_3}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + s_3 + 2\alpha_3}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + s_3 + 2\alpha_3}{2}\right)$$

$$\cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + s_3 + 2\alpha_3}{2}\right) \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{s_1 + s_3 + 2\alpha_3}{2}\right) ds_1ds_3d\alpha.$$

Strictly speaking this is what we want to bound in the case that $\kappa_2 = \kappa_3 = 0$, but as before we need to shift the line of integration in the $\alpha_2$ variable to $\Re(\alpha_2) = \kappa_2$ such that the real part of the exponent of $y_2$ is $2 + a_2$. This means that

$$a_2 = \Re(-s_1 + \alpha_2 - 2(r_1 - \delta_1 - \delta)) = a_1 + \kappa_2 - 2(r_1 - \delta_1 - \delta),$$

or in other words,

$$(5.4.19) \quad \kappa_2 = 2(r_2 - \delta + r_1 - \delta_1) + a_2' - a_1', \quad 0 < a_1', a_2' < 1.$$  

This implies that $\Re(\alpha_2)$ gets shifted to the right. Just as in the case of Lemma 5.4.13, one can show in this case that no poles are crossed in moving $\Re(\alpha_2)$. So it suffices to bound the above for these values of $\kappa_2$ and $\kappa_3$.

The exponential factor is $e^{-\frac{z}{2}\mathcal{E}}$ where

$$\mathcal{E} = |\xi_1 - \tau_2 - 2\tau_3| - |\xi_3 - \tau_3| - |\xi_3 - \xi_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3|,$$

which leads to two exponential zero sets, the first of which is

$$\mathcal{R} : \quad \tau_3 \leq \xi_3 \leq \xi_1 - \tau_2 - \tau_3,$$

and the second is similar but the inequalities are reversed.
The polynomial factor (coming from the Gamma-factors specifically) is

$$\mathcal{P} = (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_2|)^{1 + R + 2\alpha'_2 - a'_2} P_{r_2 - r_1 + \delta_1} (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_3|)^{1 + R - a'_2 - a'_1 - r_2 - \delta_1}$$

$$\cdot (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_3|)^{1 + R + a'_1 - \delta - \delta_1} (1 + |2\xi_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3|)^{1 + R - a'_1 - a'_2 - r_2 - \delta_1}$$

$$\cdot (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_3|)^{1 + R - a'_1 + 2\alpha'_2 - 2r_2 + \delta_1} (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_2 + 2\tau_3|)^{1 + R + a'_2}$$

$$\cdot (1 + |\tau_3 - \tau_1|)^{1 + R - a'_2 - a'_1 - r_3} (1 + |\xi_3 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3|)^{1 + R - a'_2 - a'_1 - r_3 - \delta_1},$$

where $0 < a'_j < 1$ for each $j = 1, 2, 3$.

Note that the the presence of the exponential term means that we can restrict the integral to the set of $|\tau_2|, |\tau_3|, |\xi_1| \leq T^{1+\varepsilon}$. Thus, using the trivial bound for the remaining polynomial factors, it follows that the integral that we seek to bound is less than or equal to a constant multiple of

$$\int_{T^{1+\varepsilon}} \prod_{|\tau_2|, |\tau_3|, |\xi_1| \leq T^{1+\varepsilon}} (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_3|)^{1 + R - r_2 + \delta_1} (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_3|)^{1 + R - r_2 - \delta_1} (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_2 + 2\tau_3|)^{1 + R + a'_2}$$

$$\cdot (1 + |\tau_3 - \tau_1|)^{1 + R - r_3} (1 + |\xi_1 + \tau_1 + \tau_2 + \tau_3|)^{1 + R - r_3 - \delta} d\xi_3 d\xi_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3$$

$$\ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + \alpha_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{c + 10 + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_0 r_3 - r_1 - r_2 - r_3 - (r_2 - \delta) - \delta_1}$$

$$\ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + \alpha_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{c + 4R + 8 + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_0 r_3 - r_1 - r_2 - r_3},$$

since $r_1 - \delta, \delta_1 \geq 1$. 

\[\square\]

5.5. Bounds for the double residue terms. There are two types of double residue terms that we need to consider, namely $p_{T, R}^{12, (\delta_1, \delta_2)}(y; -a_3)$ and $p_{T, R}^{13, (\delta_1, \delta_3)}(y; -a_2)$. They are obtained by taking residues, at $s_2 = -\alpha_1 - \alpha_4 - 2\delta_2$ and $s_3 = \alpha_2 - 2\delta_3$ respectively, of the single residue term $p_{T, R}^{1, (\delta_1)}(y)$ defined by (3.4.1).

Specifically, write

\[(5.5.1)\hspace{1cm} p_1 = -\alpha_1 - 2\delta_1, \quad p_2 = -\alpha_1 - \alpha_4 - 2\delta_2, \quad p_3 = \alpha_2 - 2\delta_3, \]

where $0 \leq \delta_j \leq r_j - 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq 3$. Then we find from Proposition [C.0.6] that

\[(5.5.2)\hspace{1cm} p_{T, R}^{12, (\delta_1, \delta_2)}(y; -a_3) = \prod_{\text{Re}(\alpha) = 0} e^{\alpha_1^{2} \cdots \alpha_3^{2}} \int_{\text{Re}(s_3) = -a_3} \int_{\text{Re}(s_3) = -a_3} \int_{y_1^{\frac{3}{2} - p_1} y_2^{2 - p_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} - s_3} F_{R}(\alpha) \Gamma_{R}(\alpha)} \cdot f_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(s_3, \alpha) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1 - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1)$$

$$\cdot \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \Gamma(\frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2}) ds_3 d\alpha,$$
and

\begin{equation}
(5.5.3)
\end{equation}

\[
p_{T,R}^{13,(\delta_1,\delta_3)}(y; -a_2) = \int_{\Re(\alpha) = 0} \int_{\Re(s_2) = -a_2} e^{\frac{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_3}{27^2}} y_1^{\frac{4}{9} - p_1} y_2^{2 - s_2} y_3^{\frac{4}{9} - p_3} F_R(\alpha) \Gamma_R(\alpha) \cdot g_{\delta_1,\delta_3}(s_2, \alpha) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1)
\end{equation}

\[
\cdot \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1)
\end{equation}

\[
\cdot \int y_1^{\frac{4}{9} + \alpha_1 + \delta_1} y_2^{2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4 + 2\delta_1} y_3^{\frac{4}{9} - s_3} F_R(\alpha) f_{\delta_1,\delta_2}(s_3, \alpha) \cdot d\alpha,
\end{equation}

where \(\deg f_{\delta_1,\delta_2} \leq 2\delta_1 + \delta_2\) and \(\deg g_{\delta_1,\delta_3} \leq 2\delta_1 + \delta_3\).

In what follows, we show that the bounds on (5.5.2) and (5.5.3) are “small.”

We begin with (5.5.2).

**Proposition 5.5.4.** Let \(r_1, r_2, r_3\) be positive integers. Let \(0 < \varepsilon\). If

\begin{equation}
(5.5.5)
0 \leq \delta_j \leq r_j - 1 \quad (1 \leq j \leq 2), \quad \text{and} \quad 2r_j - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_j \leq 2r_j - \varepsilon \quad (1 \leq j \leq 3),
\end{equation}

then

\begin{equation}
(5.5.6)
|p_{T,R}^{12,(\delta_1,\delta_2)}(y; -a_3)| \ll y_1^{\frac{4}{9} + \alpha_1} y_2^{2 + \alpha_1 + 2\delta_1} y_3^{\frac{4}{9} - s_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + \frac{13}{9} + \delta_3} a_{r_1 - r_2 - r_3}.
\end{equation}

**Proof.** The proof is similar, in spirit and in many of the details, to that of Proposition 5.4.2.

More specifically: to obtain the desired bound on \(p_{T,R}^{12,(\delta_1,\delta_2)}(y; -a_3)\), we will need to shift the lines of integration in both the \(\alpha_1\) and \(\alpha_2\) variables, so that the resulting exponents of \(y_1\) and \(y_2\) have real parts as stated in the proposition. In doing so, we will pick up residues. That is, we will have

\begin{equation}
(5.5.7)
p_{T,R}^{12,(\delta_1,\delta_2)}(y; -a_3) = p_{T,R}^{12,(\delta_1,\delta_2)}(y; -a_3, \kappa) + \sum \text{Residues},
\end{equation}

where

\begin{equation}
(5.5.8)
p_{T,R}^{12,(\delta_1,\delta_2)}(y; -a_3, \kappa) := \int_{\Re(\alpha) = \kappa} \int_{\Re(s_3) = -a_3} e^{\frac{\alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_3}{27^2}} y_1^{\frac{4}{9} + \alpha_1 + 2\delta_1} y_2^{2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4 + 2\delta_1} y_3^{\frac{4}{9} - s_3} F_R(\alpha) f_{\delta_1,\delta_2}(s_3, \alpha) \cdot \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_1 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_2 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - a_3}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_2 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - a_3}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - a_3}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_2 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - a_3}{2} - \delta_1)
\end{equation}

\[
\cdot \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - a_3}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - a_3}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2 - a_3}{2} - \delta_1)
\end{equation}

\[
\cdot \int \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_1 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_4 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_4 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_4 - a_3}{4}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2)
\end{equation}

\[
\cdot \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2)
\end{equation}

\[
\cdot \int \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4 - a_3}{2} - \delta_2)
\end{equation}

\[
\cdot \int d\alpha,
\end{equation}

and the residues that appear depend on the particular choice of \(\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3)\). We’ve grouped the Gamma factors, above, in a manner that will be convenient for what follows.

Because we want the exponents of \(y_1\) and \(y_2\), in (5.5.8), to have real parts \(3/2 + a_1\) and \(2 + a_2\) respectively, we will choose \(\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3\) such that

\[
\Re(\alpha_1 + 2\delta_1) = \kappa_1 + 2\delta_1 = a_1, \quad \Re(\alpha_1 + \alpha_4 + 2\delta_2) = -\kappa_2 - \kappa_3 + 2\delta_2 = a_2.
\]

Specifically, we will define

\begin{equation}
(5.5.9)
\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) = (a_1 - 2\delta_1, -a_2 + 2\delta_2, 0) \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_4 = -\kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - \kappa_3.
\end{equation}
For this value of $\kappa$, we will obtain an estimate of the desired magnitude for $p_{T,R}^{12,\{\delta_1,\delta_2\}}(y; -a_3, \kappa)$.

It will remain to estimate the residues that appear in (5.5.7). To do so we first identify the poles, cf. Lemma 5.5.16 below. We then show that, for these residue terms, the desired exponents on the $y_j$’s can be obtained by shifting lines of integration, without passing additional poles. Finally, using this information, we show that the residue terms are small.

**Step 1: Bounding the shifted integral $p_{T,R}^{12,\{\delta_1,\delta_2\}}$**

Before estimating the residue terms in (5.5.7), we obtain a bound of the desired magnitude on the shifted integral $p_{T,R}^{12,\{\delta_1,\delta_2\}}(y; -a_3, \kappa)$, with $\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3)$ as in (5.5.9).

Note that, from any of the grouped combinations of Gamma functions in (5.5.8) except for the second one, the contribution to the exponential factor in Stirling’s formula is zero. This is because absolute values of imaginary parts from the numerator of any such combination cancel those from the denominator. So, again, the only one of these terms that contributes to the exponential factor is the second one, which contributes a factor of

$$e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}(|\tau_2-\tau_3|/4+|\tau_1-\tau_2|/4+|\tau_1-\tau_3|/2+|\tau_2-\tau_3|)/2-|\tau_2-\tau_3|/2-|\tau_3-\tau_2|)/2} = e^{-\frac{\pi}{4}(|\tau_3-\tau_2|+|\tau_3-\tau_3|-|\tau_2-\tau_3|)}.$$  

But the integrand in (5.5.8) is invariant under $\alpha_2 \leftrightarrow \alpha_3$, so we may assume that $\tau_2 \geq \tau_3$, whence the exponential factor in question is simply

$$e^{-\frac{\pi}{4}(|\tau_3-\tau_2|+|\tau_3-\tau_3|-\tau_2+\tau_3)}.$$ 

It is then easily seen that there is just one exponential zero set, namely

$$\mathcal{R} := \{(-a_3 + i\xi_3) \in \mathbb{C} | \tau_3 \leq \xi_3 \leq \tau_2 \}.$$ 

Replacing the Gamma factors with their corresponding polynomial terms, in (5.5.8), then gives

(5.5.10)

$$\left| p_{T,R}^{12,\{\delta_1,\delta_2\}}(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T e^{R+R+2\delta_1+\delta_2}$$

$$\cdot \int_{|\tau_1|,|\tau_2|,|\tau_3| \leq T^{1+e}}^{\tau_1,\tau_2,\tau_3} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_2|)^{R+1+\kappa_3-\kappa_1-\delta_1} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_3|)^{R+1+\kappa_3-\kappa_1-\delta_1} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_4|)^{R+1+\kappa_3-\kappa_1-\delta_1}$$

$$\cdot (1 + \tau_2 - \tau_3)^{2+R} (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_4|)^{R+1+\kappa_2-\kappa_4-\delta_2} (1 + |\tau_3 - \tau_4|)^{R+1+\kappa_2-\kappa_4-\delta_2}$$

$$\cdot \int_{\xi_3=\tau_3}^{\tau_2} (1 + \tau_2 - \xi_3)^{-1-a_3-\kappa_3} (1 + \xi_3 - \tau_3)^{-1-a_3-\kappa_3} d\xi_3 d\tau.$$ 

The change of variables

$$\xi_3 \mapsto \xi_3 + \tau_3, \quad T_j = \tau_j - \tau_{j+1} \quad (1 \leq j \leq 3)$$
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applied to (5.5.10) then gives

\begin{align}
(5.5.11) \\
\left| p^{12(\delta_1, \delta_2)}_{T, R}(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right| & \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_2} \\
& \quad \cdot \iint_{0 \leq |T_1|, |T_2|, |T_3| \leq T^{1+\varepsilon}} \left(1 + |T_1|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{2} - \delta_1} \left(1 + |T_1 + T_2|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_3 - \kappa_1}{2} - \delta_1} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(1 + |T_1 + T_2 + T_3|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_1} \left(1 + T_2\right)^{\frac{2 + R}{2} - \delta_2} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(1 + |T_2 + T_3|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_2} \left(1 + |T_3|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_2} \\
& \quad \cdot \int_{\xi_3=0}^{T_2} \left(1 + T_2 - \xi_3\right)^{-\frac{1 - a_3 - \kappa_2}{2}} \left(1 + \xi_3\right)^{-\frac{1 - a_3 - \kappa_3}{2}} d\xi_3 dT_1 dT_2 dT_3.
\end{align}

Now Lemma A.0.1 and the fact that \( \kappa_3 = 0 \) (cf. (5.5.9)) tell us that

\begin{align}
\int_{\xi_3=0}^{T_2} \left(1 + T_2 - \xi_3\right)^{-\frac{1 - a_3 - \kappa_2}{2}} \left(1 + \xi_3\right)^{-\frac{1 - a_3 - \kappa_3}{2}} d\xi_3 \\
& \ll (1 + T_2)^{-\min\left\{\frac{1 + a_3 + \kappa_2}{2}, \frac{1 + a_3 + \kappa_2}{2}, a_3 + \frac{a_3 + \kappa_3}{2}\right\} + \varepsilon} \\
& = (1 + T_2)^{-\frac{1 + a_3 + \kappa_2}{2} + \varepsilon \max\{0, \kappa_2, 1 - a_3\} + \varepsilon}. \tag{5.5.12}
\end{align}

By (5.5.5), we have

\[ \kappa_2 = -a_2 + 2\delta_2 \leq 1 - 2r_2 - \varepsilon + 2(r_2 - 1) = -1 - \varepsilon < 0, \]

and

\[ 1 - 2r_3 + \varepsilon \leq 1 - a_3 \leq 2 - 2r_3 - \varepsilon; \]

from this information, it follows that

\[ \max\{0, \kappa_2, 1 - a_3\} \leq 2\delta_{r_3, 0}. \]

So by (5.5.12),

\begin{align}
(5.5.13) \\
\int_{\xi_3=0}^{T_2} \left(1 + T_2 - \xi_3\right)^{-\frac{1 - a_3 - \kappa_2}{2}} \left(1 + \xi_3\right)^{-\frac{1 - a_3 - \kappa_3}{2}} d\xi_3 & \ll (1 + T_2)^{-\frac{1 + a_3 + \kappa_2}{2} + \delta_{r_3, 0} + \varepsilon}. \tag{5.5.13}
\end{align}

Then (5.5.11) gives

\begin{align}
(5.5.14) \\
\left| p^{12(\delta_1, \delta_2)}_{T, R}(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right| & \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_2} \\
& \quad \cdot \iint_{0 \leq |T_1|, |T_2|, |T_3| \leq T^{1+\varepsilon}} \left(1 + |T_1|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{2} - \delta_1} \left(1 + |T_1 + T_2 + T_3|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_1} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(1 + |T_1 + T_2|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_1} \left(1 + |T_1 + T_2 + T_3|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_1} \\
& \quad \cdot \left(1 + T_2\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_3}{2} + \delta_{r_3, 0} + \varepsilon} \left(1 + |T_2 + T_3|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_2} \left(1 + |T_3|\right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_3}{2} - \delta_2} dT_1 dT_2 dT_3.
\end{align}

It’s straightforward to estimate the above integral, using the facts that, on the indicated domains of integration,

\[ T_1, T_2, T_3 \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}, \]
and that the length of each domain of integration is also \( \ll T^{1+\varepsilon} \). We thereby find that

\[
\left| p_{T,R}^{12}(\delta_1,\delta_2)(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{2}{3} + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 6 + \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_{r_3} - a_1 - a_2 - \frac{a_3}{2}}.
\]

But we’re assuming (5.5.5). So our above estimate reads

\[
(5.5.15) \quad \left| p_{T,R}^{12}(\delta_1,\delta_2)(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{2}{3} + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + \frac{1}{2} + \delta_{r_3} - r_1 - r_2 - r_3},
\]

which gives us a bound of the desired magnitude on the shifted integral \( p_{T,R}^{12}(\delta_1,\delta_2)(y; -a_3, \kappa) \) in (5.5.7).

