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ABSTRACT. We establish results of Bombieri–Vinogradov type for the von Mangoldt function \( \Lambda(n) \) twisted by a nilsequence. In particular, we obtain Bombieri–Vinogradov type results for the von Mangoldt function twisted by any polynomial phase \( e(P(n)) \); the results obtained are as strong as the ones previously known in the case of linear exponential twists. We derive a number of applications of these results. Firstly, we show that the primes \( p \) obeying a “nil-Bohr set” condition, such as \( \|\alpha p^k\| < \varepsilon \), exhibit bounded gaps. Secondly, we show that the Chen primes are well-distributed in nil-Bohr sets, generalizing a result of Matomäki. Thirdly, we generalize the Green–Tao result on linear equations in the primes to primes belonging to an arithmetic progression to large modulus \( q \leq x^\theta \), for almost all \( q \).

1 INTRODUCTION

The celebrated Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem states that

\[
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \equiv c \pmod{d}} \Lambda(n) \right| \ll A, \varepsilon \frac{x}{\varphi(d)} \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},
\]

thus proving equidistribution of the von Mangoldt function in all residue classes to almost all moduli \( d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon} \). The \( x^{1/2-\varepsilon} \) threshold can further be improved to \( x^{1/2}/(\log x)^B \) for suitable \( B = B(A) \), but either with or without this improvement the conclusion can be stated as saying that the primes have level of distribution \( 1/2 \).

It is natural to study whether other sequences related to the primes or various arithmetic functions also satisfy bounds of Bombieri–Vinogradov type. For 1-bounded multiplicative functions, Bombieri–Vinogradov type estimates were proved in \cite{12,11}, and there are a number of works on the level of distribution of the \( k \)-fold divisor functions \( d_k(n) \) \cite{9,10,19} and of the smooth numbers \cite{6,18}.

Our object in this paper is to obtain level of distribution results for another natural class of functions, namely twists \( \Lambda(n)e(P(n)) \) of the von Mangoldt function by polynomial phases and, more generally, nilsequences. There has been previous work on the case of linear polynomials \( P \); we recall these results later in this introduction. Let us first present the necessary definitions for stating our main theorems; in Section \( 2 \) we present their applications.

1.1 Results for nilsequence twists

In order to state our results for nilsequence twists, we need a few definitions. The results for polynomial phases will be deduced as special cases in Subsection \( 1.2 \); and they do not require knowledge of nilsequences. For an in-depth discussion of nilsequences and their importance in additive combinatorics, see \cite{30}.

**Definition 1.1** (Nilsequences). Let \( G \) be a connected, simply-connected nilpotent Lie group, and let \( \Gamma \leq G \) be a lattice. By a filtration \( G_\bullet = (G_i)_{i=0}^\infty \) on \( G \), we mean an infinite
sequence of subgroups of $G$ (which are also connected, simply-connected nilpotent Lie groups) such that

$$G = G_0 = G_1 \supset G_2 \supset \cdots$$

and such that the commutators satisfy $[G_i, G_j] \subset G_{i+j}$, and with the additional properties that $\Gamma_i := \Gamma \cap G_i$ is a lattice in $G_i$ for $i \geq 0$ and $G_{s+1} = \{\text{id}\}$ for some $s$.

The least such $s$ is called the degree of $G_\bullet$.

A polynomial sequence on $G$ (adapted to the filtration $G_\bullet$) is any sequence $g : \mathbb{Z} \to G$ satisfying the derivative condition

$$\partial_{h_1} \cdots \partial_{h_k} g(n) \in G_k$$

for all $k \geq 0$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and all $h_1, \ldots, h_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $\partial_h g(n) := g(n + h)g(n)^{-1}$ is the discrete derivative with shift $h$.

Finally, if $\varphi : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ is Lipschitz with respect to a natural metric on $G/\Gamma$ (induced by a Mal’cev basis; see definition below), we call a sequence of the form $n \mapsto \varphi(g(n)\Gamma)$ a nilsequence.

Since nilsequences are a vast class of functions, it is natural to restrict to those that have “bounded complexity”. This is made precise in the following definition.

**Definition 1.2** (Bounded complexity nilsequences). For a positive integer $s$ and real numbers $\Delta, K \geq 2$, we define $\Psi_s(\Delta, K)$ to be the class of all nilsequences $\psi : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$ of the form $\psi(n) = \varphi(g(n)\Gamma)$, where

1. $G/\Gamma$ is a nilmanifold of dimension at most $\Delta$, equipped with a filtration $G_\bullet$ of degree at most $s$ and a $K$-rational Mal’cev basis $\mathcal{X}$ (defined in [16, Definition 2.1, Definition 2.4]);
2. $g : \mathbb{Z} \to G$ is a polynomial sequence adapted to $G_\bullet$;
3. $\varphi : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ is a Lipschitz function with $\|\varphi\|_{\text{Lip}(\mathcal{X})} \leq 1$ (the Lipschitz norm is defined in [16 Definition 2.2]).

The important examples to keep in mind are the polynomial phase functions $\psi(n) = e(g(n))$, where $g$ is a polynomial of degree at most $s$. Here the relevant nilmanifold is $G/\Gamma = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with the simple filtration $G_k = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ for $k \leq s$ and $G_k = \{0\}$ for $k > s$. We also note that any $s$ bracket polynomial, such as $e(P_1(n)[P_2(n)])$, with $P_1(x), P_2(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, is essentially a nilsequence, in the sense that (by smoothing the fractional part function a bit, as in [30, p. 102]) this function be written as a linear combination with bounded coefficients of $\ll (\log x)^{\Delta}$ nilsequences $\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, K)$ for some $s, \Delta, K \ll 1$, plus an error term of $O((\log x)^{-A/10})$.