**Step 2: Bounding the residue terms**

Our next step is to estimate the residues in (5.5.7). Recall: these are the residues at the poles that one crosses in moving the lines of integration in (5.5.2), to transform it into (5.5.8).

We first locate these poles.

**Lemma 5.5.16.** Suppose the lines of integration, in (5.5.2), are shifted from \( \text{Re}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (0, 0, 0) \) to \( \text{Re}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (a_1 - 2\delta_1, -a_2 + 2\delta_2, 0) \). Then:

(a) No poles are crossed in the \( \alpha_1 \) variable.
(b) For a fixed \( s_3 \), any pole crossed in the \( \alpha_2 \) variable belongs to the set

\[
(5.5.17) \quad \{ s_3 + 2\delta_3 \mid \delta_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \max\{0, r_3 - (r_2 - \delta_2)\} \leq \delta_3 \leq r_3 - 1 \}.
\]

**Proof.** First we consider the factors

\[
\Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4}\right) \quad (1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4),
\]

in the integrand of (5.5.8). If \( R \) is sufficiently large, then no poles of these factors will be crossed in moving our lines of integration in \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \).

Nor do any of the terms of the form

\[
\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2} - \delta_n\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2} - \delta_n\right)}
\]

give rise to any poles. Indeed, if the numerator of this term has a pole, then \( \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2} - \delta_n \) is a nonpositive integer, whence \( \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2} \in \mathbb{Z} \), so this numerator pole will be cancelled by a pole from either \( \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2}\right) \) or \( \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_j}{2} - \delta_n\right) \) in the denominator.

The only factors remaining to consider are the factors

\[
\Gamma\left(\frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma\left(\frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2}\right).
\]

and since we are not shifting the line of integration in \( \alpha_3 \), we need only examine the former of these factors.

In particular, part (a) of our lemma is proved.

Regarding \( \Gamma\left(\frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2}\right) \): for fixed \( s_3 \), this factor has poles, as a function of \( \alpha_2 \), whenever

\[
(5.5.18) \quad \alpha_2 = s_3 + 2\delta_3 \quad (\delta_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}).
\]

But for such an \( \alpha_2 \) to lie between the initial line of integration \( \text{Re} \alpha_2 = 0 \) and the terminal line \( \text{Re} \alpha_2 = -a_2 + 2\delta_2 \), we must have

\[
(5.5.19) \quad -a_2 + 2\delta_2 \leq \text{Re} \alpha_2 = \text{Re} (s_3 + 2\delta_3) = -a_3 + 2\delta_3 \leq 0.
\]
(We know that \(-a_2 + 2\delta_2 \leq 0\) by \((5.5.3)\).)

But

\[-a_3 + 2\delta_3 \geq -a_2 + 2\delta_2 \implies \delta_3 \geq \frac{a_3 - a_2}{2} + \delta_2 \geq r_3 - r_2 + \delta_2 - \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon,\]

the last inequality by \((5.5.5)\). Since \(\delta_3\) is an integer, this implies \(\delta_3 \geq r_3 - r_2 + \delta_2\). On the other hand,

\[-a_3 + 2\delta_3 \leq 0 \implies \delta_3 \leq \frac{a_3}{2} \leq r_3 - \varepsilon\]

(again by \((5.5.5)\)), so that \(\delta_3 \leq r_3 - 1\). So part (b) of our lemma is proved.

To complete our proof of Proposition 5.5.4, then, we need only show that the residue at each of the above poles in the variable \(\alpha_2\), is sufficiently small.

For ease of notation, let us denote such a pole by \(\hat{\alpha}_2\), for some fixed \(\delta_3\) as described in the above lemma. We also write \(\hat{\alpha}_4 := -\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_3\), and \(\hat{\alpha} := (\alpha_1, \hat{\alpha}_2, \alpha_3, \hat{\alpha}_4)\). Then by \((5.5.2)\) and \((5.5.8)\), the residue at \(\hat{\alpha}_2\) has the following form:

\[(5.5.20)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Res}_{\alpha_2=\hat{\alpha}_2} \left( p_{T, R}^{12, (\delta_1, \delta_2)}(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right) &= \frac{(-1)^{\delta_3}}{\delta_3!} \int_{\text{Re}(s_3)=-a_3} \int_{\text{Re}(s_3)=0} \left( \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_3}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})} \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_3}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2)} \\
&\quad \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_3}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2 + R + \alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})} \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1 - \hat{\alpha}_2)} \\
&\quad \cdot ds_3 \, d\alpha_3 \, d\alpha_1.
\end{align*}
\]

We want our bound on \((5.5.20)\) to contain the factor \(y_1^{3/2 + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{3/2 + a_3}\), as usual. To effect this, we will move the line of integration in \(\alpha_3\), in \((5.5.20)\), from \(\text{Re} \alpha_3 = 0\) to \(\text{Re}(2 - \hat{\alpha}_2 - \alpha_3 + 2\delta_2) = 2 + a_2\), which is to say, to the line

\[(5.5.21)\]

\[
\text{Re} \alpha_3 = -a_2 - \hat{\alpha}_2 + 2\delta_2 = -a_2 + a_3 + 2\delta_2 - 2\delta_3.
\]

The crucial observation here is that, in moving this line, we do not cross any poles. This is by arguments very similar to those employed in the proof of the above lemma. The only additional argument we need to make here regards the term \(\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})\), in \((5.5.20)\). But if this factor contributes a pole, then \(s_3 - \alpha_3 \in 2\mathbb{Z}\); since \(s_3 - \hat{\alpha}_2 = -2\delta_3\) is also in \(2\mathbb{Z}\), we conclude that \(\alpha_3 - \hat{\alpha}_2 \in 2\mathbb{Z}\), whence the pole from either the term \(\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})\) or the term \(\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})\) in the denominator of \((5.5.20)\) cancels the pole from \(\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3 - \hat{\alpha}_2}{2})\).

So in estimating \((5.5.20)\), we may replace the line of integration \(\text{Re} \alpha_3 = 0\) with the line given by \((5.5.21)\). The estimation is then similar to that of \((5.5.8)\).
Specifically: as was the case with (5.5.8), the only grouped combination of Gamma functions in (5.5.20) that contributes to the exponential factor in Stirling’s formula is the second one. In the present case, since \( \text{Im} \tilde{\alpha}_2 = \text{Im} s_3 = \xi_3 \), these Gamma functions contribute a factor of \( e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}|(\xi_3 - \tau_3)/2 - (\xi_3 - \tau_3)/2|} = e^{0} \).

In other words, our exponential zero set entails no restrictions on our integration in (5.5.2), but different enough that some detail is merited.

We now write (5.5.22)

\[
(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) := (\text{Re} \alpha_1, \text{Re} \tilde{\alpha}_2, \text{Re} \alpha_3, \text{Re} \tilde{\alpha}_4)
\]

\[
= (a_1 - 2\delta_1, -a_3 + 2\delta_3, -a_2 + a_3 + 2\delta_2 - 2\delta_3, -a_1 + a_2 + 2\delta_1 - 2\delta_2).
\]

Then (5.5.20) yields (5.5.23)

\[
\text{Res}_{\alpha_2 = \tilde{\alpha}_2} \left( p_{T, R}^{12(\delta_1, \delta_2)}(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right) \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{3 + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_2} T^{\varepsilon - 3R + 3 + a_2 - 3\lambda_1 + 2\lambda_2 - 3\lambda_3 - 3\delta_1 - 2\delta_2} d\xi_3 d\tau_3 d\tau_1.
\]

The factor

\[
e^{-\frac{\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \gamma^2 + \delta^2}{2T^2}}
\]

in (5.5.23) is of exponential decay in \( \tau_1 \) if \( |\tau_1| \gg T^{1+\varepsilon} \), and similarly for the variables \( \tau_3 \) and \( \xi_3 \). So for our estimate, we may restrict attention to the domain where \( |\tau_1|, |\tau_3|, |\xi_3| \ll T^{1+\varepsilon} \). On such a domain, each of the other factors in our integrand is \( \ll T^{c+\varepsilon} \), where \( c \) is the exponent on that factor. So (5.5.23) implies

\[
\text{Res}_{\alpha_2 = \tilde{\alpha}_2} \left( p_{T, R}^{12(\delta_1, \delta_2)}(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right) \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{3 + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_2} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 6 - a_2 - a_3} d\xi_3 d\tau_3 d\tau_1
\]

and

\[
\ll y_1^{\frac{1}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{3 + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 6 - r_1 - r_2 - r_3}.
\]

By (5.5.5) and by Lemma 5.5.16 then,

\[
\text{Res}_{\alpha_2 = \tilde{\alpha}_2} \left( p_{T, R}^{12(\delta_1, \delta_2)}(y; -a_3, \kappa) \right) \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{3 + a_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + r_1 - r_2 - r_3},
\]

In other words, the sum of the residue terms in (5.5.7) also has a bound of the magnitude stipulated in Proposition 5.5.4. This completes the proof of that proposition. □

We now turn to our estimate of the term (5.5.3). The analysis here is similar to that of (5.5.2), but different enough that some detail is merited.

We have:
Proposition 5.5.24. Let \( r_1, r_2, r_3 \) be positive integers. Let \( 0 < \varepsilon \). If
\[
0 \leq \delta_j \leq r_j - 1 \quad (j \in \{1, 3\}), \quad \text{and} \quad 2r_j - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_j \leq 2r_j - \varepsilon \quad (1 \leq j \leq 3),
\]
then
\[
|p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_3)}_{T,R}(y; -a_2)| \ll \frac{y_1^{\frac{1}{3}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{3}+a_3}}{T^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}+\frac{1}{4}+\delta_{2,0}-r_1-r_2-r_3}}.
\]

Proof. To obtain the desired bound on \( p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_3)}_{T,R}(y; -a_3) \), we need to shift the lines of integration in both the \( \alpha_1 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) variables, so that the exponents of \( y_1 \) and \( y_3 \) become \( 3/2 + a_1 \) and \( 3/2 + a_3 \) respectively. In doing so, we will pick up residues, whence
\[
p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_3)}_{T,R}(y; -a_2) = p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_3)}_{T,R}(y; -a_2, \kappa) + \sum \text{Residues},
\]
where
\[
p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_3)}_{T,R}(y; -a_2, \kappa) := \int \int \int \left. e^{\alpha_1 x + x_2 y_2 + y_3 z} \right|_{\text{Re}(\alpha) = \kappa} \int \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2+R+\alpha_1-a_2}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{2+R+\alpha_1-a_1}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2-a_1}{2} - \delta_1)}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1-a_2}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2-a_1}{2})} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2+R+\alpha_1-a_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{2+R+\alpha_1-a_1}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3-a_1}{2} - \delta_1)}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1-a_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3-a_1}{2})} \cdot \frac{\Gamma(\frac{2+R+\alpha_1-a_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{2+R+\alpha_1-a_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2+a_1+a_3}{2} - \delta_1)}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2+a_1+a_3}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2+a_1+a_3}{2})} \, ds_2 \, d\alpha,
\]
and the residues that appear depend on the particular choice of \( \kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) \). As before, we’ve grouped the Gamma factors in an auspicious manner.

To obtain the desired exponents on \( y_1 \) and \( y_3 \), in (5.5.28), we will choose \( \kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \) such that
\[
\text{Re}(\alpha_1 + 2\delta_1) = \kappa_1 + 2\delta_1 = a_1, \quad \text{Re}(\alpha_2 + 2\delta_2) = -\kappa_2 + 2\delta_2 = a_3,
\]
by putting
\[
\kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) = (a_1 - 2\delta_1, -a_3 + 2\delta_3, 0) \quad (\text{and} \quad \kappa_4 = -\kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - \kappa_3).
\]
For this value of \( \kappa \), we will obtain an estimate of the desired magnitude for \( p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_3)}_{T,R}(y; -a_2, \kappa) \). Subsequently we will, as before, show that the residues in (5.5.27) are small.

Step 1: Bounding the shifted integral \( p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_2)}_{T,R} \)

Here we estimate the term \( p^{13,(\delta_1, \delta_3)}_{T,R}(y; -a_2, \kappa) \), with \( \kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) \) as in (5.5.29).

Only the last grouped combination of Gamma functions, in (5.5.28), contributes to the exponential factor in Stirling’s formula, for the same reasons as we discussed in the proof of Proposition 5.5.3. In the present case, this last term contributes a factor of
\[
e^{-\frac{1}{2}((\gamma_4 - \gamma_3)/4 + |\gamma_4 - \gamma_3|/4 + (|\gamma_2 + \gamma_3|/2 + |\gamma_2 + \gamma_3|/2 - |\gamma_4 - \gamma_3|/2 - |\gamma_4 - \gamma_3|)/2)} = e^{-\frac{1}{2}(|\gamma_2 + \gamma_3| + |\gamma_2 + \gamma_3| - |\gamma_4 - \gamma_3|)}.
\]
As the integrand in (5.5.28) is invariant under $\alpha_3 \leftrightarrow \alpha_4$, we may assume that $\tau_3 \geq \tau_4$, so that the exponential factor in question equals
\[ e^{-\frac{\pi}{4}((\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3) + (\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_4) - \tau_3 - \tau_4)}. \]

Then the corresponding exponential zero set is seen to be
\[ \mathcal{R} := \{ (-a_2 + i\xi_2) \in \mathbb{C} \mid -\tau_1 - \tau_3 \leq \xi_2 \leq -\tau_1 - \tau_4 \}. \]

We replace the Gamma factors in (5.5.28) with their corresponding polynomial terms; we get
\begin{align*}
(5.5.30) 
\left| p_{T,R}^{13,(\delta_1,\delta_3)}(y; -a_2, \kappa) \right| & \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T^{\epsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_3} \\
& \cdot \iint_{|\tau_1 - \tau_2|, |\tau_2 - \tau_3| \leq T^{1+\epsilon}} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_2|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_1 - \kappa_4 - \delta_1}{2}} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_3|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_3 - \kappa_4 - \delta_1}{2}} (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_4|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_3 - \kappa_4}{2}} \\
& \cdot \left( 1 + \tau_2 - \tau_3 \right)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_4}{2} - \delta_3} (1 + \tau_2 - \tau_4)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_4}{2} - \delta_3} (1 + \tau_3 - \tau_4)^{\frac{2+R}{2}} \\
& \cdot \int_{\xi_2 = -\tau_1 - \tau_3} (1 + \xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_3)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa_1+\kappa_3}(1 - (\xi_2 + \tau_1 + \tau_4)^{-\frac{1}{2}+\kappa_1+\kappa_3} d\xi_2 d\tau.
\end{align*}

The change of variables
\[ \xi_2 \mapsto \xi_2 - \tau_1 - \tau_3, \quad T_j = \tau_j - \tau_{j+1} \quad (1 \leq j \leq 3) \]

applied to (5.5.30) then gives
\begin{align*}
(5.5.31) 
\left| p_{T,R}^{13,(\delta_1,\delta_3)}(y; -a_2, \kappa) \right| & \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T^{\epsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_3} \\
& \cdot \iint_{|T_1|, |T_2|, |T_3| \leq T^{1+\epsilon}} (1 + |T_1|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_4 - \delta_1}{2}} (1 + |T_1 + T_2|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_3 - \kappa_4 - \delta_1}{2}} (1 + |T_1 + T_2 + T_3|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_4 - \delta_3}{2}} \\
& \cdot (1 + |T_2 + T_3|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_4}{2} - \delta_3} (1 + T_3)^{\frac{2+R}{2}} \\
& \cdot \int_{\xi_2 = 0} (1 + \xi_2)^{-\frac{1}{2}-a_2+\kappa_1+\kappa_3} (1 + T_3 - \xi_2)^{-\frac{1}{2}-a_2+\kappa_1+\kappa_3} d\xi_2 dT_1 dT_2 dT_3.
\end{align*}

Now by Lemma A.0.1 we find that
\begin{align*}
(5.5.32) 
\int_{\xi_2 = 0} (1 + \xi_2)^{-\frac{1}{2}-a_2+\kappa_1+\kappa_3} (1 + T_3 - \xi_2)^{-\frac{1}{2}-a_2+\kappa_1+\kappa_3} d\xi_2 & \ll (1 + T_3)^{-\min\left\{ \frac{1}{2}+\kappa_3-a_2+\kappa_1-\kappa_4, \frac{1}{2}+\kappa_3-a_2+\kappa_1-\kappa_4, \frac{1}{2}+\kappa_3-a_2+\kappa_1-\kappa_4 \right\} + \epsilon} \\
& = (1 + T_3)^{-\min\left\{ -\kappa_1 - \kappa_4, -\kappa_1 - \kappa_3, 1-a_2 \right\} + \epsilon}.
\end{align*}

Further, it follows from (5.5.25) and (5.5.29) that
\[ -\kappa_1 - \kappa_4, -\kappa_1 - \kappa_3, 1-a_2 \leq 0, \]
and that $1 - a_2 \leq 0$ unless $r_2 = 0$, in which case $1 - a_2 \leq 2$. In either case, $1 - a_2 \leq 2\delta_{r_2,0}$. So (5.5.31) and (5.5.32) give

(5.5.33)

$$\left| p_{T,R}^{13,\delta_1,\delta_3}(y; -a_2, \kappa) \right| \leq y_1^{2+\alpha_1} y_2^{2+\alpha_2} y_3^{2+\alpha_3} T^{1+\epsilon+R+2\delta_1+\delta_3}$$

Then, because $T_1, T_2, T_3 \ll T^{1+\epsilon}$ on the indicated domains of integration, and because the length of each domain of integration is also $\ll T^{1+\epsilon}$, we see that

$$\left| p_{T,R}^{13,\delta_1,\delta_3}(y; -a_2, \kappa) \right| \leq y_1^{2+\alpha_1} y_2^{2+\alpha_2} y_3^{2+\alpha_3} T^{1+\epsilon+R+6+\delta_1+\delta_3+\delta_{r_2,0} - a_1 - \frac{3\alpha}{2} - 3}.$$

But we're assuming (5.5.25), so we conclude that

(5.5.34)

$$\left| p_{T,R}^{13,\delta_1,\delta_3}(y; -a_2, \kappa) \right| \leq y_1^{2+\alpha_1} y_2^{2+\alpha_2} y_3^{2+\alpha_3} T^{1+\epsilon+R+13+\delta_{r_2,0} - r_1 - r_2 - r_3},$$

which gives us a bound of the desired magnitude on the shifted integral $p_{T,R}^{13,\delta_1,\delta_3}(y; -a_2, \kappa)$ in (5.5.27).

**Step 2: Bounding the residue terms**

Next, we estimate the residues in (5.5.27), which arise from moving the lines of integration in (5.5.3), to get (5.5.28).

The locations of the poles in question are as follows.

**Lemma 5.5.35.** Suppose the lines of integration, in (5.5.3), are shifted from $\text{Re}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (0, 0, 0)$ to $\text{Re}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (a_1 - 2\delta_1, -a_3 + 2\delta_3, 0)$. Then:

(a) For a fixed $s_2$ and $\alpha_3$, any pole crossed in the $\alpha_1$ variable belongs to the set

(5.5.36) $$\left\{ -s_2 - \alpha_3 - 2\delta_2 \mid \delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \max\{0, r_2 - (r_1 - \delta_1)\} \leq \delta_2 \leq r_2 - 1 \right\}.$$ 

(b) For a fixed $s_2$ and $\alpha_3$, any pole crossed in the $\alpha_2$ variable belongs to the set

(5.5.37) $$\left\{ s_2 - \alpha_3 + 2\delta_2 \mid \delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \max\{0, r_2 - (r_3 - \delta_3)\} \leq \delta_2 \leq r_2 - 1 \right\}.$$ 

**Proof.** As before, no poles will arise from the factors

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{2+R+\alpha_1-\alpha_k}{4}\right) \quad (1 \leq j \neq k \leq 4)$$

in (5.5.28), if $R$ is sufficiently large.

Nor will any of the terms of the form

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k-\alpha_j}{2} - \delta_n\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_j-\alpha_k}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_k-\alpha_j}{2}\right)}$$


give rise to any poles, for the same reasons as before. The only terms remaining to consider are the factors
\[
\Gamma\left(\frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4}{2}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma\left(\frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4}{2}\right) = \Gamma\left(\frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4}{2}\right).
\]
The former of these factors will give rise to poles when we shift the line of integration in \(\alpha_1\); the latter will do so when we shift the line in \(\alpha_2\).

Consider the first of these factors, \(\Gamma\left(\frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4}{2}\right)\). For fixed \(s_2\) and \(\alpha_3\), this factor has poles, as a function of \(\alpha_1\), whenever
\[
(5.5.38) \quad \alpha_1 = -s_2 - \alpha_3 - 2\delta_2 \quad (\delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}).
\]
But for such an \(\alpha_1\) to lie between the initial line of integration \(\Re \alpha_1 = 0\) and the terminal line \(\Re \alpha_1 = a_1 - 2\delta_1\), we must have
\[
(5.5.39) \quad 0 \leq \Re \alpha_1 = \Re (-s_2 - \alpha_3 - 2\delta_2) = a_2 - 2\delta_2 \leq a_1 - 2\delta_1.
\]
(That \(a_1 - 2\delta_1 \geq 0\) follows from (5.5.25).) But
\[
a_2 - 2\delta_2 \leq a_1 - 2\delta_1 \implies \delta_2 \geq \frac{a_2 - a_1}{2} + \delta_1 \geq r_2 - r_1 + \delta_1 - \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon,
\]
the last inequality by (5.5.25). As \(\delta_2\) is a nonnegative integer, we therefore have \(\delta_2 \geq \max\{0, r_2 - r_1 + \delta_1\}\). On the other hand,
\[
a_2 - 2\delta_2 \geq 0 \implies \delta_2 \leq - \frac{a_2}{2} \leq r_2 - \varepsilon
\]
(again by (5.5.25)), so that \(\delta_2 \leq r_2 - 1\). So part (a) of our lemma is proved.

Part (b) is similar: as a function of \(\alpha_2\), \(\Gamma\left(\frac{s_2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4}{2}\right)\) has poles, for fixed \(s_2\) and \(\alpha_3\), whenever
\[
(5.5.40) \quad \alpha_2 = s_2 - \alpha_3 + 2\delta_2 \quad (\delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}).
\]
But for such an \(\alpha_2\) to lie between \(\Re \alpha_2 = 0\) and \(\Re \alpha_2 = -a_3 + 2\delta_3\), we must have
\[
(5.5.41) \quad -a_3 + 2\delta_3 \leq \Re \alpha_2 = \Re (s_2 - \alpha_3 + 2\delta_2) = a_2 + 2\delta_2 \leq 0.
\]
We conclude from (5.5.41), (5.5.25), and the fact that \(\delta_3\) is a nonnegative integer that
\[
\max\{0, r_2 - (r_3 - \delta_3)\} \leq \delta_2 \leq r_2 - 1,
\]
so part (b) of our lemma is proved. \(\square\)

Therefore, to complete our proof of Proposition 5.5.24, it will suffice to show that the residue at each of the above poles in \(\alpha_1\) or \(\alpha_2\) is sufficiently small.

We will consider the poles in \(\alpha_1\) only; those in \(\alpha_2\) may be treated in a very similar fashion. Let us, then, denote such a pole in \(\alpha_1\) by \(\tilde{\alpha}_1\), for some fixed \(\delta_2\) and \(\alpha_3\) as described in part (a) of the above lemma. We also write \(\tilde{\alpha}_4 := -\tilde{\alpha}_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3\), and \(\tilde{\alpha} := (\tilde{\alpha}_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \tilde{\alpha}_4)\). Then
by \((5.5.3)\) and \((5.5.28)\), the residue at \(\tilde{\alpha}_1\) has the following form:

\[
(5.5.42) \quad \text{Res}_{\alpha_1=\tilde{\alpha}_1} \left( P_{T,R}^{13}(\delta_1,\delta_3) \left( y_i; -a_2, \kappa \right) \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{(-1)^{\delta_2}}{\delta_2!} \int_{\text{Re}(\alpha_2)=-a_1+2\delta_3}^{\text{Re}(\alpha_2)=0} \int_{\text{Re}(\alpha_3)=0}^{\text{Re}(\alpha_3)=0} e^{\frac{\tilde{\alpha}_1^2+a_2^2+\tilde{\alpha}_3^2+\alpha_2^2}{2\pi^2}} y_1^{3-s_2-a_3-2\delta_2+2\delta_1} y_2^{2-s_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}-a_2+2\delta_3} \mathcal{F}_R(\tilde{\alpha}) g_{\delta_1,\tilde{\alpha}}(s_2, \tilde{\alpha})
\]

In order that our bound on \((5.5.42)\) contain the factor \(\frac{\Gamma(2+R+\tilde{\alpha}_3-\alpha_3)}{4^{\alpha_1-\alpha_2}} \), we now move the line of integration in \(\alpha_3\), in \((5.5.42)\), from \(\text{Re} \alpha_3 = 0\) to \(\text{Re} (3/2-s_2-a_3-2\delta_2+2\delta_1) = 3/2+a_1\), or equivalently

\[
(5.5.43) \quad \text{Re} \alpha_3 = -a_1 + a_2 + 2\delta_1 - 2\delta_2.
\]

In moving this line, we do not cross any poles. This is by the same kinds of arguments as were used above. In particular we note that, if the factor \(\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3-\tilde{\alpha}_4-a_4}{4})\) has a pole, then \(s_2-a_2-a_3 \in 2\mathbb{Z}\); since \(s_2 + \tilde{\alpha}_1 + \alpha_3 = s_2 - a_2 - \tilde{\alpha}_4 = -2\delta_2\) is also in \(2\mathbb{Z}\) (by assumption), we conclude that \(\alpha_3 - \tilde{\alpha}_4 \in 2\mathbb{Z}\), whence the pole from either the term \(\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_4-\tilde{\alpha}_4}{4})\) or the term \(\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_3-\tilde{\alpha}_4}{4})\) in the denominator of \((5.5.42)\) cancels the pole from \(\Gamma(\frac{s_2-a_2-a_3}{2})\).

So in estimating \((5.5.42)\), we may replace the line of integration \(\text{Re} \alpha_3 = 0\) with the line given by \((5.5.43)\). The estimation then proceeds as follows. First, the only grouped combination of Gamma functions in \((5.5.42)\) that contributes to the exponential factor in Stirling’s formula is the last one. Since

\[
\text{Im} \tilde{\alpha}_4 = \text{Im} (-\tilde{\alpha}_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) = \text{Im} (s_2 - a_2) = \xi_2 - \tau_2,
\]

these Gamma functions contribute a factor of

\[
e^{-\frac{s}{2}(|\xi_2-\tau_2-\tau_3|/2-|\xi_2-\tau_2-\tau_3|/2)} = e^{0}.
\]

So our exponential zero set here places no restrictions on our domain of integration in \(\xi_2 = \text{Im}(s_2)\).

Next, we write

\[
(5.5.44) \quad (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4) := (\text{Re} \tilde{\alpha}_1, \text{Re} \alpha_2, \text{Re} \alpha_3, \text{Re} \tilde{\alpha}_4)
\]

\[
= (a_1 - 2\delta_1, -a_3 + 2\delta_3, -a_1 + a_2 + 2\delta_1 - 2\delta_2, -a_2 + a_3 + 2\delta_2 - 2\delta_3).
\]
Then (5.5.42) yields

\[(5.5.45)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Res}_{\alpha_1=\tilde{\alpha}_1}^{13, (\delta_1, \delta_3)}(y; -\alpha_2, \kappa) &\ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_3} \\
&\cdot \iint_{\tau_2, \tau_3, \xi_2 \in \mathbb{R}} e^{\frac{\hat{\alpha}_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \delta_3^2}{2T^2}} (1 + |\tau_2 + \tau_3 + \xi_2|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_1}{2} - \delta_1} (1 + |2\tau_3 + \xi_2|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_1}{2} - \delta_1} \\
&\cdot (1 + |2\xi_2 - \tau_2 + \tau_3|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_1 - \delta_1}{2} (1 + |\tau_3 - \tau_2|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \lambda_3 - \lambda_2 - \delta_3}{2} (1 + |2\tau_2 - \xi_2|)^{\frac{R + 1 + \lambda_2 - \lambda_4}{2} - \delta_3} \\
&\cdot (1 + |\xi_2 - \tau_2 - \tau_3|)^{\frac{R + 1 - \alpha_2 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3}{2}} d\xi_2 d\tau_3 d\tau_2.
\end{align*}
\]

The factor

\[
e^{-\frac{\hat{\alpha}_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \delta_3^2}{2T^2}}
\]

in (5.5.45) is of exponential decay in \(\tau_2\) if \(|\tau_2| \gg T^{1+\varepsilon}\), and similarly for the variables \(\tau_3\) and \(\xi_2\). So for our estimate, we need only consider the domain where \(|\tau_2|, |\tau_3|, |\xi_2| \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}\). On this domain, each of the other factors in the integrand of (5.5.45) is \(\ll T^{c+\varepsilon}\), where \(c\) is the exponent on that factor. So (5.5.45) implies

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Res}_{\alpha_1=\tilde{\alpha}_1}^{13, (\delta_1, \delta_3)}(p_{T,R})^{13, (\delta_1, \delta_3)}(y; -\alpha_2, \kappa) &\ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_3} \\
&\cdot \iint_{|\tau_2|, |\tau_3|, |\xi_2| \ll T^{1+\varepsilon}} T^{\varepsilon + 3R + 3\cdot \frac{\alpha_2 - 3\lambda_2 + 2\lambda_4 - \lambda_3}{2} - 3\delta_1 - 2\delta_3} d\xi_2 d\tau_3 d\tau_2 \\
&\ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 6 - a_2 - a_3 + \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_3}.
\end{align*}
\]

So, by (5.5.25) and Lemma 5.5.35

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Res}_{\alpha_1=\tilde{\alpha}_1}^{13, (\delta_1, \delta_3)}(p_{T,R})^{13, (\delta_1, \delta_3)}(y; -\alpha_2, \kappa) &\ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} y_2^{2+a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} T^{\varepsilon + 4R + 6 - r_1 - r_2 - r_3}.
\end{align*}
\]

So the sum of the residue terms in (5.5.27) also has a bound of the magnitude described in Proposition (5.5.24) and the proposition is proved. \(\square\)

5.6. **Bounds for the triple residue terms.** There is only one type of triple residue term to consider, namely \(p_{T,R}^{12, (\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)}(y)\). This term may be obtained by taking the residue, at \(s_3 = \alpha_2 - 2\delta_3\), of the double residue term \(p_{T,R}^{12, (\delta_1, \delta_2)}(y; -\alpha_3)\) defined by (5.5.2). Thus

\[(5.6.1)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
p_{T,R}^{12, (\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3)}(y) &\equiv \iint_{\text{Re}(\alpha)=0} e^{\frac{\hat{\alpha}_1^2 + \alpha_2^2}{2T^2}} y_1^{\frac{3}{2}+\alpha_1+2\delta_1} y_2^{2+\alpha_1+\alpha_2+2\delta_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2}+\alpha_2+2\delta_3} \mathcal{F}_R(\alpha) \Gamma_R(\alpha) \\
&\cdot h_{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3}(\alpha) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_4 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1\right) \\
&\cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2} - \delta_2\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2} - \delta_2\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_3}{2} - \delta_3\right) d\alpha,
\end{align*}
\]

where \(h_{\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3}\) is a polynomial of degree at most \(2\delta_1 + \delta_2\).

We have
Proposition 5.6.2. Let \( r_1, r_2, r_3 \) be positive integers. Let \( 0 < \varepsilon \). If

\[
0 \leq \delta_j \leq r_j - 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2r_j - 1 + \varepsilon \leq a_j \leq 2r_j - \varepsilon \quad (1 \leq j \leq 3),
\]

then

\[
\left| p_{T,R}^{123,(\delta_1,\delta_2,\delta_3)}(y) \right| \ll y_1^{\frac{1}{4}+\alpha_1} y_2^{\frac{2}{4}+\alpha_2} y_3^{\frac{1}{4}+\alpha_3} T^{\varepsilon+4R+6-r_1-r_2-r_3}.
\]

Proof. To obtain the desired bound on \( p_{T,R}^{123,(\delta_1,\delta_2,\delta_3)}(y) \), we shift the lines of integration in the \( \alpha_j \)'s to \( \text{Re}(\alpha) = \kappa \), where \( \kappa = (\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3) \) is such that the resulting exponents of \( y_1, y_2 \), and \( y_3 \) have real parts as indicated in the proposition. We do so by choosing

\[
\kappa = (a_1 - 2\delta_1, -a_3 + 2\delta_3, -a_2 + a_3 + 2\delta_2 - 2\delta_3) \quad (\text{and} \quad \kappa_4 = -\kappa_1 - \kappa_2 - \kappa_3).
\]

Then

\[
p_{T,R}^{123,(\delta_1,\delta_2,\delta_3)}(y) = \int\int e^{\frac{\alpha^T}{4}x} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2+R+a_1-\alpha_2}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2+R+a_2-\alpha_1}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-\alpha_2-\alpha_3}{2}-\delta_1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-\alpha_2}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_2-\alpha_1}{2}\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_2+a_3}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_3+a_2}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_3-a_2}{2}-\delta_3\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{a_3-a_2}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_2-a_3}{2}\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_2+a_4}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_4+a_2}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_2-a_4}{2}-\delta_2\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{a_2-a_4}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_4-a_2}{2}\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_1+a_4}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_4+a_1}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-a_4}{2}-\delta_1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-a_4}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_4-a_1}{2}\right)} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_1+a_3}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2+R-a_3+a_1}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-a_3}{2}-\delta_2\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-a_3}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_3-a_1}{2}\right)} d\alpha,
\]

Notice that, in this case, there are no poles crossed in moving the lines of integration, and therefore no residue terms to consider. This is for reasons encountered in prior situations: if \( R \) is large enough, then none of the terms

\[
\Gamma\left(\frac{2+R+a_1-\alpha_2}{4}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{2+R+a_2-\alpha_1}{4}\right)
\]

in (5.6.6) will give rise to any poles; moreover, any pole in the numerator of a factor

\[
\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-\alpha_2-\alpha_3}{2}-\delta_1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{a_1-\alpha_2}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{a_2-\alpha_1}{2}\right)}
\]

will be canceled by a pole in the denominator.