We make a technical remark on the function $\varphi$ appearing in Definition 1.2(3). When applying the machinery of nilsequences to problems in additive combinatorics, it is arguably more convenient to work with smooth functions $\varphi$ (with controlled smoothness norms) instead of Lipschitz functions, although the use of Lipschitz functions has by now become standard. All the results proved in this paper would remain true with this alternative definition of nilsequences.

In order to state our main theorems, we need the $W$-trick. For $w \geq 2$, we write $\mathscr{P}(w) := \prod_{p \leq w} p$. 


Theorem 1.3. Let an integer $s \geq 1$, large real numbers $A, \Delta \geq 2$, and a small real number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ be given. Then for any $x \geq 2$, we have
\[
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \log x)} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \psi(n) - \frac{dW}{\varphi(dW)} \sum_{n \leq x} \psi(n) \right| \ll_{s, A, \Delta, \varepsilon} \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},
\]
where $W = \mathcal{P}((\log x)^B)$ for some constant $B = B(A, s, \Delta)$.

We can increase the level of distribution to $1/3$ if the nilsequence $\psi$ is fixed (does not depend on $d$).

Theorem 1.4. Let an integer $s \geq 1$, large real numbers $A, \Delta \geq 2$, and a small real number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ be given. Then for any nilsequence $\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \log x)$ and $x \geq 2$, we have
\[
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \log x)} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \psi(n) - \frac{dW}{\varphi(dW)} \sum_{n \leq x} \psi(n) \right| \ll_{s, A, \Delta, \varepsilon} \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},
\]
where $W = \mathcal{P}((\log x)^B)$ for some constant $B = B(A, s, \Delta)$.

We can further increase the level of distribution to $1/2$ if $c$ is fixed (does not depend on $d$) and the absolute value inside the $d$ sum is replaced by a well-factorable weight, defined in the following definition.

Definition 1.5 (Well-factorable sequences). We say that a sequence $(\lambda_d)$ of real numbers is well-factorable of level $D$ if $(\lambda_d)$ is supported on $d \in [1, D]$ and for any $1 \leq R, S \leq D$ with $RS = D$ one can write $\lambda_d = \beta * \gamma(d) := \sum_{d = d_1 d_2} \beta(d_1) \gamma(d_2)$ for some sequences $\beta(d), \gamma(d)$ of modulus at most 1 and such that $\beta$ is supported on $[1, R]$ and $\gamma$ is supported on $[1, S]$.

Well-factorable weights arise in many sieve problems due to the fact that the linear sieve weights (introduced by Iwaniec) are a bounded linear combination of well-factorable weights; see [K] Lemma 12.16.

Theorem 1.6. Let integers $s \geq 1$, $c \neq 0$, large real numbers $A, \Delta \geq 2$, and a small real number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ be given. Then for any nilsequence $\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \log x)$ and any well-factorable sequence $(\lambda_d)$ of level $x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$ with $x \geq 2$, we have
\[
\left| \sum_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \lambda_d \left( \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \psi(n) - \frac{dW}{\varphi(dW)} \sum_{n \leq x} \psi(n) \right) \right| \ll_{s, A, \Delta, \varepsilon, c} \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},
\]
where $W = \mathcal{P}((\log x)^B)$ for some constant $B = B(A, s, \Delta)$.

Remark 1.7. In Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.6 in order to get an arbitrary power of log saving in the error term, it is necessary to perform a “W-trick” to overcome the fact that functions such as $\Lambda(n)e^{(2\pi n x)}$ are not equidistributed in all residue classes when $q \leq (\log x)^B$. Since this leads to the choice $W = \mathcal{P}((\log x)^B)$ which is rather large, we are unable to perform the same W-trick as in [14] which compares $\Lambda$ to the function $n \mapsto \varphi(W)\Lambda(Wn + 1)$. We have adapted an alternative approach which, roughly speaking, compares $\Lambda$ to (a normalized version of) the function $n \mapsto 1_{(n,W)=1}$.
We also obtain similar results for the Möbius function, without the need for the $W$-trick and with no main term.

**Theorem 1.8.** (i) With the notations and assumptions of Theorem 1.3 we have

$$
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/4 - \varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \log x)} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \psi(n) \right| \ll s, A, \Delta, \varepsilon \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}.
$$

(ii) With the notations and assumptions of Theorem 1.4, we have

$$
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/3 - \varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \psi(n) \right| \ll s, A, \Delta, \varepsilon \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}.
$$

(iii) With the notations and assumptions of Theorem 1.6, we have

$$
\left| \sum_{d \leq x^{1/2 - \varepsilon}} \lambda_d \left( \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \psi(n) \right) \right| \ll s, A, \Delta, \varepsilon \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}.
$$

In fact, our results above also apply to a number of other multiplicative functions, such as the divisor functions $d_k(n)$ (for all values of $k$, including non-integer and complex values) and the indicator function $1_S(n)$ of sums of two squares. For these functions, however, one would have to modify the main term sum involving $(n, W) = 1$ in Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.6. For simplicity, and to reduce repetition in the arguments, we only state Bombieri–Vinogradov type theorems for these functions in the equidistributed ("minor arc") case where there is no main term; see Theorem 3.5.