So we need only bound the right-hand side of (5.6.6), and we do so in the usual way. We get
\[ p_{\tau, R}(\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3) (y) \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{\epsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_2} \]

\[ \cdot \int \int \int (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_2|) \frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{2} \delta_1 (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_3|) \frac{R + 1 + \kappa_3 - \kappa_1}{2} \delta_1 (1 + |\tau_1 - \tau_4|) \frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_1}{2} \delta_1 d\tau \]

\[ \cdot (1 + \tau_2 - \tau_3) \frac{R + 1 + \kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{2} \delta_2 (1 + |\tau_2 - \tau_4|) \frac{R + 1 + \kappa_3 - \kappa_1}{2} \delta_2 (1 + |\tau_3 - \tau_4|) \frac{R + 1 + \kappa_4 - \kappa_1}{2} \delta_2 d\tau \]

\[ \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{\epsilon + R + 2\delta_1 + \delta_2} \int \int \int T^{3R + 3 + 3\kappa_1 + 3\kappa_2 + 3\kappa_3 + 3\kappa_4 - 3\delta_1 - 2\delta_2 - \delta_3} d\tau \]

\[ \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{\epsilon + 4R + 6 - a_2 - a_3 + \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_1} . \]

But we’re assuming \((5.6.3)\). It follows that

\[ p_{\tau, R}(\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3) (y) \ll y_1^{\frac{3}{2} + a_1} y_2^{2 + a_2} y_3^{\frac{3}{2} + a_3} T^{\epsilon + 4R + 6 - a_2 - a_3 + \delta_1 + \delta_2 + \delta_1} \]

which proves our proposition. 

6. **Bounding the geometric side**

Recall from \((3.4.2)\) that the Kloosterman contribution to the Kuznetsov trace formula is given by

\[ C_{L,M}^{-1} \sum_{w \in W_4} I_w \]

where \(C_{L,M} = c_4 \cdot (\ell_1 m_1)^3 (\ell_2 m_2)^4 (\ell_3 m_3)^3\), and

\[ I_w = \sum_{w \in V_4} \sum_{c_1 = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_2 = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_3 = 1}^{\infty} S_w(\psi_L, \psi_M, c) \int_{y_1 = 0}^{\infty} \int_{y_2 = 0}^{\infty} \int_{y_3 = 0}^{\infty} \int_{U_w(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus U_w(\mathbb{R})} T_w(\mathbb{R}) \psi_L(\text{wuy}) \psi_M^*(u) p_{\tau, R}(Lcwuy) p_{\tau, R}(M y) d^r u \frac{dy_1 dy_2 dy_3}{y_1^4 y_2^5 y_3^4} , \]

and

\[ c = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} 1/c_3 \\ c_3/c_2 \\ c_2/c_1 \\ c_1 \end{array} \right) . \]

The main term in the Kuznetsov trace formula is given in Proposition \(3.5.1\) and consists of the first term (corresponding to the identity Weyl element \(w = w_1\)) on the geometric side of the trace formula. For \(w = w_1\), we have the asymptotic formula:

\[ I_{w_1} \sim \delta_{L,M} \cdot c_1 \cdot T^{8R + 9} , \]

where \(c_1\) is computed in Proposition \(3.5.1\). In this section we bound \(I_w\) in each of the remaining cases.
We remark first, by Friedberg [Fri87], that \( \mathcal{I}_w = 0 \) unless \( w \) is relevant. That is \( w \) must be of the form

\[
  w = \begin{pmatrix}
    I_{n_1} & & \\
    & \ddots & \\
    & & I_{n_k}
  \end{pmatrix},
\]

where \( I_{n_i} \) is the identity matrix of size \( n_i \times n_i \) and \( 4 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} n_i \) with \( 1 \leq k \leq 4 \) and \( n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \).

The relevant Weyl group elements are therefore,

\[
  w_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
  w_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad w_8 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \ & \ \\ & 1 & \ \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\]

**Proposition 6.0.3.** Let \( \mathcal{I}_w \) be as above. Let \( M = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \), \( L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \), with \( C_{L,M} \neq 0 \). Let \( r \geq 1 \) be an integer. Then for \( R \) sufficiently large and any \( \epsilon > 0 \), we have

\[
  C_{L,M}^{-1} |\mathcal{I}_w| \lessapprox_{\epsilon,R} (\ell_1 m_1)^{-3/2} (\ell_2 m_2)^{-2} (\ell_3 m_3)^{-3/2} Q_j(M, L) P_j(M, L) B_j(T),
\]

where

\[
  B_j(T) = \begin{cases} 
    T^{\epsilon+8R+22-4r} & \text{if } j = 2, 3, 4, \\
    T^{\epsilon+8R+21-5r} & \text{if } j = 6, 7, \\
    T^{\epsilon+8R+20-6r} & \text{if } j = 5, 8,
  \end{cases}
\]

\[
  P_j(M, L) = \begin{cases} 
    (m_1 m_2 m_3)^{1/4} & \text{if } j = 2, \\
    (m_1 m_2 m_3)^{1/4} & \text{if } j = 3, \\
    1 & \text{if } 4 \leq j \leq 7, \\
    (m_1 m_2 m_3 \ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3)^{1/2} & \text{if } j = 8,
  \end{cases}
\]

and

\[
  Q_j(M, L) = \begin{cases} 
    (\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 m_1)^{2r} & \text{if } j = 2, \\
    (\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 m_2)^{2r} & \text{if } j = 3, \\
    (\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 m_2)^{2r} & \text{if } j = 4, \\
    (\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 m_1 m_2 m_3)^{2r} & \text{if } j = 5, 8, \\
    (\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 m_2 m_3)^{2r} & \text{if } j = 6, \\
    (\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 m_1 m_2)^{2r} & \text{if } j = 7.
  \end{cases}
\]

**Remark 6.0.4.** Given (6.0.2), then strictly speaking, we only need \( r \) large enough so that \( 20 - 4r < 9 \), which can obviously be done. In fact, as will be shown in Theorem 7.0.7, the contribution to our theorem from the Eisenstein series is \( T^{\epsilon+8R+6} \), hence any choice of \( r > 4 \) will not lead to any overall improvement.

**Proof.** The main idea of the proof is to apply Theorem 5.2.1 to each of the two instances of \( p_{T,R} \) which appear on the right hand side of (6.0.1). Before doing so, we make the change
of variables \( u \mapsto yuy^{-1} \). Note that, by definition, \( d(yuy)^{-1} = \Delta_w(y) du \) for any \( u \in U_w \). We see that taking absolute values in (6.0.1), we obtain

\[
|I_w| \ll \sum_{r \in Y_1} \sum_{c_1 = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_2 = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{c_3 = 1}^{\infty} |S_w(\psi_L, \psi_M, c)| \int_{y_1 = 0}^{\infty} \int_{y_2 = 0}^{\infty} \int_{y_3 = 0}^{\infty} U_w(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus U_w(\mathbb{R}) T_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{R}) \\
\cdot \Delta_w(y) |p_{T, R}(Lcwyu)| \cdot |p_{T, R}(My)| d^* u \frac{dy_1 dy_2 dy_3}{y_1^2 y_2^4 y_3^4},
\]

For the term \( p_{T, R}(Lcwyu) \), we need the Iwasawa form:

\( Lcwyu =: u'tk \)

so that we can apply Theorem 5.2.1 for a particular choice of integers \( r_1, r_2, r_3 \) and parameters \( 2r_j - 1 < a_j < 2r_j \) for each \( j = 1, 2, 3 \).

For notational purposes, we write

\( t = t(Lcwyu) =: Y = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3). \)

It is easy to see that \( Y_i \) factors as

\( Y_i =: Y_i(w, c)Y_i(w, L)Y_i(w, y)Y_i(w, u) \)

with each factor being an expression in the entries of \( c, L, y \) or \( u \) respectively. (Note that we are following the notation of (2.1.2) for the element \( Y \).) By inspection, we see that it is always the case that

\[
Y_1(w, L) = \ell_1^{\frac{1}{2} + a_1}, \quad Y_2(w, L) = \ell_2^{a_2}, \quad Y_3(w, L) = \ell_3^{a_3}
\]

for all \( w \), and

\[
Y_1(w, u) = \frac{\sqrt{\xi_2(w, u)}}{\xi_1(w, u)}, \quad Y_2(w, u) = \frac{\sqrt{\xi_1(w, u) \cdot \xi_3(w, u)}}{\xi_2(w, u)}, \quad Y_3(w, u) = \frac{\sqrt{\xi_2(w, u)}}{\xi_3(w, u)},
\]

where each function \( \xi_j(w, u) \) is strictly positive for any \( u \in U(\mathbb{R}) \).

For example, in the case of \( w = w_8 \), the long element, we find that if

\[
u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_{12} & x_{13} & x_{14} \\ 0 & 1 & x_{23} & x_{24} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & x_{34} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y = (y_1, y_2, y_3) = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 y_2 y_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y_1 y_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & y_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\]

then

\[
Y_1(w_8, y) = \frac{1}{y_3}, \quad Y_2(w_8, y) = \frac{1}{y_2}, \quad Y_3(w_8, y) = \frac{1}{y_1},
\]

and

\[
\xi_1(w_8, u) = 1 + x_{12}^2 + x_{13}^2 + x_{14}^2,
\]

\[
\xi_2(w_8, u) = 1 + x_{23}^2 + x_{24}^2 + \left( x_{12} x_{24} - x_{14} \right)^2 + \left( x_{12} x_{23} - x_{13} \right)^2 + \left( x_{13} x_{24} - x_{14} x_{23} \right)^2,
\]

\[
\xi_3(w_8, u) = 1 + x_{34}^2 + \left( x_{23} x_{34} - x_{24} \right)^2 + \left( x_{12} x_{23} x_{34} - x_{13} x_{34} - x_{12} x_{24} + x_{14} \right)^2.
\]

Returning now to (6.0.5), we apply Theorem 5.2.1 for \( r = (r_1, r_2, r_3) \) and \( 2r_j - 1 < a_j < 2r_j \) for each \( j = 1, 2, 3 \) to the term \( p_{T, R}(u'tk) \). To the other term we apply the theorem for a
choice \( r' = (r'_1, r'_2, r'_3) \) and \( 2r'_j - 1 < b_j < 2r'_j \). As we will see, values of \( r' \) and \( b'_j \) will be forced upon us in order to guarantee the converges of the sum over \( c \), the integral over \((y_1, y_2, y_3)\) and the integral over \( u \). In fact, it will become evident that these values are determined by \( w \) and \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \).

Independent of the choice of \( w \), we define

\[
I_0 := (0, 1], \quad I_1 = (1, \infty),
\]

hence

\[
\int_{y_1=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_2=0}^{\infty} \int_{y_3=0}^{\infty} = \sum_{i,j,k \in \{0,1\}} \int_{I_i} \int_{I_j} \int_{I_k}.
\]

Using the bounds for \( p_{T,R} \) (once with parameters \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) and once with parameters \( b_1, b_2, b_3 \) as described above), it follows that

\[
(6.0.9) \quad |I_w| \ll T^{e+8R+20+E(r,r')} (\ell_1 m_1)^{3/2} (\ell_2 m_2)^2 (\ell_3 m_3)^{3/2} \ell_1^{a_1} \ell_2^{a_2} \ell_3^{a_3} m_1^{b_1} m_2^{b_2} m_3^{b_3} \]

\[
\sum_{v \in V_4} \sum_{c_1=1}^{c_2-1} \sum_{c_2=1}^{c_3-1} \sum_{c_3=1}^{c_4-1} \frac{|S_w(\psi_M, \psi'_L, c)|}{c_1^{1+2a_1-a_2} c_2^{1-a_1+2a_2-a_3} c_3^{1-a_2+2a_3}} \]

\[
\sum_{i,j,k \in \{0,1\}} \int_{I_i} \int_{I_j} \int_{I_k} Y_1(w, y) \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_1 Y_2(w, y)^{2+\alpha_2} Y_3(w, y)^{2+\alpha_3} \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_1 + \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_2 + \frac{1}{2} + \alpha_3 \cdot \Delta_w(y) \]

\[
\frac{dy_1 \, dy_2 \, dy_3}{y_1^4 \, y_2^4 \, y_3^4} \int_{U_w(\mathbb{Z}) \setminus U_w(\mathbb{R})} \int_{U_w(\mathbb{R})} \xi_1^{1/2 - \alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \cdot \xi_2^{1/2 - \alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \cdot \xi_3^{1/2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3} \cdot |d'u|,
\]

where \( E(r, r') \) will depend on the particular choice of parameters \( r = (r_1, r_2, r_3) \) and \( r' = (r'_1, r'_2, r'_3) \). Recall that for any such choice of \( r, r' \) we are assuming that

\[
2r_j - 1 < a_j < 2r_j, \quad 2r'_j - 1 < b_j < 2r'_j \quad (j = 1, 2, 3).
\]

It is known (cf. [Jac67]) that the integral in \( \xi \) will converge provided that each of the exponents of \( \xi_j \) for \( j = 1, 2, 3 \) is less than \(-\frac{1}{2}\). Explicitly, we require that

\[
(6.0.10) \quad 2a_3, 2a_1 > a_2, \quad \text{and} \quad 2a_2 > a_1 + a_3.
\]

By an abuse of notation, let \( r_1 = r_2 = r_3 = r \geq 1 \). Then the first of the conditions in (6.0.10) is ensured for any choice of \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) such that

\[
(6.0.11) \quad 2r - 1 < a_j < 2r \quad \text{for each} \quad j = 1, 2, 3.
\]

In this range, the second condition (that \( 2a_2 > a_1 + a_3 \)) can be easily satisfied as well.

We next want to determine what additional restrictions on \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) must be satisfied to guarantee the convergence of the sum over \( c \). To this end, we apply the bounds obtained by Binrong Huang in Appendix B for the Kloosterman sums \( S_w(\psi_M, \psi'_L, c) \). Doing so, we deduce the following.

**Proposition 6.0.12.** Let \( w \neq w_1 \). The sum

\[
\mathcal{K}(M, L, c; w, a) := \sum_{v \in V_4} \sum_{c_1=1}^{c_2-1} \sum_{c_2=1}^{c_3-1} \sum_{c_3=1}^{c_4-1} \frac{|S_w(\psi_M, \psi'_L, c)|}{c_1^{1+2a_1-a_2} c_2^{1-a_1+2a_2-a_3} c_3^{1-a_2+2a_3}},
\]

which appears on the right hand side of (6.0.9), satisfies the following bounds (with all implied constants independent of \( M, L, c, \) and \( a \)).
For $2 \leq j \leq 8$ and any $\varepsilon > 0$, we have
\[
\mathcal{K}(M, L; c; w_j, a) \ll P_j(M, L) \sum_{c_1=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{c_1^{\nu(j)}} \sum_{c_2=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{c_2^{\nu(j)-2a_2-a_3-\varepsilon}} \sum_{c_3=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{c_3^{\nu(j)-2a_2+2a_3-\varepsilon}},
\]
where
\[
P_j(M, L) = \begin{cases} 
(m_1 m_2^2 m_3^3)^{1/4} & \text{if } j = 2, \\
(m_1^3 m_2^2 m_3)^{1/4} & \text{if } j = 3, \\
1 & \text{if } 4 \leq j \leq 7, \\
(m_1 m_2 m_3 \ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3)^{1/2} & \text{if } j = 8,
\end{cases}
\]
and
\[
\nu(j) = \begin{cases} 
1/4 & \text{if } 2 \leq j \leq 3, \\
0 & \text{if } 4 \leq j \leq 7, \\
1/10 & \text{if } j = 8.
\end{cases}
\]

Proof. From Table B.1.1, we find that
\[
(6.0.13) \quad |S_{w_j}(\psi_M, \psi_L; c)| \ll \begin{cases} 
\delta_{1, c \varepsilon c_3} & \text{if } j = 1, \\
P(M, L)(c_1 c_2 c_3)^{1-\nu(j)+\varepsilon} & \text{if } 2 \leq j \leq 8.
\end{cases}
\]
(The Kloosterman sum $S_{w_j}(\psi_M, \psi_L; c)$ is, in fact, zero unless $M, L,$ and $c$ satisfy certain “compatibility conditions,” as described in Table B.1.1. But when the Kloosterman sum is zero, the bounds (6.0.13) are trivially satisfied.) Applying (6.0.13) to the definition of $\mathcal{K}(M, L; c; w, a)$ then gives the desired result. □

Clearly, the series in the above proposition will converge as long as the exponents are less than $-1$. The worst-case scenarios for convergence are when $4 \leq j \leq 7$. So we see that, in all cases, convergence will be guaranteed by the following additional set of restrictions:
\[
(6.0.14) \quad -2a_1 + a_2 < -1, \quad a_1 - 2a_2 + a_3 < -1, \quad a_2 - 2a_3 < -1.
\]

The next step is to show that the integral over $y = (y_1, y_2, y_3)$ also converges. An elementary calculation shows that
\[
\sum_{w_1} \frac{Y_1(w, y)^{\frac{3}{2}+a_1} Y_2(w, y)^{2+a_2} Y_3(w, y)^{\frac{3}{2}+a_3} \Delta_w(y)}{y_1^{y_1} y_2^{y_2} y_3^{y_3}} dy_1 dy_2 dy_3
\]
\[
= y_1^{b_1-e_1(w; a)} y_2^{b_2-e_2(w; a)} y_3^{b_3-e_3(w; a)} dy_1 dy_2 dy_3,
\]
where $e_j(w; a)$ is given by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$w$</th>
<th>$e_1(w; a)$</th>
<th>$e_2(w; a)$</th>
<th>$e_3(w; a)$</th>
<th>$(r_1', r_2', r_3')$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$w_2$</td>
<td>$a_3$</td>
<td>$-a_1 + a_3$</td>
<td>$-a_2 + a_3$</td>
<td>$(r, 0, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_3$</td>
<td>$a_1 - a_2$</td>
<td>$a_1 - a_3$</td>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>$(0, 0, r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_4$</td>
<td>$a_2 - a_3$</td>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>$-a_1 + a_2$</td>
<td>$(0, r, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_5$</td>
<td>$a_3$</td>
<td>$a_1 - a_2 + a_3$</td>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>$(r, r, r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_6$</td>
<td>$a_2 - a_3$</td>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>$(0, r, r)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_7$</td>
<td>$a_3$</td>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>$-a_1 + a_2$</td>
<td>$(r, r, 0)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_8$</td>
<td>$a_3$</td>
<td>$a_2$</td>
<td>$a_1$</td>
<td>$(r, r, r)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result for $w_8$, for example, is established using (6.0.8) and the fact that $\Delta_{w_8}(y) = y_1^3 y_2^4 y_3^2$. 
This means that for each \( j = 1, 2, 3 \) and \( k = 0, 1 \) we are searching for \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) satisfying (6.0.10) and (6.0.11) (and (6.0.14) if \( w = w_k \)) and \( r'_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \) such that for some choice of \( b_1, b_2, b_3 \) satisfying \( 2r'_j - 1 < b_j < 2r'_j \), the integral

\[
\int_{I_k} y_j^{e_j(a,b)} \frac{dy_j}{y_j}
\]

converges. Since \( I_0 = (0, 1] \) and \( I_1 = (1, \infty) \), we require that \( b_j - e_j(w; a) \) be positive if \( k = 0 \) and negative if \( k = 1 \). With this in mind, we let \( \epsilon > 0 \) and choose \( b_1, b_2, b_3 \) such that

\[
b_j - e_j(w; a) = \begin{cases} 
  + \epsilon & \text{if } k = 0 \\
  - \epsilon & \text{if } k = 1.
\end{cases}
\]

Now we observe that given \( a_1, a_2, a_3 \) satisfying the required conditions, there exists \( \epsilon > 0 \) such that for the choice of \( b_1, b_2, b_3 \) above, we have

\[
2r'_j(w) - 1 < b_j < 2r'_j(w), \quad j = 1, 2, 3,
\]

where \( r'_j(w) = r'_j \) is given by the final column of the table above. This informs which bound from Theorem 5.2.1 for \( p_{T,R}(y) \) we must use. Having applied this bound, the value of \( E(r, r') \) is evident.

To complete the proof, we note that having determined \( b_1, b_2, b_3 \), the contribution \( Q_t(M) \) can be read off of the table above since \( a_j < 2r \) and \( b_j < 2r'_j(w) \).

\( \square \)

7. Bounding the contribution from the continuous spectrum

Let \( 2 \leq n \leq 4 \). Assuming that \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \), we define

\[
p^{(n)}_{T,R}(\alpha) := \begin{cases} 
  e^{\frac{a_1^2 + \cdots + a_n^2}{2r'^2}} \frac{\prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq n} \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)} & \text{if } n = 2, 3, \\
  e^{\frac{a_1^2 + \cdots + a_n^2}{2r'^2}} F_R(\alpha) \frac{\prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq n} \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)} & \text{if } n = 4,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( F_R(\alpha) \) is as in (3.1.2). In the case of \( n = 4 \) we will sometimes drop \( n \) from the notation.

Suppose that \( \phi \) is a Maass form for \( \text{GL}(n) \) with Langlands parameter \( \alpha(\phi) := \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \). Then we define

\[
h^{(n)}_{T,R}(\phi) := \prod_{1 \leq j \neq k \leq n} \left| \frac{p^{(n)}_{T,R}(\alpha)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right)} \right|^2.
\]

Theorem 7.0.3 (Weyl Law for \( \text{GL}(2) \) and \( \text{GL}(3) \)). Suppose that \( n = 2 \) or \( n = 3 \). Let \( \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots\} \) be an orthogonal basis of Maass forms for \( \text{GL}(n) \) ordered by eigenvalue. Then there exists a constant \( c_n \) such that

\[
\sum_j \frac{h^{(n)}_{T,R}(\phi_j)}{L(1, \Ad \phi_j)} \sim c_n T^{\frac{n(n-1)R}{2} + \frac{n+2(n-1)}{2}}.
\]

Remark 7.0.5. In the case of \( n = 3 \) this is Theorem 1.3 of [GK13]. The case of \( n = 2 \) is well known, but we remark that it can be proved by the same method as for \( \text{GL}(3) \). The point is that the main term for the left hand side of (7.0.3) is \( |p^{(n)}_{T,R}|^2 \) which can be easily estimated using Stirling’s estimate for the Gamma function.
Suppose that $4 = n_1 + \cdots + n_r$ is a partition of $n$ and $\Phi = (\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_r)$ where each $\phi_j$ is a Maass form for SL$(n_j, \mathbb{Z})$. Let $P = P_{n_1, \ldots, n_r}$. Then we define

$$
\mathcal{E}_{P, \Phi} := \int_{\text{Re}(s_1) = 0} \cdots \int_{\text{Re}(s_r) = 0} A_{E_{P, \Phi}}(L, s) \cdot \overline{A_{E_{P, \Phi}}(M, s)} \cdot \left| p_{T,R}^{\#}(\alpha_{P, \Phi}(s)) \right|^2 ds_1 \cdots ds_{r-1},
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{E}_{P_{\text{Min}}} := \int_{\text{Re}(s_1) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_2) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_3) = 0} A_{E_{P_{\text{Min}}}}(L, s) \overline{A_{E_{P_{\text{Min}}}}(M, s)} \cdot \left| p_{T,R}^{\#}(\alpha_{P_{\text{Min}}}(s)) \right|^2 ds_1 ds_2 ds_3.
$$

**Remark 7.0.6.** In the above integrals $\alpha_{P, \Phi}(s), \alpha_{P_{\text{Min}}}(s)$ denote the Langlands parameters of the Eisenstein series $E_{P, \Phi}(g, s), E_{P_{\text{Min}}}(g, s)$, respectively. Also, $A_{E_{P, \Phi}}(L, s), A_{E_{P, \Phi}}(M, s)$ denote the $L^{th}$ and $M^{th}$ Fourier coefficient of $E_{P, \Phi}(g, s)$. Similarly for $E_{P_{\text{Min}}}(g, s)$.

Thus, if we define

$$
\mathcal{E}_P := \sum_{\Phi} c_{L,M,P} \cdot \mathcal{E}_{P, \Phi},
$$

then the contribution to the Kuznetsov trace formula coming from the Eisenstein series (defined in [3.7]) is given by

$$
\mathcal{E} := c_1 \mathcal{E}_{P_{\text{Min}}} + c_2 \mathcal{E}_{P_{2,1,1}, \Phi} + c_3 \mathcal{E}_{P_{2,2,1,1}, \Phi} + c_4 \mathcal{E}_{P_{3,1,1, \Phi}},
$$

for constants $c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 > 0$.

**Theorem 7.0.7.** Suppose the Ramanujan Conjecture (at $\infty$) for GL$(n)$ with $n \leq 3$, i.e., the Langlands parameters are all purely imaginary. Let $L = (\ell, 1, 1)$ and $M = (m, 1, 1)$. Then

$$
|\mathcal{E}_{P_{\text{Min}}}| \ll \epsilon (\ell m)^{\epsilon} \cdot T^{3+8R+\epsilon}, \quad |\mathcal{E}_{2,1,1}| \ll \epsilon (\ell m)^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} \cdot T^{4+8R+\epsilon},
$$

$$
|\mathcal{E}_{2,2}| \ll \epsilon (\ell m)^{\frac{3}{2}+\epsilon} \cdot T^{5+8R+\epsilon}, \quad |\mathcal{E}_{3,1,1}| \ll \epsilon (\ell m)^{\frac{5}{2}+\epsilon} \cdot T^{6+8R+\epsilon},
$$

as $T \to \infty$ for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$.

**Proof.** We shall require the following standard notation for completed L-functions. Let

$$
\zeta^*(w) = \pi^{-\frac{w}{2}} \Gamma \left( \frac{w}{2} \right) \zeta(w) = \zeta^*(1-w), \quad (w \in \mathbb{C}).
$$

For a Maass form $\phi$ on GL$(2)$ with spectral parameter $\frac{1}{2} + v$, define the completed L-function $L^*(s, \phi)$ associated to $\phi$ by

$$
L^*(w, \phi) := \pi^{-w} \Gamma \left( \frac{w+v}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{w-v}{2} \right) L(w, \phi) = L^*(1-w, \phi), \quad (w \in \mathbb{C}).
$$

If $\phi_1, \phi_2$ are two Maass forms on GL$(2)$ with spectral parameters $\frac{1}{2} + v, \frac{1}{2} + v'$, respectively, then the completed L-function for the Rankin-Selberg convolution $L(w, \phi_1 \times \phi_2)$ is given by

$$
L^*(w, \phi_1 \times \phi_2) = \pi^{-2w} \Gamma \left( \frac{w+v+v'}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{w-v-v'}{2} \right) \cdot \Gamma \left( \frac{w+v-v'}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{w-v+v'}{2} \right) L(w, \phi_1 \times \phi_2).
$$

\[5\text{Note that we include the case that } \phi_j \text{ is the constant function (properly normalized).}\]
Finally, for a Maass form $\phi$ on $GL(3)$ with spectral parameter $\frac{1}{3} + (v, v')$ define the completed L-function $L^*(w, \phi)$ associated to $\phi$ by

$$L^*(w, \phi) := \pi^{-\frac{3w}{2}} \Gamma \left( \frac{w + v + 2v'}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{w - 2v - v'}{2} \right) L(w, \phi) = L^*(1 - w, \phi).$$

Recall the adjoint L-function of a Maass form $\phi$ is defined by $L(w, Ad \phi) := \frac{L(w, \phi \cdot \overline{\phi})}{\zeta(w)}$.

The following table (see [GMW]) lists, for each partition, the Maass form $\Phi$ (with its associated spectral parameters), the values of $s$-variables, Langlands parameters, and the Fourier-Whittaker coefficients of the $SL(4, \mathbb{Z})$ Eisenstein series $E_{\mathbb{P}, \Phi}$. Note that $E_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{Min}}, \Phi} := E_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{Min}}}$.

### FOURIER COEFFICIENTS OF SL(4, Z) LANGLANDS EISENSTEIN SERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partition</th>
<th>$s$ variables of $E_{\mathbb{P}, \Phi}$</th>
<th>First Coefficient $A_{E_{\mathbb{P}, \Phi}}((1, 1, 1), s)$ (up to a constant factor)</th>
<th>$m^{th}$ Hecke eigenvalue $\lambda_{E_{\mathbb{P}, \Phi}}((m, 1, 1), s)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$4 = 1+1+1+1$</td>
<td>$s = \frac{1}{4} + (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} + v$</td>
<td>$1 + s_1 + s_2 + s_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 = 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 = -s_1 + 2s_2 + s_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_3 = -s_1 - 2s_2 + s_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_4 = -s_1 - 2s_2 - 3s_3$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ on $GL(2) \times GL(2)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} + v, \frac{1}{2} + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s = (1 + s_1, -1 - s_1)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 = s_1 + v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 = s_1 - v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_3 = s_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_4 = -2s_1 - s_2$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ on $GL(2) \times GL(2)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} + v, \frac{1}{2} + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s = (1 + s_1, -1 - s_1)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 = s_1 + v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 = s_1 - v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_3 = -s_1 + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_4 = -s_1 - v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ on $GL(2) \times GL(2)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} + v, \frac{1}{2} + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s = (1 + s_1, -1 - s_1)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 = s_1 + v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 = s_1 - v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_3 = -s_1 + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_4 = -s_1 - v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ on $GL(2) \times GL(2)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} + v, \frac{1}{2} + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s = (1 + s_1, -1 - s_1)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 = s_1 + v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 = s_1 - v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_3 = -s_1 + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_4 = -s_1 - v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2)$ on $GL(2) \times GL(2)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{1}{2} + v, \frac{1}{2} + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$s = (1 + s_1, -1 - s_1)$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1 = s_1 + v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2 = s_1 - v$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_3 = -s_1 + v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_4 = -s_1 - v'$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Remark 7.0.9. The formulas given here for the first coefficient are valid when the form \( \phi \) or \( \tilde{\phi}_j \) is a Maass form. In the case that any of these is the constant function, the result is somewhat different.

Following the above table of Fourier coefficients of \( \text{SL}(4, \mathbb{Z}) \) Langlands Eisenstein series, we now list the integrals arising in the contribution of the continuous spectrum decomposition of the inner product of two Poincaré series given in Proposition 3.7.3. For the rest of the proof, and for each partition of 4, we will give the Langlands parameter \( \alpha_{\mathcal{P}, \Phi}(s) := (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \) for \( (\mathcal{P}, \Phi) \) and then use Theorem 7.0.3 to obtain the result.

In each case below we will use the fact that for any \( 1 \leq j, k \leq 4 \) and \( \Re(\alpha_j) = \Re(\alpha_k) = 0, \)

\[
\frac{\left| \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right) \right|^4}{\left| \Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right) \right|^2} \sim c \left( 1 + \left| \alpha_j - \alpha_k \right| \right)^R
\]

for some constant \( c \). This follows trivially from Stirling’s estimate.

We also will use the bound of Luo-Rudnick-Sarnak (see [LRS99]) for the \( m^{th}\)-Fourier coefficient of a non-constant \( \text{GL}(n) \) \( (n \geq 2) \) Maass form \( \phi \):

\[
\lambda_{\phi}(m, 1, \ldots, 1) \ll m^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n^2} + \varepsilon}.
\]

Note that this is proved in [Gol15] as well.

The integral \( \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}} \):

The Langlands parameters for \( E_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}}(s) \) with \( s = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \) these are given by:

\[
\alpha_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}}(s) = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4),
\]

\[
\alpha_1 = 3s_1 + 2s_2 + s_3, \quad \alpha_2 = -s_1 + 2s_2 + s_3, \quad \alpha_3 = -s_1 - 2s_2 + s_3, \quad \alpha_4 = -s_1 - 2s_2 - 3s_3.
\]

Therefore, using the above table and the fact that for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \)

\[
\lambda_{E_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}}}(m, 1, 1, s) = \sum_{c_1c_2c_3c_4 = m} a_1^{c_1}a_2^{c_2}a_3^{c_3}a_4^{c_4} \ll m^{\varepsilon}
\]

whenever \( \Re(\alpha_j) = 0 \) \( (j = 1, 2, 3, 4) \), we see that

\[
\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}} = \int_{\text{Re}(s_1) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_2) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_3) = 0} A_{E_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}}}(L, s) \overline{A_{E_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}}}(M, s)} \cdot \left| \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{R}}(\alpha_{\mathcal{P}_{\min}}(s)) \right|^2 \, ds_1 ds_2 ds_3
\]

\[
\ll \int_{\text{Re}(s_1) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_2) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_3) = 0} e^{\frac{\alpha_1^2 + \alpha_2^2 + \alpha_3^2 + \alpha_4^2}{2}} \cdot (\ell m)^{\varepsilon} \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} \left| \zeta(1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k) \right|^2 \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} \left| \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{4} \right) \right|^4 \left| \Gamma \left( \frac{1 + \alpha_j - \alpha_k}{2} \right) \right|^2
\]

\[
\cdot \left( 1 + \left| \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4 \right| \right) \left( 1 + \left| \alpha_1 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4 \right| \right) \left( 1 + \left| \alpha_1 + \alpha_4 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 \right| \right)
\]

\[
ds_1 ds_2 ds_3.
\]

If we make the change of variables

\[
\alpha_1 = 3s_1 + 2s_2 + s_3, \quad \alpha_2 = -s_1 + 2s_2 + s_3, \quad \alpha_3 = -s_1 - 2s_2 + s_3, \quad \alpha_4 = -s_1 - 2s_2 - 3s_3
\]

in the above integral, it follows from the Jacobian transformation, that \( ds_1 ds_2 ds_3 \) maps to \( \frac{d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3}{32} \).
Now, we have the Vinogradov (see [Vin58]) bound

\[ \frac{1}{|\zeta(1 + it)|} \ll (1 + |t|)^{\varepsilon}, \quad (t \in \mathbb{R}), \]

which together with the above coordinate change imply that

\[ E_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{Min}}} \ll (\ell m)^{\varepsilon} \int \int \prod_{1 \leq j < k \leq 4} (1 + |\alpha_j - \alpha_k|)^{R + \varepsilon} (1 + |\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_4|)^{2R} \]

\[ \cdot \left( (1 + |\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_4|)(1 + |\alpha_1 + \alpha_4 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3|) \right)^{2R} d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 d\alpha_3. \]

Next, make the change of variables \( \alpha_1 \to \alpha_1 T, \quad \alpha_2 \to \alpha_2 T, \quad \alpha_3 \to \alpha_3 T. \) It easily follows that

\[ E_{\mathcal{P}_{\text{Min}}} \ll (\ell m)^{\varepsilon} T^{8R + 3 + \varepsilon}. \]

The integral \( \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}}: \)

We take \( \Phi \) to be a GL(2) Maass form with spectral parameter \( \frac{1}{2} + \nu \) where \( \nu \in \mathbb{C} \) is pure imaginary. The Langlands parameters \( \alpha_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}}(s) \) for \( E_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}}(s) \) with \( s = (s_1, s_2, s_3) \) are given by:

\[ \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \]

\[ \alpha_1 = s_1 + \nu, \quad \alpha_2 = s_1 - \nu, \quad \alpha_3 = s_2, \quad \alpha_4 = -2s_1 - s_2. \]