1.2 Results for polynomial phase twists

Since polynomial phases of the form $e(P(n))$ are examples of nilsequences of bounded complexity, Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.6 immediately imply as special cases Bombieri–Vinogradov type estimates for $\Lambda(n)e(P(n))$. We state these below, since they are of independent interest and since they will be utilized in deriving some of the applications of our results.

**Corollary 1.9.** Let an integer $s \geq 1$, a large real number $A \geq 2$, and a small real number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$ be given. Then for any $x \geq 2$, we have

$$
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/4 - \varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\deg(P) \leq s} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)e(P(n)) \frac{dW}{\varphi(dW)} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{e(P(n))}{(n, W)=1} \right| \ll s, A, \varepsilon \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},
$$

where $W = \mathcal{O}((\log x)^B)$ for some constant $B = B(A, s)$.

**Corollary 1.10.** Let an integer $s \geq 1$, a large real number $A \geq 2$, and a small real number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$ be given. Then for any polynomial $P(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree $s$ and $x \geq 2$, we have

$$
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/3 - \varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)e(P(n)) \frac{dW}{\varphi(dW)} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{e(P(n))}{(n, W)=1} \right| \ll s, A, \varepsilon \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},
$$

where $W = \mathcal{O}((\log x)^B)$ for some constant $B = B(A, s)$.
Corollary 1.11. Let integers $s \geq 1$, $c \neq 0$, a large real number $A \geq 2$, and a small real number $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ be given. Then for any polynomial $P(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ of degree $s$ and any well-factorable sequence $(\lambda_d)$ of level $x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$ with $x \geq 2$, we have

$$
\left| \sum_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \equiv c \pmod{d}} \Lambda(n) e(P(n)) \right| \ll_{s,A,\varepsilon} \frac{x}{(\log x)^A};
$$

where $W = \mathcal{O}((\log x)^B)$ for some constant $B = B(A, s)$.

Remark 1.12. We could also obtain analogous results for bracket polynomial phases, so for example $e(P_1(n)/P_2(n))$, where $P_1, P_2$ are polynomials. One simply needs the fact that these functions are well-approximable by nilsequences of bounded complexity, a property that was noted above. We leave the details to the interested reader.

Previous results related to our main theorems are as follows:

- For the Möbius function, it was established in [29] for $Q < x^{1/2}$ that

$$\max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_{s}(\lambda, K)} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \equiv c \pmod{d}} \mu(n) \psi(n) \right| \ll_{s,A,\lambda, K} \frac{x \log \log x}{Q(\log(x/Q^2))}$$

for almost all $d \in [Q, 2Q]$, in the sense that the number of exceptional $d$ is $\ll_A Q(\log x)^{-A}$. Although this result is applicable for $d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, it saves a factor of $(\log \log x)/(\log x)$ at best. The proof relies crucially on almost all numbers having prime factors in various suitable ranges, and hence it does not work for the case of primes, i.e. the von Mangoldt function.

- For linear exponentials (that is, $s = 1$), Theorem 1.4 was proved by Todorova and Tolev [32], and for quadratic phase functions (which is a special case of the $s = 2$ case) by Tolev [33].

- It was shown by Matomäki [22], improving on work of Mikawa [28], that the well-factorable level of distribution estimate given by Theorem 1.6 holds for $s = 1$.

1.3 Notation

We use the usual asymptotic notation $\ll, \gg, O(\cdot), o(\cdot), \asymp$. Dependence of these symbols on parameters is indicated whenever such a dependence occurs (so, for example, $o_{w,x \to \infty}(1)$ is a quantity depending on $w$ and $x$ and tending to 0 as $x \to \infty$).

We use $\Lambda$ to denote the von Mangoldt function, $\mu$ to denote the Möbius function, $\varphi$ to denote the Euler phi function, $d_k$ to denote the $k$-fold divisor function (with $d(n) := d_2(n)$) and $(a, b)$ to denote the greatest common divisor of $a$ and $b$. We also let $\mathcal{P}(w) := \prod_{p \leq w} p$.

Let $\| \cdot \|_{U^k(\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})}$ stand for the usual Gowers norm over the cyclic group $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$. Given a function $f : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$ supported on $[N] := \{1, 2, \cdots, N\}$, we define its Gowers norm $\|f\|_{U^k[N]}$ over the interval $[N]$ as

$$
\|f\|_{U^k[N]} := \frac{\|f \cdot 1[N]\|_{U^k(\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})}}{\|1[N]\|_{U^k(\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z})}},
$$

where $N' > 2N$ (say $N' = 2N + 1$ for concreteness) and $f \cdot 1[N]$ and $1[N]$ are extended to $\mathbb{Z}/N'\mathbb{Z}$ in the natural way.
If $A$ is any nonempty, finite set and $f : A \to \mathbb{C}$ is a function, we use the averaging notation
\[
\mathbb{E}_{a \in A} f(a) := \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{a \in A} f(a).
\]

For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, we use $\|x\|$ to denote the distance from $x$ to its closest integer.
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### 2 Applications

We now present several applications of our Bombieri–Vinogradov type theorems to problems related to Diophantine properties of the primes, as well as to additive combinatorics.

#### 2.1 Bounded gaps between primes in Bohr sets

Our first application generalizes the celebrated result of Zhang [34], Maynard [26] and Tao (unpublished) on bounded gaps between primes. Subsequent to these works, a number of interesting subsets of the primes have also been shown to exhibit bounded gaps. See [1], [27] for primes in short intervals, [31], [27] for work on Chebotarev sets, and [2], [5] for work on primes in Beatty sequences $(\lfloor \alpha n + \beta \rfloor)_{n \geq 1}$.