It follows that

\[ \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}} := \int_{\text{Re}(s_1) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_2) = 0} A_{E_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}}}(L, s) \cdot \overline{A_{E_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}}}(M, s)} \cdot |p^\#_{T,R}(\alpha)|^2 \ ds_1 ds_2 \]

\[ \quad = \int_{\text{Re}(s_1) = 0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_2) = 0} e^{(s_1 + \nu)^2 + (s_1 - \nu)^2 + (s_2)^2 + (2s_1 + s_2)^2} \cdot \lambda_{E_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}}}(L, s) \overline{\lambda_{E_{\mathcal{P}_{2,1,1,\Phi}}}(M, s)} \]

\[ \cdot \left( (1 + |s_1|)(1 + |2s_1 + 2s_2 + 2\nu|)(1 + |2s_1 + 2s_2 - 2\nu|) \right)^{2R/3} \cdot \left( \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + s_1 - s_2 - \nu}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + s_1 + s_2 + \nu}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + 3s_1 + s_2 - \nu}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + 3s_1 + s_2 + \nu}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + s_1 - s_2 + 2\nu}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + s_1 + s_2 - 2\nu}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + 3s_1 + s_2 - \nu}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + 3s_1 + s_2 + \nu}{4} \right)} \right)^4 \]

\[ \cdot \frac{|L^*(1 + s_1 - s_2, \phi)L^*(1 + 3s_1 + s_2, \phi)|^2}{|L(1, \text{Ad} \phi)|^2} \cdot \left( \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + 2\nu}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + 2s_1 + 2s_2}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1 + 2\nu}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{1 + 2s_1 + 2s_2}{2} \right)} \right)^2 \ ds_1 ds_2 \]
from which we obtain the bound
\[
\mathcal{E}_{P_{2,1}, \Phi} \ll \frac{e^{\frac{v^2}{4}} \left| \Gamma \left( \frac{2R+2v}{4} \right) \right|^4 T^{2R}}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1+2v}{2} \right)} \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} \int_{\text{Re}(s_2)=0} e^{\frac{2s_1^2 + s_2^2 + (2s_1 + s_2)^2}{2T^2}} \lambda_{P_{2,1}, \Phi}(L, s) \lambda_{P_{2,1}, \Phi}(M, s) \left| \left| \frac{\Gamma \left( \frac{2R+s_1 - s_2 - v}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2R+s_1 + s_2 - v}{4} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{2R+3s_1 + s_2 + v}{4} \right)}{\Gamma \left( \frac{1+s_1 - s_2 - v}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{1+s_1 + s_2 - v}{2} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{1+3s_1 + s_2 + v}{2} \right)} \right|^4 \right| \right|_{\Gamma(2R+2s_1+2s_2)} \zeta(1+2s_1 + 2s_2)^2 ds_1 ds_2.
\]

Here
\[
\lambda_{P_{2,1}, \Phi}(m, 1, 1, s) = \sum_{c_1c_2c_3=m} \lambda(c_1) \cdot c_1^{s_1} c_2^{s_2} c_3^{-2s_1-s_2} \ll m^{\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon},
\]

by the bound for \( \lambda(c) \) given in (7.0.11).

It then follows from the above bound, Stirling’s estimate for the Gamma function, and (7.0.13) that
\[
\mathcal{E}_{P_{2,1}, \Phi} \ll (\ell m)^{\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon} \cdot T^{2+6R+\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{e^{\frac{v^2}{4}} \left| \Gamma \left( \frac{2R+2v}{4} \right) \right|^4 \left| \Gamma \left( \frac{1+2v}{2} \right) \right|^2}{\Gamma(1+3s_1 + s_2 + \phi)} = (\ell m)^{\frac{1}{4} + \varepsilon} \cdot T^{2+6R+\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{h_{T,R}^{(2)}(\phi_j)}{L(1, \text{Ad} \phi_j)}.
\]

To bound \( \mathcal{E}_{P_{2,1}, \Phi} \) we simply sum \( \mathcal{E}_{P_{2,1}, \Phi} \) over all Maass forms \( \Phi \) for \( \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}) \) using the Weyl law for \( \text{GL}(2) \) given in Theorem 7.0.3. The stated result follows.

The integral \( \mathcal{E}_{P_{2,2}, \Phi} \):

Here, we take \( \Phi = (\phi_1, \phi_2) \) to be Maass forms for \( \text{GL}(2) \) with spectral parameters \( \frac{1}{2} + v, \frac{1}{2} + v' \), respectively. The Langlands parameters \( \alpha_{P_{2,2}, \Phi} \) for \( \mathcal{E}_{P_{2,2}, \Phi}(s) \) with \( s = (s_1, s_2) \) are given by
\[
\alpha_1 = s_1 + v, \quad \alpha_2 = s_1 - v, \quad \alpha_3 = -s_1 + v', \quad \alpha_4 = -s_1 - v'.
\]

It follows that
\[
p_{T,R}^{\phi,(4)}(\alpha) = p_{T,R}^{\phi,(2)}(\nu) \cdot p_{T,R}^{\phi,(2)}(\nu') \cdot e^{\frac{2s_1^2}{T^2}} \prod_{\varepsilon, \delta \in \{\pm 1\}} \left| \Gamma \left( \frac{2 + R + 2s_1 + \varepsilon v + \delta v'}{4} \right) \right| \left( 1 + 4|s_1| \right) \left( 1 + 2|v + v'| \right) \left( 1 + 2|v - v'| \right)^{\frac{3}{2}}.
\]

Using this and the fact that
\[
L^*(1 + 2s_1, \phi_1 \times \phi_2) = \pi^{-2(1+2s_1)} L(1 + 2s_1, \phi_1 \times \phi_2) \prod_{\delta, \delta' \in \{\pm 1\}} \left| \Gamma \left( \frac{1+2s_1 + \delta v + \delta' v'}{2} \right) \right|,
\]
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we see that

\[ \mathcal{E}_{P_{2,1}} \ll T^{2R+\epsilon} \frac{h_{T,R}^{(2)}(\phi_1) h_{T,R}^{(2)}(\phi_2)}{L(1, \text{Ad} \phi_1) L(1, \text{Ad} \phi_2)} \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} \frac{\lambda_{E_{P_{2,1}}} (L, s)}{L(1 + 2s_1, \phi_1 \times \phi_2)} \lambda_{E_{P_{2,1}}} (M, s) \mid_{\lambda \in (\pm 1)} \prod_{\delta, \delta' \in (\pm 1)} \frac{\mid \Gamma \left( \frac{3\ell_1 + 4s_1 - \beta}{4} \right) \mid^4 \mid \Gamma \left( \frac{3\ell_1 + 4s_1 - \beta - 4s_1}{4} \right) \mid^4}{\mid \Gamma \left( \frac{3\ell_1 + 4s_1 - \beta + 4s_1}{4} \right) \mid^4} ds_1 \]

where

\[ \lambda_{E_{P_{2,1}}} (m, 1, 1, s) = \sum_{c_1c_2 = m} \lambda_{\phi_1}(c_1) \lambda_{\phi_2}(c_2) \left( \frac{c_1}{c_2} \right)^{s_1} \ll m^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} \]

by the bounds for \( \lambda_{\phi_1}(c), \lambda_{\phi_2}(c) \) given in (7.0.11).

Applying this bound, the Theorem 7.0.3 bound, together with the L-function bound

\[ \frac{1}{L(1 + 2s_1, \phi_1 \times \phi_2)} \ll (1 + |s_1| + |\nu| + |\nu'|)^\epsilon, \]

and Stirling’s bound to estimate the integral in \( s_1 \), we find

\[ |\mathcal{E}_{E_{2,1}}| \ll (\ell m)^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} . T^{\epsilon + 6R + 1} \sum_{(\phi_1, \phi_2)} \frac{h_{T,R}^{(2)}(\phi_1) h_{T,R}^{(2)}(\phi_2)}{L(1, \text{Ad} \phi_1) L(1, \text{Ad} \phi_2)} \ll (\ell m)^{\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon} . T^{\epsilon + 6R + 1} T^R + 2T^{R+2} \]

as claimed.

The integral \( \mathcal{E}_{P_{3,1},1} \):

Let \( \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \) and \( \frac{1}{2} + (\nu, \nu') \) denote the Langlands and spectral parameters, respectively, associated to a Maass form \( \Phi \) on GL(3). Here

\[ \beta_1 = 2\nu + \nu', \quad \beta_2 = -\nu + \nu', \quad \beta_3 = -\nu - 2\nu'. \]

The Langlands parameters \( \alpha_{P_{3,1}}(s) \) for \( E_{P_{3,1}}(s) \) with \( s = (s_1, s_2) \) are given by: \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4) \) where

\[ \alpha_1 = s_1 + \beta_1, \quad \alpha_2 = s_1 + \beta_2, \quad \alpha_3 = s_1 + \beta_3, \quad \alpha_4 = -3s_1. \]

Note that in this case, since

\[ \sum_{j=1}^4 \alpha_j^2 = 9s_1^2 + \sum_{j=1}^3 (s_1 + \beta_j)^2 = 12s_1^2 + \sum_{j=1}^3 \beta_j^2 \]

and \( s_1, \beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3 \) are purely imaginary, we have

\[ p_{T,R}^{\beta}(\alpha) = p_{T,R}^{\beta}(\beta) \cdot e^{\frac{6\alpha_1^2}{3}} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^3 \Gamma \left( \frac{3\ell_1 + 4s_1 - \beta_j}{4} \right) \]

\[ \cdot \left( 1 + |\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - 4s_1| \left( 1 + |\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 + 4s_1| \left( 1 + |\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 + 4s_1| \right) \right)^{\frac{6}{3}} \right) \]

where \( p_{T,R}^{\beta}(\beta) \) is defined by (7.0.1).
This allows us to write
\[ \mathcal{E}_{p_3, \phi} := \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} A_{E_{p_3, \phi}}(L, s) \cdot  A_{E_{p_3, \phi}}(M, s) \cdot |p_{T,R}^\#(\alpha)|^2 \, ds_1 \]
\[ = \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} \frac{\lambda_{E_{p_3, \phi}}(L, s) \cdot \lambda_{E_{p_3, \phi}}(M, s)}{L(1, \text{Ad } \Phi)} \cdot |L^*(1 + 4s_1, \phi)|^2 \cdot h_{T,R}^{(3)}(\beta) \cdot e^{\frac{j_{2R}}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^3 \left| \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + 4s_1 + \beta_j}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+4s_1+\beta_j}{2}\right)} \right|^4 \]
\[ \cdot \left(1 + |\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - 4s_1|\right) \left(1 + |\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 + 4s_1|\right) \left(1 + |\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 + 4s_1|\right) \frac{2\pi}{\lambda_{\phi}(c_1) \cdot c_1^{-3s_1}} \ll m^\frac{7}{15} + \epsilon. \]

where
\[ \sum_{c_1c_2=m} \lambda_{\phi}(c_1) \cdot c_1^{-s_1} \ll m^\frac{7}{15} + \epsilon. \]

In the above
\[ L^*(1 + 4s_1, \phi) = \pi^{-\frac{3+12s_1}{2}} L(1 + 4s_1, \phi) \prod_{j=1}^3 \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{1 + 4s_1 + \beta_j}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+4s_1+\beta_j}{2}\right)}. \]

It follows from \[\text{[Mor85, Sar04, and HR95]}\] that for every \( \epsilon > 0 \)
\[ L(1 + 4s_1, \phi) \gg \frac{1}{(1 + |s_1| + |v| + |v'|)}, \]

where the implied constant in the \( \gg \) symbol is effective unless \( \phi \) is a self-dual Maass form that is not a symmetric square lift from \( GL(2) \).

Let \( \{\phi_1, \phi_2, \ldots\} \) be the Maass forms for \( GL(3) \) ordered by eigenvalue, and set \( L_j := L(1, \text{Ad } \phi_j) \). It follows from (7.0.14), (7.0.15) that
\[ \sum_j \mathcal{E}_{p_3, \phi_j} = \sum_j \frac{h_{T,R}^{(3)}(\beta)}{L_j} \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} \frac{\lambda_{E_{p_3, \phi_j}}(L, s) \cdot \lambda_{E_{p_3, \phi_j}}(M, s)}{L(1 + 4s_1, \phi_j)^2} \cdot e^{\frac{j_{2R}}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^3 \left| \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + 4s_1 + \beta_j}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+4s_1+\beta_j}{2}\right)} \right|^4 \]
\[ \cdot \left(1 + |\beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 - 4s_1|\right) \left(1 + |\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \beta_3 + 4s_1|\right) \left(1 + |\beta_1 - \beta_2 + \beta_3 + 4s_1|\right) \frac{2\pi}{\lambda_{\phi}(c_1) \cdot c_1^{-3s_1}} \ll \left(\ell m\right)^{\frac{7}{5} + \epsilon} T^{2R} \sum_j \frac{h_{T,R}^{(3)}(\beta^{(j)})}{L_j} \int_{\text{Re}(s_1)=0} \frac{L(1 + 4s_1, \phi_j)}{L(1 + s_1, \phi_j)} \prod_{j=1}^3 \left| \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + 4s_1 + \beta_j}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+4s_1+\beta_j}{2}\right)} \right|^4 \, ds_1. \]

Using Stirling’s estimate for the Gamma-functions here, it easy to see that
\[ \prod_{j=1}^3 \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{2 + R + 4s_1 + \beta_j}{4}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1+4s_1+\beta_j}{2}\right)} \ll \prod_{j=1}^3 \left(1 + |4s_1 + 2\beta_j| \right)^R. \]

Combining this with the previous bounds and Theorem 7.0.3, we find that
\[ \mathcal{E}_{p_3, \phi} \ll \sum_j |\mathcal{E}_{p_3, \phi_j}| \ll \left(\ell m\right)^{\frac{7}{5} + \epsilon} T^{6+8R+\epsilon}. \]
Remark 7.0.17. As outlined in [Blo13], it should be possible to obtain bounds for the more general case of $L = (\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3)$ and $M = (m_1, m_2, m_3)$ using the relations for the $GL(4)$ Hecke operators.

APPENDIX A. Integral Bounds

Lemma A.0.1. Suppose that $e, f$ are real numbers. Then
\[
\int_{x=0}^{T} \frac{dx}{(1 + T - x)^e(1 + x)^f} \ll (1 + T)^{-\min\{e, f + f - 1\} + \varepsilon}
\]
as $T \to \infty$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$.

Proof. We consider the integrals
\[
\int_{x=0}^{T/2} (1 + T - x)^{-e}(1 + x)^{-f} \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{x=T/2}^{T} (1 + T - x)^{-e}(1 + x)^{-f} \, dx
\]
individually. Since
\[
\int_{x=1}^{T/2} x^{-f} \, dx \ll \begin{cases} T^{-f + 1} + 1 & \text{if } f \neq 1, \\ \log T + 1 & \text{if } f = 1, \end{cases}
\]
it follows in the case of $f \neq 1$ that
\[
\int_{x=0}^{T/2} (1 + T - x)^{-e}(1 + x)^{-f} \, dx \ll (1 + T)^{-e}(1 + (1 + T)^{-f + 1}).
\]
In like fashion, we find that if $e \neq 1$,
\[
\int_{x=T/2}^{T} (1 + T - x)^{-e}(1 + x)^{-f} \, dx \ll (1 + T)^{-e-f + 1} + (1 + T)^{-f}.
\]
Putting this together proves the result. In the case that $e = 1$ or $f = 1$, the logarithm contributes $T^\varepsilon$ as claimed. □

Lemma A.0.2. Assume $B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \cdots \leq B_k$. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$
\[
\int_{x=B_1}^{B_k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 + |x - B_j|)^{-\varepsilon_j} \ll (1 + B_k - B_1)^{\varepsilon} \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} (1 + B_{j+1} - B_j)^{-\min\{\varepsilon_j, \varepsilon_j + 1\}} \\
\cdot \prod_{i \neq j, j+1} (1 + |B_j^*(i) - B_i|)^{-\varepsilon_i},
\]

where

\[
B^*_j(i) := \begin{cases} 
B_j & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } e_i > 0, \\
B_{j+1} & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } e_i < 0, \\
B_{j+1} & \text{if } i > j + 1 \text{ and } e_i > 0, \\
B_j & \text{if } i > j + 1 \text{ and } e_i < 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Proof. First,

\[
\int_{x=B_{j+1}} B_k \leq \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \int_{x=B_j} B_{j+1}.
\]

For every \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, k - 1 \) we have

\[
\int_{B_j}^{B_{j+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 + |x - B_i|)^{-e_i} \, dx \ll \int_{B_j}^{B_{j+1}} (1 + x - B_j)^{-e_j} (1 + B_{j+1} - x)^{-e_{j+1}} \\
\cdot \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} (1 + x - B_i)^{-e_i} \prod_{\ell=j+2}^{k} (1 + B_i - x)^{-e_{\ell}} \, dx.
\]

For each of the terms with \( i < j \) and any \( B_j \leq x \leq B_{j+1} \),

\[
(1 + x - B_j)^{-e_i} \ll \begin{cases} (1 + B_j - B_i)^{-e_i} & \text{if } e_i > 0, \\
(1 + B_{j+1} - B_i)^{-e_i} & \text{otherwise.}
\end{cases}
\]

A similar bound holds for the terms with \( \ell > j + 1 \). So in order to complete the proof, we need the bound

\[
\int_{B_j}^{B_{j+1}} (1 + x - B_j)^{-e_j} (1 + B_{j+1} - x)^{-e_{j+1}} \, dx \ll (1 + B_k - B_1)^{\varepsilon} \left(1 + B_{j+1} - B_j\right)^{-\min \{e_j, e_{j+1}, e_j + e_{j+1} - 1\}}
\]

which follows from Lemma A.0.1 by a simple change of variables. \( \square \)