As a consequence of our main theorems, we are able to add to this list that the primes lying in a nil-Bohr set exhibit bounded gaps. This generalizes the result of Baker and Zhao [2] mentioned above, which corresponds to classical Bohr sets of a special form.

Nil-Bohr sets were introduced by Host and Kra in [20] and are a natural generalization of classical Bohr sets to the setting of higher-order Fourier analysis. For the convenience of the reader, we first define classical Bohr sets and then nil-Bohr sets.

**Definition 2.1 (Bohr sets).** Let $U$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{R}$. Then for any real number $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ the set
\[
B = \{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : \| \alpha n \| \in U \}
\]
is called a (classical) Bohr set.

**Definition 2.2 (nil-Bohr sets).** Let $U$ be an open subset of $\mathbb{C}$, and let $\psi : G/\Gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ be a nilsequence defined on some nilmanifold. Then the set
\[
B = \{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : \psi(n) \in U \}
\]
is called a nil-Bohr set.

Note that any Bohr set is also a nil-Bohr set. In fact, any polynomial Bohr set of the form
\[
\{ n \in \mathbb{Z} : \| Q(n) \| < \rho \}
\]
is a nil-Bohr set for any polynomial $Q(x)$ and any $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$; take $\psi(n) = e(Q(n))$ as the nilsequence in the definition, and take $U$ to be $\{ z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} : \arg(z) \in (-2\pi \rho, 2\pi \rho) \}$. Any nil-Bohr set that is “irrational” in a suitable sense (see Remark 2.4) contains infinitely
many primes. This is however not a trivial fact; if $Q(x)$ is a polynomial with irrational leading coefficient, then proving the asymptotic

$$|\{p \leq x : \|Q(p)\| < \rho\}| = (2\rho + o(1))\frac{x}{\log x}$$

requires Weyl’s equidistribution criterion and exponential sum estimates related to the Waring–Goldbach problem, and moreover in the case of general nil-Bohr sets one needs the full machinery of the Green–Tao result [15] on Möbius orthogonality with nilsequences to be able to show this. Also note that nil-Bohr sets (as well as classical Bohr sets) can be rather irregular: in the asymptotic formula (2.1) it is not possible to specify the $o(1)$ term without imposing a restriction on how fast the denominators of the continued fraction convergents of the leading coefficient of $Q(x)$ grow.

In what follows, we say that a set $S \subset \mathbb{N}$ has bounded gaps if there exists $C > 0$ such that the inequality $0 < s_1 - s_2 \leq C$ has infinitely many solutions with $s_1, s_2 \in S$.

**Theorem 2.3** (Bounded gaps between primes in nil-Bohr sets). Let $Q(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ be a polynomial with at least one irrational coefficient which is not the constant term. Let $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$, and form the nil-Bohr set

$$B = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : \|Q(n)\| < \rho\}.$$  

Then the subset of the primes $\mathbb{P} \cap B$ has bounded gaps.

**Remark 2.4.** It is only for the sake of simplicity that we restrict to nil-Bohr sets of this form; essentially the same arguments would work for any nil-Bohr set $B$ that satisfies the following two natural properties: (i) $B$ is irrational in the sense that, in the notation of Definition 3.1, for some constant $c > 0$ and infinitely many $x \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, K; x^{-c}, x)$ with $s, \Delta, K$ fixed. (ii) $B$ is dense in the sense that $|B \cap [1, x]| \gg x$. We leave the details of this generalization to the interested reader.

2.2 Chen primes in Bohr sets

Our next application involves Chen primes, which are primes $p$ such that $p + 2 \in P_2$, where $P_2$ is the set of positive integers with at most two prime factors. We write

$$P_{\text{Chen}} = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : p + 2 \in P_2\}.$$  

A celebrated result of Chen [4] shows that $P_{\text{Chen}}$ is infinite. It is moreover a sparse subset of the primes, since it can be shown to satisfy $|P_{\text{Chen}} \cap [1, x]| \asymp x/(\log x)^2$.

It was shown by Matomäki [22] that Chen primes are well-distributed in classical Bohr sets, meaning that there exists $\theta > 0$ such that

$$\|\alpha p\| < p^{-\theta}$$

has infinitely many solutions in Chen primes $p$ for any fixed irrational $\alpha$.

We generalize this by proving that the Chen primes are well-distributed in more general nil-Bohr sets.

**Theorem 2.5** (Chen primes in nil-Bohr sets). Let $Q(x) \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $s \geq 1$ such that $Q$ has at least one irrational coefficient which is not the constant term. Then for some constant $\theta_s > 0$ (independent of $Q$) there are infinitely many solutions to

$$\|Q(p)\| < p^{-\theta_s}, \quad p \in P_{\text{Chen}}.$$
Remark 2.6. As in the case of Theorem 2.3, our proof method generalizes to showing that for any irrational and dense nil-Bohr set \( B \) we have infinitely many solutions to \( p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Chen}} \cap B \). We leave the details to the interested reader.

2.3 Linear equations in primes in arithmetic progressions

The next application is a generalization of the groundbreaking result proved by Green–Tao [14, 15] and Green–Tao–Ziegler [17] that one can asymptotically count the number of solutions to any linear system of equations in the primes (of finite complexity, which excludes for instance counting twin primes or solutions to the binary Goldbach problem). It is natural to consider this problem for subsets of the primes as well, in particular the primes belonging to an arithmetic progression. We show that even if the modulus \( q \) of the progression \( a \pmod{q} \) of primes one studies is allowed to range up to \( q \leq x^{\theta} \) for suitable \( \theta > 0 \), we still obtain asymptotics for linear equations in primes restricted to the congruence class \( a \pmod{q} \), for almost all choices of \( q \).

In what follows, we set

\[
\Lambda_{a,q}(n) := \left( \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \right) \Lambda(qn + a),
\]

which is a normalized version of the von Mangoldt function restricted to the arithmetic progression \( a \pmod{q} \). Extend \( \Lambda_{a,q}(n) \) to integers \( n \leq 0 \) by setting it to be zero at them.

Further, for a system \( \Psi(n) = (L_1(n), \ldots, L_t(n)) \) of affine linear forms in \( d \) variables we define its size at scale \( N \) to be

\[
\|\Psi\|_N := \sum_{i=1}^{t} \sum_{j=1}^{d} |L_i(e_j) - L_i(0)| + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \left| L_i(0) \right| N,
\]

where \( e_1, \ldots, e_d \) are the standard basis vectors in \( \mathbb{Z}^d \).

**Theorem 2.7** (Linear equations in primes in arithmetic progressions to large moduli). Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( A, t, d, M \geq 1 \) be given. Let \( x \geq 10 \) and \( Q \leq x^{1/3 - \varepsilon} \). Then for all but \( \ll_{\varepsilon, A, t, d, M} Q/(\log x)^A \) choices of \( 1 \leq q \leq Q \) the following holds. For every \( a \in (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^d \) and every finite complexity tuple \( \Psi = (L_1(n), \ldots, L_t(n)) \) of non-constant affine-linear forms in \( d \) variables of size \( \|\Psi\|_x \leq M \) we have

\[
\sum_{n \in [1,x]^d} \Lambda(L_1(qn + a)) \cdots \Lambda(L_t(qn + a)) = \beta_\infty \prod_p \beta_{p,a,q} + o_{t,d,M}(x^d),
\]

where the product on the right-hand side is convergent, \( \beta_{p,a,q} \geq 0 \), \( 0 \leq \beta_\infty \ll x^d \), and the local factors \( \beta_{p,a,q} \) are given by

\[
\beta_{p,a,q} := \mathbb{E}_{n \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d} \prod_{i=1}^{t} \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}}(L_i(qn + a)),
\]

and \( \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}}(b) = \frac{1}{p-1} \chi_{(1,p)}(b) \), and \( \beta_\infty = \text{vol}_d([1,x]^d \cap \Psi^{-1}(\mathbb{R}^t_+)) \).

We also obtain a similar theorem (without the main term) with the Möbius function in place of the von Mangoldt function; see Proposition 10.1. Note that the condition \( Q \leq x^{1/3 - \varepsilon} \) actually corresponds to a 1/4 level of distribution, since the primes being counted are of size \( \approx Qx \).
Remark 2.8. Theorem 2.7 can be viewed as generalizing a result of Bienvenu [21] on linear equations in primes in the Siegel–Walfisz regime, corresponding to \( q \ll_A (\log x)^A \) in [2.3]. As in the Siegel–Walfisz theorem, there are no exceptional moduli \( q \) in [21, Theorem 1.3]. The same applies to our Theorem 2.7 as well, since if we are considering moduli of size \( \leq Q = (\log x)^A \), the theorem gives \( \ll_A (\log x)^{-2A} \) exceptional moduli, and this quantity is clearly less than 1 for \( x \) large.

In the course of proving Theorem 2.7, we obtain Gowers uniformity of primes in almost all arithmetic progressions.

Theorem 2.9 (Gowers uniformity of primes in arithmetic progressions to large moduli). Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( A, k, \ell \geq 1 \) be given. Let \( x \geq 10, Q \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon} \), and \( w \geq 1 \). Then for all but \( \ll_{\varepsilon, A, k} Q/(\log x)^A \) choices of \( 1 \leq q \leq Q \) with \( \mathcal{P}(w) \mid q \) the following holds. For every \((a, q) = 1\), the function \( \Lambda_{a,q} \) defined by (2.2) satisfies the Gowers norm bound

\[
\|\Lambda_{a,q} - 1\|_{U^k[\mathbb{F}_q]} = o_{w \to \infty}(1) + o_{w;x \to \infty}(1).
\]

We conclude with an immediate corollary of Theorem 2.7 to long arithmetic progressions in the primes.

Corollary 2.10 (Green–Tao theorem for primes in arithmetic progressions to large moduli). Let \( x \geq 10 \), and let \( A, \ell \geq 1 \) and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) be given. Also let \( Q \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon} \). Then for all but \( \ll_{\varepsilon, A, k} Q/(\log x)^A \) moduli \( q \leq Q \), each of the sets \( \mathbb{P} \cap (q\mathbb{Z} + a) \) with \( (a, q) = 1 \) contains a nontrivial \( k \)-term arithmetic progression all of whose elements are \( \leq x \).

2.4 Future work

In ongoing work with P.-Y. Bienvenu, we develop a transference principle for arbitrary systems of linear equations (not necessarily translation-invariant) in the spirit of [13, 14], generalizing the transference principle of [23]. This new transference principle requires as a key input that the sparse set we want to transfer is “well–distributed” in nil-Bohr sets, which using our Bombieri–Vinogradov theorems (Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.6) we can verify for many subsets of the primes of interest. In particular, we will be able to generalize the Green–Tao linear equations in primes result to Chen primes.

3 Bombieri–Vinogradov theorems for equidistributed nilsequences

In this section we reduce our problem to studying those nilsequences \( \psi \) that are “equidistributed”. In the case when \( \psi(n) = e(\alpha n^s) \), this corresponds to \( \alpha \) lying in “minor arcs”.