Lemma A.0.3. Assume \( B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \cdots \leq B_k \). Suppose that \( 1 \leq j_{\min} < j_{\max} \leq k \). Then for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
\int_{x=B_{j_{\min}}}^{B_{j_{\max}}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 + |x - B_j|)^{-e_j} \, dx \ll (1 + B_{j_{\max}} - B_{j_{\min}})^{\varepsilon} \\
\cdot \sum_{j=j_{\min}}^{j_{\max}-1} (1 + B_{j+1} - B_j)^{-\min \{e_j, e_{j+1}, e_j + e_{j+1} - 1\}} \prod_{i \neq j, j+1} (1 + |B^*_j(i) - B_i|)^{-e_i},
\]

where

\[
B^*_j(i) := \begin{cases} 
B_j & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } e_i > 0, \\
B_{j+1} & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } e_i < 0, \\
B_{j+1} & \text{if } i > j + 1 \text{ and } e_i > 0, \\
B_j & \text{if } i > j + 1 \text{ and } e_i < 0.
\end{cases}
\]
Proof. First,
\[
\int_{x=B_{j_{\text{min}}}}^{B_{j_{\text{max}}}} dx = \sum_{j=j_{\text{min}}}^{j_{\text{max}}-1} \int_{B_{j}}^{B_{j+1}} dx.
\]
For every \( j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1 \) we have
\[
\int_{B_{j}}^{B_{j+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{k} (1 + |x - B_i|)^{-e_i} dx \ll \int_{B_{j}}^{B_{j+1}} (1 + x - B_j)^{-e_j} (1 + B_{j+1} - x)^{-e_{j+1}}
\]
\[
\cdot \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} (1 + x - B_i)^{-e_i} \cdot \prod_{\ell = j+2}^{k} (1 + B_i - x)^{-e_{\ell}} dx.
\]
For each of the terms with \( i < j \) and any \( B_j \leq x \leq B_{j+1} \),
\[
(1 + x - B_i)^{-e_i} \ll \begin{cases} (1 + B_j - B_i)^{-e_i} & \text{if } e_i > 0, \\ (1 + B_{j+1} - B_i)^{-e_i} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\]
A similar bound holds for the terms with \( \ell > j + 1 \). So in order to complete the proof, we need the bound
\[
\int_{B_{j}}^{B_{j+1}} (1 + x - B_j)^{-e_j} (1 + B_{j+1} - x)^{-e_{j+1}} \ll (1 + B_k - B_i)^{\varepsilon} (1 + B_{j+1} - B_j)^{-\min \{e_j, e_{j+1}, e_j + e_{j+1} - 1\}},
\]
which follows from Lemma [A.0.1] by a simple change of variables. \( \square \)

APPENDIX B. Kloosterman sums on GL(4)
by Binrong Huang

B.1. Introduction. The classical Kloosterman sum is given by
\[
S(m, n; c) = \sum_{d \text{ (mod } c)}^{*} e \left( \frac{md + nd\bar{d}}{c} \right),
\]
where \( dd \equiv 1 \text{ (mod } c) \) and \( e(x) = e^{2\pi ix} \), which arises when one computes the Fourier expansion of the GL(2) Poincaré series. Weil [Wei48] obtained the algebro-geometric estimate
\[
|S(m, n; c)| \leq \gcd(m, n, c)^{1/2} \varepsilon^{1/2} \tau(c),
\]
where \( \tau(\cdot) \) is the divisor function. Bump, Friedberg and Goldfeld [BFG88] introduced Poincaré series for GL(n), \( n \geq 2 \), and showed in the case \( n = 3 \) that certain “GL(3) Kloosterman sums” arise in the Fourier expansion. Friedberg [Fri87] and Stevens [Ste87] extended this result to all \( n \), studying GL(n) Poincaré series and their related GL(n) Kloosterman sums, from the classical and adelic points of view respectively. Friedberg, following the work of Larsen (\( n = 3 \) [BFG88], obtained upper bounds for GL(n) in certain cases. Stevens [Ste87] gave a nontrivial estimate for the GL(3) Kloosterman sum corresponding to the long element of the Weyl group. By their results, we get nontrivial upper bounds for all GL(3) Kloosterman sums.
In this appendix, we consider all $\text{GL}(4)$ Kloosterman sums. We will write $\mathbb{Q}_p$ for the completion of $\mathbb{Q}$ at a place $p$ and write $\mathbb{A}$ for the adeles of $\mathbb{Q}$. Let $G = \text{GL}(4)$. Let $W$ be the Weyl group of $G$. Let $U = \{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & * & * & * \\ 0 & 1 & * & * \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \}$ be the standard unipotent group and let

$$U_w = (w^{-1} \cdot U \cdot w) \cap U, \quad \bar{U}_w = (w^{-1} \cdot tU \cdot w) \cap U, \quad w \in W.$$ 

Let $c_1, \ldots, c_3$ be non-zero integers, and set

$$c = \text{diag}(1/c_3, c_3/c_2, c_2/c_1).$$

Following Stevens [Ste87, §2], we define

$$C(cw) := U(\mathbb{Q}_p)cwU(\mathbb{Q}_p) \cap G(\mathbb{Z}_p), \quad X(cw) := U(\mathbb{Z}_p)\backslash C(cw)/\bar{U}_w(\mathbb{Z}_p).$$

By the Bruhat decomposition we have natural maps

$$u : X(cw) \to U(\mathbb{Z}_p)\backslash U(\mathbb{Q}_p), \quad u' : X(cw) \to \bar{U}_w(\mathbb{Q}_p)/\bar{U}_w(\mathbb{Z}_p),$$

defined by the relation $x = u(x)cwu'(x)$ for $x \in X(cw)$. Let $\psi : U(\mathbb{A})/U(\mathbb{Q}) \to \mathbb{C}^*$ be a character of $U(\mathbb{A})$ which is trivial on $U(\mathbb{Q})$. Every such character has the form $\psi = \psi_n$ for some $n = (n_1, n_2, n_3) \in \mathbb{Q}^3$ where $\psi_n$ is given by

$$\psi_n \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x_1 & * & * \\ 0 & 1 & x_2 & * \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & x_3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \xi(n_1x_1 + n_2x_2 + n_3x_3)$$

and $\xi : \mathbb{A} \to \mathbb{C}^*$ is the standard additive character. We can write $\psi = \prod_p \psi_p$ where $\psi_p$ is a character of $U(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ which is trivial on $U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. The local Kloosterman sum is defined by

$$Kl_p(\psi_p, \psi'_p; c, w) = \sum_{x \in X(cw)} \psi_p(u(x)) \cdot \psi'_p(u'(x)).$$

The global Kloosterman sum is defined by $Kl(\psi, \psi'; c, w) = \prod_p Kl_p(\psi_p, \psi'_p; c, w)$. Our main results for $Kl(\psi_m, \psi_m'; c, w)$ are in the following table.

It was shown in Friedberg [Fri87, §1] that the Kloosterman sums are non-zero only if $w \in W$ is of the form $w = \begin{pmatrix} I_{k_1} \\ & I_{k_2} \\ & & \ddots \\ & & & I_{k_r} \end{pmatrix}$, where the $I_k$ are $k \times k$ identity matrices and $k_1 + \cdots + k_r = n$ (may have some minus sign to make its determinant 1).

For the case $w = w_1$, we have $Kl(\psi_m, \psi_m; c, w_1) = \delta_{c_1,1} \delta_{c_2,1} \delta_{c_3,1} \delta_{m,n_1} \delta_{m_2,n_2} \delta_{m_3,n_3}$, where $\delta_{m,n} = 1$ if $m = n$, and $\delta_{m,n} = 0$ otherwise.

For the case $w = w_2$ or $w_3$, Friedberg [Fri87] gave some very nice bounds for $\text{GL}(n)$ Kloosterman sums attached to $w = (I_{n-1} \pm 1)$. For $n = 3$, this is due to Larsen, see [BFG88, Appendix]. Then Friedberg [Fri87, §4] generalized it to all $n$. In some applications, we may need to give a bound with power saving in terms of all $c_1, c_2, c_3$. One can modify Friedberg’s proof to give such a bound in the case $n = 4$. Note that the main situation is when $c_j = p^{ja}$, $a \geq 1$, $1 \leq j \leq 3$, in which case $(c_1c_2c_3)^{3/4}$ agrees with $c_j^{9/2j}$ in [Fri87]. In the proof, we need Deligne’s deep theorems from algebraic geometry [Del77]. For the case $w = w_3$, one can use the involution operator $\iota : g \mapsto w_8^t g^{-1}w_8$ to get the result.

By [DR98, Theorem 0.3 (i)], we have the “trivial” bound

$$Kl(\psi, \psi'; c, w) \leq \#X(cw) \leq c_1c_2c_3.$$
Main results for GL(4) Kloosterman sums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weyl element</th>
<th>Compatibility conditions</th>
<th>Upper bounds of the Kloosterman sum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$w_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$m_1 = n_1$, $m_2 = n_2$, $m_3 = n_3$; $c_1 = c_2 = c_3 = 1$</td>
<td>$\delta_{c_1,1}\delta_{c_2,1}\delta_{c_3,1}\delta_{m_1,n_1}\delta_{m_2,n_2}\delta_{m_3,n_3}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; -1 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$n_1 = \frac{c_1m_2}{c_2^2}$, $n_2 = \frac{c_2m_1}{c_1}$; $c_1</td>
<td>c_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; 1 \ -1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$n_1 = \frac{c_1m_2}{c_2^2}$, $n_2 = \frac{c_2m_1}{c_1}$; $c_3</td>
<td>c_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_4 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$n_1 = \frac{m_2c_1}{c_2}$, $n_3 = \frac{m_1c_2}{c_3}$; $c_1</td>
<td>c_2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_5 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$n_2 = \frac{c_1m_2}{c_2}$</td>
<td>$c_1c_2c_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_6 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; -1 \ -1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$n_3 = \frac{c_2m_1}{c_3}$; $c_3</td>
<td>c_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_7 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; -1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td>$n_1 = \frac{c_2m_1}{c_3}$; $c_1</td>
<td>c_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w_8 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 &amp; 1 \ 1 &amp; 1 \end{pmatrix}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\bullet$ $\tau(c_1c_2c_3)^{\frac{m_1}{2}}(m_1n_3, [c_1, c_2, c_3])^{1/2} \cdot (m_2n_2, [c_1, c_2, c_3])^{1/2}(m_1n_1, [c_1, c_2, c_3])^{1/2}$ $\cdot \min \left{ \left[ [c_1, c_3]^{1/2}(c_1, c_2c_3), c_1c_3(c_1, c_2c_3)^{1/2} \right] \right}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We use this for $w = w_j$, with $4 \leq j \leq 7$. In fact, this kind of bound holds for a general Kloosterman sum.

B.2. Stevens’ approach. In this section, we follow Stevens’ approach [Ste87] to bound the GL(4) long element Kloosterman sums. For $w \in W$, we define $w(j), j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ by the formula

$$w \cdot e_j = \pm e_{w(j)},$$

where $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4$ is the standard basis of column vectors. Let $\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3, \nu'_1, \nu'_2, \nu'_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and define the characters $\psi, \psi'$ of $U(\mathbb{Q}_p)/U(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ by

$$\psi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & u_1 & * & * \\ 1 & u_2 & * & * \\ 1 & u_3 & * & * \end{pmatrix}\right) = \xi(\nu_1u_1 + \nu_2u_2 + \nu_3u_3), \quad \psi'\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & u_1 & * & * \\ 1 & u_2 & * & * \\ 1 & u_3 & * & * \end{pmatrix}\right) = \xi(\nu'_1u_1 + \nu'_2u_2 + \nu'_3u_3).$$

Fix

$$c = \text{diag}(p^{-t}, p^{t-r}, p^{r-s}, p^{s}).$$

We will use the same notation as in Stevens [Ste87], §4. And we need Definition 4.9 and Theorem 4.10 in [Ste87]. Note that $n$ in [Ste87] will be our $cw$.

Our main result in this appendix is the following theorem.
Then element $w_s$, we have

\begin{equation}
C_s = 64(|\nu_1\nu_3|^{-1}, p^t)^{1/2}(|\nu_2\nu_4|^{-1}, p^t)^{1/2}(|\nu_3\nu_4|^{-1}, p^t)^{1/2}(q+1)(r+1)^2(\sigma+1)^2.
\end{equation}

Then

\begin{equation}
|KL_p(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)| \leq C_s \min(p^{r+\sigma+\varepsilon/2}, p^{\sigma+2\sigma+r/2}).
\end{equation}

In particular, we have $|KL_p(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)| \leq Csp^{q(t+r)/10}$. Suppose we are given $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$ and nonnegative integers $a, b, c, d, e, f$ satisfying

\begin{equation}
a \leq s, \quad d \leq s, \quad e = s, \quad f \leq r, \quad b + c \leq \max(t, f);
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
x = -\gamma p^{-f} \in \mathbb{Z}_p,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
y = p^f(\beta p^{-s} - \gamma p^{-a-f}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
z = p^f(\gamma p^{-f} - p^{-b-c}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p;
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\lambda = p^r(\beta p^{-b-s} - \alpha p^{-d-f}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times,
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\mu = p^f(\gamma p^{-a-f} + \alpha p^{-d-c} - p^{-a-b-c} - \beta p^{-s}) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times.
\end{equation}

Hence, by $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, we have

\begin{equation}
b \leq r, \quad a + f \leq \max(r, s).
\end{equation}

Then there is an element $x_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma} \in X(cw_s)$ for which

\begin{equation}
u'(x_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & p^{-a} \alpha p^{-d} & \beta p^{-s} \\ 1 & p^{-b} & \gamma p^{-f} \\ 1 & p^{-c} & 1 \end{pmatrix} (\text{mod } U(\mathbb{Z}_p)).
\end{equation}

Indeed, we have the matrix identity

\begin{equation}
\begin{pmatrix} \mu^{-1} \\ z\lambda^{-1} & \mu\lambda^{-1} \\ x^{-1} & y^{-1} & \lambda^{-1} \beta^{-1} \\ p^s & p^{s-a} & \alpha p^{s-d} & \beta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & u_1 & u_4 \\ 1 & u_2 & u_5 \\ 1 & u_3 & 1 \end{pmatrix} cw_s \begin{pmatrix} 1 & p^{-a} \alpha p^{-d} & \beta p^{-s} \\ 1 & p^{-b} & \gamma p^{-f} \\ 1 & p^{-c} & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\end{equation}

where

\begin{equation}
\begin{aligned}
u_4 &= \mu^{-1}p^{r-t}(p^{-a-b} - \alpha p^{-d}), \\
u_5 &= -\mu^{-1}p^{s-r-a}, \\
u_6 &= \lambda^{-1}p^{r-s-f},
\end{aligned}
\end{equation}

Write (B.2.10) as $g = ucw_su'$. Then we have

\begin{equation}
g' = w_s t g^{-1} w_s = \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha^{-1}p^{s-d} \\ (\alpha p^{s-d} - p^{-a-b})^{-1} \\ p^t \end{pmatrix},
\end{equation}

and its Bruhat decomposition is

\begin{equation}
\begin{pmatrix} 1 & -u_1 & * \\ 1 & -u_2 & * \\ 1 & -u_3 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} p^{-s} & * \\ * & p^{s-r} \\ * & p^{r-t} \end{pmatrix} w_s \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -p^{-c} & * \\ 1 & -p^{-b} & * \\ 1 & -p^{-a} & 1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{equation}

Note that here we use $c$ in two meanings, one for a matrix, and another for a nonnegative integers. However one can easily determine what does it mean in the context.
Since \( g \in X(cw_8) \), we have \( g^t \in X((cw_8)^t) \subseteq G(\mathbb{Z}_p) \), hence
\[
(B.2.12) \quad c \leq t, \quad a + b \leq \max(r, d), \quad \alpha p^{-d} - p^{r-a-b} \in \mathbb{Z}_p.
\]

Let \( \psi, \psi' \) be characters of \( U(\mathbb{Q}_p)/U(\mathbb{Z}_p) \). For \( a, b, c, d, f, \alpha, \beta, \gamma \) satisfying \( (B.2.5)-(B.2.8) \) and \( (B.2.12) \), let \( X_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(cw_8) = T(\mathbb{Z}_p) * x_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma} \) be the orbit through \( x_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma} \), and let
\[
S_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8) = \sum_{x \in X_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(cw_8)} \psi(u(x)) \psi'(u'(x))
\]
be the Kloosterman sum restricted to this orbit. For \( a, b, c \) satisfying \( (B.2.5), (B.2.8) \) and \( (B.2.12) \), let \( X_{a,b,c}(cw_8) = \bigcup_{d, f, \alpha, \beta, \gamma} X_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(cw_8) \), where \( d, f \) run over nonnegative integers, and \( \alpha, \beta, \gamma \) run over the elements of \( \mathbb{Z}_p^* \) satisfying \( (B.2.5)-(B.2.7) \). Let
\[
S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8) = \sum_{x \in X_{a,b,c}(cw_8)} \psi(u(x)) \psi'(u'(x)).
\]

**Lemma B.2.13.** We have \( X(cw_8) = \prod_{a,b,c} X_{a,b,c}(cw_8) \), where \( a, b, c \geq 0 \) run over integers satisfying \( (B.2.5), (B.2.8), \) and \( (B.2.12) \).