Definition 3.1 (Equidistributed nilsequences). Recall the definition of \( \Psi_s(\Delta, K) \) in Definition 1.2. For \( \eta \in (0, 1) \) and \( x \geq 2 \), we define \( \Psi_s(\Delta, K; \eta, x) \) to be the class of those nilsequences \( \psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, K) \) of the form \( \psi(n) = \varphi(g(n)\Gamma) \) that obey the following additional conditions:

1. The finite sequence \( (g(n)\Gamma)_{1 \leq n \leq 10x} \) is totally \( \eta \)-equidistributed in \( G/\Gamma \) (defined in 10, Definition 1.2);
2. The Lipschitz function \( \varphi \) satisfies \( \int_{G/\Gamma} \varphi = 0 \) (Here the integral is with respect to the unique Haar measure on \( G/\Gamma \)).

We will loosely call those nilsequences in \( \Psi_s(\Delta, K; \eta, x) \) \( \eta \)-equidistributed.

The following theorems show that our main theorems hold for \( \eta \)-equidistributed nilsequences when \( 0 < \eta \leq (\log x)^{-O_A(1)} \). Moreover, the error term for such nilsequences can be even power-saving if \( \eta = x^{-\delta} \) for some constant \( \delta > 0 \).
Theorem 3.2. Let an integer \( s \geq 1 \), a large real number \( \Delta \geq 2 \), and a small real number \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1/4) \) be given. There exists a constant \( \kappa = \kappa(s, \varepsilon) > 0 \), such that for \( x \geq 2 \), \( \eta > 0 \) we have
\[
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \eta^{-\kappa}; \eta, x/d)} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \psi((n-c)/d) \right| \ll_{s, \Delta, \varepsilon} \eta^\kappa x (\log x)^{O(1)}.
\]

Theorem 3.3. Let an integer \( s \geq 1 \), a large real number \( \Delta \geq 2 \), and a small real number \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1/3) \) be given. There exists a constant \( \kappa = \kappa(s, \varepsilon) > 0 \), such that for any \( x \geq 2 \), \( \eta > 0 \) and any nilsequence \( \psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \eta^{-\kappa}; \eta, x) \) we have
\[
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\eta, x/d} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \psi(n) \right| \ll_{s, \Delta, \varepsilon} \eta^\kappa x (\log x)^{O(1)}.
\]

The same holds with \( \Lambda \) replaced by \( \mu \).

Theorem 3.4. Let integers \( s \geq 1 \), \( c \neq 0 \), a large real number \( \Delta \geq 2 \), and a small real number \( \varepsilon \in (0, 1/2) \) be given. There exists a constant \( \kappa = \kappa(s, \varepsilon) > 0 \), such that for any well-factorable sequence \( (\lambda_d) \) of level \( x^{1/2-\varepsilon} \) with \( x \geq 2 \) and any nilsequence \( \psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \eta^{-\kappa}; \eta, x) \) with \( \eta > 0 \), we have
\[
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon}} \lambda_d \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \psi(n) \ll_{s, \Delta, \varepsilon} \eta^\kappa x (\log x)^{O(1)}.
\]

The same holds with \( \Lambda \) replaced by \( \mu \).

As mentioned earlier, our proof methods also apply to other arithmetic functions than \( \Lambda \) and \( \mu \), in particular to the functions \( d_k \) and \( 1_S \) (and other sequences that satisfy an identity of Heath-Brown’s type).

Theorem 3.5. Theorems 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 continue to hold with \( \Lambda \) replaced by the \( k \)-fold divisor function \( d_k \) with \( k \in \mathbb{C} \) fixed, or \( \Lambda \) replaced by \( 1_S \), where \( S \) is the set of natural numbers expressible as the sum of two squares.

We now show that these equidistributed cases imply the general cases of our main theorems.

Proof of Theorems 1.5, 1.4, 1.6, 1.8 assuming Theorems 3.2, 3.3, 3.4. Let us show how Theorem 3.2 implies Theorem 1.3; the implications for Theorems 1.4 and 1.6 are identical (whereas the implication for Theorem 1.8 is also similar but slightly easier).

Let \( 1 \leq Q \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon} \). For \( q \in [Q, 2Q] \), let
\[
f_q(n) := \Lambda(n) - \frac{qW}{\varphi(qW)} 1_{(n,W)=1}.
\]

Call a modulus \( q \in [Q, 2Q] \) bad if
\[
\max_{(a,q)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, K)} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} f_q(n) \psi(n) \right| \geq \frac{x}{q(\log x)^{2A}}.
\]

Let \( B \) be the set of bad \( q \in [Q, 2Q] \). We may assume that \( \#B \geq Q(\log x)^{-2A} \) (for some choice of \( Q \)), since otherwise the claim of Theorem 1.3 follows from the triangle inequality.
For each \( q \in \mathcal{B} \), we may pick some residue class \( a \pmod{q} \) with \((a, q) = 1\) and \( \psi_q \in \Psi_s(\Delta, K) \) such that

\[
\sum_{n \leq x, n \equiv a \pmod{q}} f_q(n)\psi_q((n-a)/q) \geq \frac{x}{2q(\log x)^{2A}}.
\]

Here we used the simple observation that if \( \psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, K) \) then the dilation \( \psi'(n) = \psi(qn + a) \) is also in \( \Psi_s(\Delta, K) \).

We apply [29, Lemma 2.4], which makes use of the quantitative factorization theorem for nilsequences [16 Theorem 1.19]), to this setup (with \( \varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}(\log x)^{-2A} \) and \( M_0 = \varepsilon^{-1} \)). The lemma there is formulated for 1-bounded completely multiplicative functions, but the same proof works for any 1-bounded function \( f \), as long as we do not require the condition \((a', q') = 1\) in that lemma. So we can apply [29, Lemma 2.4] to the function \( f_q/\log x \) (whose \( L^\infty \)-norm is bounded).

Let \( C(\cdot) \) be a rapidly growing function to be chosen later. Thus for every \( q \in \mathcal{B} \) we can find

\begin{itemize}
  \item \( M \in [M_0, M_0^{O_{A,s, \Delta}(1)}] \);
  \item An interval \( I \subset [0, x] \) with \( |I| \gg x/M^3 \);
  \item A multiple \( q' \) of \( q \) with \( q' \leq qM \);
  \item A residue class \( a' \pmod{q'} \) with \( 0 \leq a' < q' \) and \( a' \equiv a \pmod{q} \) (but not necessarily with \((a', q') = 1\));
  \item A nilmanifold \( G'/\Gamma' \) of dimension \( \leq \Delta \), equipped with a filtration \( G'_{s, q} \) of degree \( \leq s \), and an \( M^{O_{A,s, \Delta}(1)} \)-rational Mal'me basis \( X' \);
  \item A polynomial sequence \( g' : \mathbb{Z} \to G' \) (adapted to \( G'_{s, q} \)) such that \( (g'(m)\Gamma')_{1 \leq m \leq x/q'} \) is totally \( M^{-C(A)} \)-equidistributed;
  \item A nilsequence \( \psi'(n) = \varphi'(g'(n)\Gamma') \), with \( \varphi' : G'/\Gamma' \to \mathbb{C} \) a Lipschitz function with \( \|\varphi'\|_\infty \leq 1 \) and \( \|\varphi'\|_{\operatorname{Lip}(X')} \leq M^{O_{A,s, \Delta}(1)} \),
\end{itemize}

such that

\[
\sum_{n \equiv a' \pmod{q'}} f_q(n)\varphi'(\psi'(n)/q') \gg \frac{|I|}{q'(\log x)^{2A}}.
\]

All of the quantities introduced above may depend on \( q \); however, by the pigeonhole principle we may restrict to a subset \( \mathcal{B}' \) of \( \mathcal{B} \) of size \( \gg Q(\log x)^{-O_{A,s, \Delta}(1)} \) such that the interval \( I \) and the quotient \( q'/q \) are independent of \( q \). Let \( q' = \ell q \) for \( q \in \mathcal{B}' \).

The Lipschitz function \( \varphi' \) produced above does not necessarily satisfy \( \int \varphi' = 0 \). However, recalling the definition of \( f_q(n) \), we have

\[
\sum_{n \equiv a' \pmod{q'}} f_q(n) = \sum_{n \equiv a' \pmod{q'}} \Lambda(n) - \frac{qW}{\varphi(qW)} \sum_{(n,W) = 1} 1.
\]

**Case 1:** First consider the case when \((a', q') > 1\). Since \( a' \equiv a \pmod{q} \) and \((a, q) = 1 \), we must have \((a', q') = (a', \ell) \leq \ell \leq (\log x)^{O_{A,s, \Delta}(1)} \). Hence we can ensure that \((a', q') \mid W^\infty \) by choosing \( B \) in the definition of \( W \) large enough, and thus the second sum on the right hand side of (3.3) is empty, so (3.3) is \( O(\log x) \) in this case.
Case 2: Now consider the case when \((a', q') = 1\). By the classical Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem, we have

\[
\sum_{n \equiv a' \pmod{q'}} \Lambda(n) = \frac{|I|}{\varphi(q')} (1 + O((\log x)^{-10A}))
\]

for all but \(O_D(Q(\log x)^{-D})\) values of \(q' \leq Q\), with \(D > 0\) arbitrary. By passing to a subset of \(B'\), we may assume that the above holds for all \(q \in B'\). Hence (3.3) is

\[
|I| \left( \frac{1}{\varphi(q')} - \frac{qW/\varphi(qW)}{q'W} \cdot \frac{1}{\varphi(q')} \right) + O \left( \frac{|I|}{q(\log x)^{\theta A}} \right) = O \left( \frac{|I|}{q(\log x)^{\theta A}} \right),
\]

since \(qW/\varphi(qW) = q'W/\varphi(q'W)\) by the fact that \(\ell | W^\infty\).

Thus we always have

\[
\left| \sum_{n \equiv a' \pmod{q'}} f_q(n) \right| \ll \frac{|I|}{q(\log x)^{\theta A}}.
\]

Hence if we replace \(\varphi'\) by \(\varphi' - \int \varphi'\), the lower bound (3.2) remains valid. Henceforth we may assume that \(\int \varphi' = 0\).