**Proof.** See Stevens [Ste87, Lemmas 5.2 and 5.7]. \( \square \)

**Lemma B.2.14.** Let \( \ell = \max(s, r, t) \), and \( a \leq s, \ b \leq r, \ c \leq t \) be nonnegative integers. Then
\[
|S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8)| \leq 64(|\nu_1^\ell|^{-1} p^{\ell^2/3} p^{\ell^2/6} |\nu_3^\ell|^{-1} p^{\ell^2/6} |\nu_1^\ell|^{-1} p^{\ell^2/3} p^{-a-b-c} \#(X_{a,b,c}(cw_8))).
\]

**Proof.** The involution \( \iota \) sends \( X_{a,b,c}(cw_8) \) to \( X_{c,a,b}(((cw_8)^t)). \) Composing \( \psi \) and \( \psi' \) with \( \iota \) has the effect of replacing \( (\nu_1, \nu_2, \nu_3) \) by \( (-\nu_3, -\nu_2, -\nu_1) \) and \( (\nu_1', \nu_2', \nu_3') \) by \( (-\nu_3', -\nu_2', -\nu_1') \). Applying \( \iota \) to \( cw_8 \) reverses the roles of \( t \) and \( s \). Thus we may assume \( t \geq s \) without loss of generality.

Let \( \ell = \max(r, t) \). The conditions \( (B.2.5)-(B.2.8) \) and \( (B.2.12) \) imply that the matrix entries of \( u(x) \) and \( u'(x) \) lie in \( p^{-\ell}\mathbb{Z}_p/\mathbb{Z}_p \) for every \( x \in X(cw_8) \). Indeed, by Lemma \( B.2.13 \) it is enough to verify this for \( x = x_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma} \). Note that \( \mu = p^{-\ell}s^f(\alpha p^{s-d-c} - \beta) + p^{-a}p^f(\gamma p^{f-r} - p^{-b-c}) = p^{-\ell}\lambda u_2 p^r + p^{-a}z \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\ell \). We have \( u_2 \in p^{-r}\mathbb{Z}_p \). The claim is now easily verified.

Now let \( S \) be a finite subset of \( \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times (\mathbb{Z}_p^*)^3 \) such that \( X_{a,b,c}(cw_8) \) is the disjoint union of the \( X_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(cw_8) \) with \( (d, f, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in S \). Then as in [Ste87 Th. 4.10] we have
\[
(B.2.15) \quad S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8) = p^{-3}(1 - p^{-1})^{-3} \sum_{(d, f, \alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in S} \#(X_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(cw_8)) S_{w_8}(\theta_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}; \ell),
\]
where \( S_{w_8} \) is defined in [Ste87 Def. 4.9], and \( \theta_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma} : A_{w_8}(\ell) \to \mathbb{C}^\times \) is the character given by
\[
\theta_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}(\Delta \times \Lambda') = e \left( (\nu_1 u_1 \lambda_1 + \nu_2 u_2 \lambda_2 + \nu_3 u_3 \lambda_3 + \nu_1' p^{-a} \lambda_1' + \nu_2' p^{-b} \lambda_2' + \nu_3' p^{-c} \lambda_3') \right)
\]
By Example 4.12 in Stevens [Ste87], we have

(B.2.16)
\[ S_{w_8}(\theta_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}; \ell) = S_2(\nu_1\mu^{-1} p^{t-r-t}(p^{-a-b} - \alpha p^{-d}), \nu_1' p^{f-c}; p) \]
\[ \cdot S_2(\nu_2\lambda^{-1} p^{t+r-r}(\alpha p^{c-d} - \beta), \nu_2' p^{f-b}; p) \cdot S_2(-\nu_3\beta^{-1} \gamma p^{r-s-f}, \nu_3' p^{f-a}; p), \]
where \( S_2 \) is the classical GL(2)-Kloosterman sum. By Weil [Wei48], we have the inequality

(B.2.17)
\[ |S_2(m, n; p^f)| \leq 2(\gcd(|m|^{-1}, |n|^{-1}, |p|^{-1}))/p^{f/2}, \]
for \( m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_p \). In order to apply this bound, we first note
\[ \gcd(|\nu_3 p^{f+r-s-f}|^{-1}, |\nu_1' p^{f-a}|^{-1}, |p^f|) \leq \gcd(|\nu_3' p^{-1}, |p| p^{f-a}), \]
\[ \gcd(|\nu_2 p^{f+t-t}(\alpha p^{c-d} - \beta)|^{-1}, |\nu_2' p^{f-b}|^{-1}, |p^f|) \leq \gcd(|\nu_2' p^{-1}, |p| p^{f-b}), \]
\[ \gcd(|\nu_1 p^{f+r-t}(p^{-a-b} - \alpha p^{-d})|^{-1}, |\nu_3' p^{f-c}|^{-1}, |p^f|) \leq \gcd(|\nu_1' p^{-1}, |p| p^{f-c}). \]

Hence we have
\[ |S_{w_8}(\theta_{a,b,c}^{d,f,\alpha,\beta,\gamma}; \ell)| \leq 8(|\nu_1' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}(\nu_2' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}(\nu_3' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}p^{3t-a+b+c}. \]

This inequality, together with (B.2.15), gives
\[ |S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8)| \leq 8(|\nu_1' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}(\nu_2' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}(\nu_3' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2} \]
\[ \cdot (1 - p^{-1})^{-3} p^{-\frac{a+b+c}{2}} \sum_{(d,f,a',\beta',c) \in S} \#(X_{a,b,c}^{d,f,a,b,\gamma}(cw_8)). \]

The sum appearing on the right hand side is equal to \( \#(X_{a,b,c}(cw_8)) \). Since \( p \geq 2 \) we have \( (1 - p^{-1})^{-3} \leq 8 \), by (B.2.18), we prove the lemma. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem B.2.3**

By the involution \( \iota \), we can assume \( t \geq s \) without loss of generality. Let
\[ C = 64(|\nu_1' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}(\nu_2' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}(\nu_3' p^{-1}, |p^f|)^{1/2}(r+1)(s+1). \]
At first, we deal with the case \( t \geq r \).

- If \( a + b + c \leq t \) and \( d + f \leq r \), then \( \#(d, f) \leq (s+1)(r+1) \), \( \#(\alpha, \gamma, \beta) \leq p^{d+s+f} \), so
  \[ \#(X_{a,b,c}(cw_8)) \leq (r+1)(s+1)p^{a+b+c+d+f+s} \leq (r+1)(s+1)p^{r+s+a+b+c}. \]
  Hence by Lemma B.2.14 we have \( |S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8)| \leq C p^{r+s+f+t/2}. \)

- If \( a + b + c \leq t \) and \( d + f > r \), then we assume that \( d + f = r + k, k \geq 1 \). Note that \( d \leq s, f \leq r \), we have \( k \leq s \). By (B.2.7), we have \( b+s = d+f = r+k \). Since \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times \), we have \( \#((\alpha, \gamma, \beta)) \leq p^{d+f+(s-k)} = p^{r+s} \). Hence
  \[ |S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8)| \leq C p^{r+s} \leq C p^{r+s+t/2}. \]

- If \( a + b + c > t \) and \( d + f \leq r \), then by (B.2.7) and a similar argument as above, we have \( \#((\alpha, \gamma, \beta)) \leq p^{d-m+f+s} \). Hence
  \[ |S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8)| \leq C p^{d-m+f+s+a+b+c} \leq C p^{r+s+t/2}. \]

- If \( a + b + c > t \) and \( d + f > r \), then we have \( \#((\alpha, \gamma, \beta)) \leq p^{d-m+f+(s-k)} \). Hence
  \[ |S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_8)| \leq C p^{d-m+f+s-k+a+b+c} \leq C p^{r+s+t/2}. \]
Proposition C.0.1. (1) The Mellin transform $\mathcal{M}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)$ in equations (4.2.1), (4.2.2), and (4.2.3) above – are demonstrated.

Now we handle the case $r > t$. By a similar argument as above, we obtain

$$|S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)| \leq Cp^{r+s+t/2}.$$ 

If $t$ is small, this bound is not good enough. So we need to bound this in other way.

- If $f > t$, then by (B.2.6), we have $b + c = f$, and $a + f \leq r$. By (B.2.7), we have $\#(\alpha, \gamma) \leq p^{d+f-(a+f-t)}$. If $d + f \leq r$, then we have

$$|S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)| \leq Cp^{d+f-(a+f-t)+s+8\alpha+8\sigma} \leq Cp^{t+s+d+8\alpha+8\sigma} \leq Cp^{t+s+4d+8\alpha} \leq Cp^{t+3s/2+r/2}.$$ 

- If $f > t$ and $d + f > r$, then by writing $d + f = r + k$, $1 \leq k \leq s$, we have

$$|S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)| \leq Cp^{d+f-(a+f-t)+s-k+8\alpha+8\sigma} \leq Cp^{t+s+4d+8\alpha+8\sigma-k} \leq Cp^{t+3s/2+r/2}.$$ 

- If $f \leq t$ and $a + b + c > r$. Since $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_p^\times$, we have $\#(\alpha, \gamma) \leq p^{d+f-(a+b+c-t)}$. Then by the same argument on the size of $d + f$, we have

$$|S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)| \leq Cp^{r+t+s+8\alpha+8\sigma} \leq Cp^{t+r+s/2}.$$ 

- If $f \leq t$, and $a + b + c \leq r$, then we have

$$|S_{a,b,c}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)| \leq Cp^{d+f+s+8\alpha+8\sigma} \leq Cp^{t+2s+r/2}.$$ 

This proves (B.2.4).

We now give a proof of the second claim. If $r + \sigma + \varrho/2 \leq \varrho + 2\sigma + r/2$, i.e., $r \leq \varrho + 2\sigma$, then $\sigma + r \leq 4\varrho$, so $r + \sigma + \varrho/2 \leq 9(\varrho + r + \sigma)/10$. If $r + \sigma + \varrho/2 > \varrho + 2\sigma + r/2$, i.e., $r > \varrho + 2\sigma$, then $9\sigma < 3\varrho$ and $\varrho + 11\sigma < 4r$, so $\varrho + 2\sigma + r/2 < 9(\varrho + r + \sigma)/10$. This proves $\min(p^{r+\varrho/2}, p^{\varrho+2\sigma+r/2}) \leq p^{9t+r+s}/10$, as claimed, and hence Theorem B.2.3.

Remark B.2.19. The result is not optimal. To improve the bound in some cases, one may use the stationary phase formulas as Dabrowski and Fisher did for GL(3), see [DF97].

Remark B.2.20. Stevens’ method can be used to bound other Kloosterman sums as well. It’s not too hard to prove bounds similar to (B.1.1). But to improve these “trivial” bounds, one may need new ideas.
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Appendix C. Poles and residues of the GL(4, $\mathbb{R}$) Mellin transform of the Whittaker function

In [ST] Propositions 9 and 10], the following results – which generalize the formulas given in equations (4.2.1), (4.2.2), and (4.2.3) above – are demonstrated.

Proposition C.0.1. (1) The Mellin transform $\mathcal{M}(\psi, \psi'; c, w_s)$ extends to a meromorphic function of the variable $(s_1, s_2, s_3) \in \mathbb{C}^3$, with poles at

$$s_1 = -\alpha_k - 2\delta_1 \quad (k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \delta_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0});$$
$$s_2 = -\alpha_j - \alpha_k - 2\delta_2 \quad (j, k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, j \neq k, \delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0});$$
$$s_3 = -\alpha_k - 2\delta_3 \quad (k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \delta_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}).$$
and no other poles or polar divisors in $\mathbb{C}^3$.

(2) Specifically, for each $\delta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there exists a polynomial $p_{\delta}(b, c, d; e, f, g)$, of degree at most $3\delta$, such that the following are true.

\begin{equation}
\text{Res}_{s_1=-\alpha_1-2\delta_1} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{\alpha_1+\alpha_4}{2})} \left[ \prod_{k=2}^{4} \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_k-\alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1) \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_2+\alpha_4+\alpha_k}{2}) \right] \times p_{\delta_1} \left( \frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_4}{2}, \frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_3}{2}, \frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{1 + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{s_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2} - \delta_1, \frac{s_2 + s_3 + \alpha_1}{2} \right),
\end{equation}

\begin{equation}
\text{Res}_{s_2=-\alpha_1-\delta_2} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \left[ \prod_{j \in \{1,4\}} \Gamma(\frac{s_1+\alpha_j}{2}) \right] \left[ \prod_{k \in \{2\}} \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_2}{2}) \prod_{j \in \{1,4\}} \Gamma(\frac{s_3-\alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2) \right] \times p_{\delta_2} \left( \frac{s_1 + \alpha_1}{2}, \frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2, \frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{1 + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{s_1 + \alpha_3}{2} - \delta_2, \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2 \right),
\end{equation}

and

\begin{equation}
\text{Res}_{s_3=\alpha_1-2\delta_3} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\frac{s_1+\alpha_4}{2} - \delta_3)} \left[ \prod_{k=2}^{4} \Gamma(\frac{\alpha_k-\alpha_1}{2} - \delta_3) \Gamma(\frac{s_1+\alpha_k}{2}) \Gamma(\frac{s_2-\alpha_1-\alpha_k}{2}) \right] \times p_{\delta_3} \left( \frac{s_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_4}{2}, \frac{s_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_3}{2}, \frac{s_1 + \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{1 - \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{s_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2}{2} - \delta_3, \frac{s_1 + s_2 - \alpha_1}{2} \right).
\end{equation}

Moreover, the polynomial $p_{\delta}(b, c, d; e, f, g)$ has the following property: if $b$, $c$ or $d$ equals $-\gamma$ for some integer $\gamma$ with $0 \leq \gamma \leq \delta$, then $p_{\delta}(b, c, d; e, f, g)$ is divisible by the polynomial

\[(e + \gamma)^{\delta-\gamma}(f + \gamma)^{\delta-\gamma}(g + \gamma)^{\delta-\gamma} = \prod_{j=0}^{\delta-1} (e + \gamma + j)(f + \gamma + j)(g + \gamma + j) = \frac{\Gamma(e + \delta)\Gamma(f + \delta)\Gamma(g + \delta)}{\Gamma(e + \gamma)\Gamma(f + \gamma)\Gamma(g + \gamma)}.
\]

Remark C.0.5. Strictly speaking, part (2) of the above proposition was proved in [ST] only for the cases $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in \{0, 1\}$. But the result can readily be extended to more general $\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, using the recurrence relations for $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$ given in Section 3 of that same reference.

In Section 5.5 above, we need to consider double residues of $\tilde{W}_\alpha(s)$ – that is, residues in any one of the three $s_j$’s of residues in either of the others. To this end, the following may be deduced readily from Proposition C.0.1 above.
Proposition C.0.6. (a) For each \( \delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), there is a polynomial \( f_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(s_3, \alpha) \), of degree at most \( 2\delta_1 + \delta_2 \), such that
\[
\text{Res}_{s_2 = -\alpha_1 - \alpha_4 - 2\delta_2} \left( \text{Res}_{s_1 = -\alpha_1 - 2\delta_1} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \right)
= \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_4 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1 \right) \prod_{k=2}^{3} \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1 \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2 \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_k}{2} \right) f_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(s_3, \alpha).
\]
(b) For each \( \delta_1, \delta_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), there is a polynomial \( g_{\delta_1, \delta_3}(s_2, \alpha) \), of degree at most \( 2\delta_1 + \delta_3 \), such that
\[
\text{Res}_{s_3 = \alpha_2 - 2\delta_3} \left( \text{Res}_{s_1 = -\alpha_1 - 2\delta_1} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \right)
= \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1 \right) \prod_{k=3}^{4} \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1 \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_2 - \alpha_k}{2} - \delta_3 \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_k}{2} \right) g_{\delta_1, \delta_3}(s_2, \alpha).
\]

Proof. We prove only part (a); the proof of part (b) is quite similar.
By (C.0.2) we have, for \( \delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \),
\[
\text{Res}_{s_2 = -\alpha_1 - \alpha_4 - 2\delta_2} \left( \text{Res}_{s_1 = -\alpha_1 - 2\delta_1} \tilde{W}_\alpha(s) \right)
= \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_4 - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1 \right) \prod_{k=2}^{3} \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_1}{2} - \delta_1 \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2 \right) \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_k}{2} \right) \cdot \left\{ \frac{(-1)^{\delta_2} \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \right)}{\delta_2! \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} + \delta_1 - \delta_2 \right)} \right\} \times p_{\delta_1} \left( -\delta_2, \frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_4}{2} - \alpha_2, \frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{1 + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{-\alpha_1 + \alpha_3}{2} - \delta_1 - \delta_2, \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2 \right).
\]
Now write \( f_{\delta_1, \delta_2}(s_3, \alpha) \) for the quantity in curly braces in (C.0.9). We consider two cases: (i) \( \delta_1 - \delta_2 \leq 0 \), and (ii) \( \delta_1 - \delta_2 > 0 \). In the first case, we have
\[
\frac{\Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \right)}{\Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} + \delta_1 - \delta_2 \right)} \cdot \left\{ \frac{(-1)^{\delta_2} \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \right)}{\delta_2! \Gamma\left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} + \delta_1 - \delta_2 \right)} \right\} \times p_{\delta_1} \left( -\delta_2, \frac{\alpha_3 - \alpha_4}{2} - \alpha_2, \frac{s_3 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{1 + \alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2}, \frac{-\alpha_1 + \alpha_3}{2} - \delta_1 - \delta_2, \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} - \delta_2 \right)
\]
and the denominator is a polynomial of degree \( \delta_1 - \delta_2 \). But by Proposition C.0.6(b), the polynomial inside curly braces in (C.0.9) is divisible by \( \left( \frac{s_3 - \alpha_4}{2} \right)_{\delta_1 - \delta_2} \); the quotient has degree at most \( 3\delta_1 - (\delta_1 - \delta_2) = 2\delta_1 + \delta_2 \). So again the desired result follows. \[\square\]
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