Now, by writing the interval \(I\) as a difference of two intervals \([1, y_2]\) \([-1, y_1]\), the conclusion is that for some \(y \leq x\) we have

\[
\sup_{\psi' \in \Psi, (\Delta, (\log x)^{C A, \Delta(1)}; \eta, \eta'/q')} \left| \sum_{n \leq y \pmod{q'}} f_q(n)\psi'((n - a')/q') \right| \gg (\log x)^{-O_{A, s, \Delta(1)} \log x} \frac{y}{q'}
\]

for \(q' \in B''\), where \(\eta = M^{-C(A)}\) and \(B'' \subset B'\) satisfies \(|B''| \gg (\log x)^{-O_{A, s, \Delta(1)}}\). Recall that \(f_q(n)\) is defined as the difference of two terms. It follows that either

\[
\sup_{\psi' \in \Psi, (\Delta, (\log x)^{C A, \Delta(1)}; \eta, \eta'/q')} \left| \sum_{n \leq y \pmod{q'}} \Lambda(n)\psi'((n - a')/q') \right| \gg (\log x)^{-O_{A, s, \Delta(1)} \log x} \frac{y}{q'}
\]

or

\[
\sup_{\psi' \in \Psi, (\Delta, (\log x)^{C A, \Delta(1)}; \eta, \eta'/q')} \left| \sum_{n \leq y \pmod{q'}} \psi'((n - a')/q') \right| \gg (\log x)^{-O_{A, s, \Delta(1)} \log x} \frac{y}{q'}
\]

holds for \(q' \in B''\).

Case 1: First assume that (3.5) holds for at least half of \(q' \in B''\). We may assume here that \((a', q') = 1\), since otherwise the sum in (3.5) is \(\ll \log x\). Recall that \(\eta = M^{-C(A)} \leq (\log x)^{-A-C(A)}\). Now we have a contradiction to Theorem 3.2 provided that the function \(C(\cdot)\) is chosen large enough in terms of \(s, \Delta\).

Case 2: Now assume that (3.6) holds for at least half of \(q' \in B''\). Again we may assume here that \((a', q') = 1\), since otherwise \((a', \ell) > 1\) and \((a', \ell) \mid W^\infty\), making the sum in (3.6) empty. Let \(D = y^{0.01}\), and let \((\lambda_q^n)_{q \leq D}\) be upper and lower linear sieve weights, defined in
Thus (3.6) implies that \( \psi' \) is real-valued. Apply the upper bound sieve to the non-negative function \( \psi' \) to obtain

\[
\sum_{n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}} \left( \psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) + 1\right) \leq \sum_{n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}} \left( \sum_{d | (n, W)} \lambda_d^+ \right) \left( \psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) + 1\right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{d | W} \lambda_d^+ \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \\ n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}}} [\psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) + 1],
\]

and apply the lower bound sieve to the constant function 1 to obtain

\[
\sum_{n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}} 1 \geq \sum_{d | W} \lambda_d^- \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \\ \frac{n}{q} \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}}} 1.
\]

Using the fundamental lemma of sieve theory \cite{Bombieri-Vinogradov} (with \( g(d) = \frac{1}{dq} 1_{(d, q') = 1} \) and \( s = (\log y)/(\log w) \)), we get

\[
\sum_{d | W} \lambda_d^+ \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \\ n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}}} 1 = \frac{y}{q} \prod_{p | W} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) + O_C\left( \frac{y}{q' (\log x)^C} \right)
\]

for any \( C \geq 2 \). It follows that

\[
\sum_{n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}} \psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) \leq \sum_{d | W} \lambda_d^+ \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \\ n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}}} \psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) + O_C\left( \frac{y}{q' (\log x)^C} \right)
\]

for any \( C \geq 2 \). Similarly, we have the lower bound

\[
\sum_{n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}} \psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) \geq \sum_{d | W} \lambda_d^- \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \\ \frac{n}{q} \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}}} \psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) - O_C\left( \frac{y}{q' (\log x)^C} \right).
\]

Thus (3.6) implies that

\[
\sup_{\psi' \in \Psi_1(\Delta, (\log x)^{O_{A,s,\Delta(1)}}, y/q')} \left| \sum_{d | W} \lambda_d^+ \sum_{\substack{n \leq y \\ n \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}}} \psi'\left(\frac{n - \alpha'}{q'}\right) \right| \gg (\log x)^{-O_{A,s,\Delta(1)}} \frac{y}{q'}
\]

holds at least half of \( q' \in \mathcal{B}' \), where \( \pm \) denotes either choice of + or −. By symmetry, we may assume that the above holds with \( \lambda_d^+ \) for at least \( 1/4 \) of those \( q' \in \mathcal{B}' \). By a change of variables \( n = dm \), we can rewrite the expression inside the absolute value sign in the form

\[
\sum_{\substack{dm \leq y \\ dm \equiv \alpha' \pmod{q'}}} a_d \psi'\left(\frac{(dm - \alpha')}{q}\right),
\]

where

\[ a_d = \prod_{p | d} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) \]
where $|a_d| \leq 1$. Since $(\lambda^+_d)$ (and thus $(a_d)$) is supported on $d \leq D = y^{0.01}$, we reach a contradiction to our type I estimate (Proposition 4.1).

### 4 Type I Estimates

Our remaining task for proving the main theorems is proving the results for equidistributed nilsequences from Section 3. By applying Vaughan’s identity [21, Chapter 13] (with $y = z = x^{2/3}$), we see that we can write the von Mangoldt function in the form $\Lambda(n) = \alpha * 1(n) + \beta * \gamma(n)$ for $x^{2/3} \leq n \leq x$, where
- $\alpha$ is supported on $[1, x^{1/3}]$;
- $\beta, \gamma$ are supported on $[x^{1/3}, x^{2/3}]$;
- $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ are divisor-bounded in the sense that they are $\ll d_3(n)(\log(2n))$ in modulus.

An analogous decomposition holds for the Möbius function. The term $\alpha * 1$ is called a type I sum, and the term $\beta * \gamma$ is a type II sum. We begin by analyzing the type I sums. The following type I estimate suffices for each of the Theorems 1.3, 1.4, 1.6.

**Proposition 4.1** (type I estimate). Let $x \geq 2$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Let $1 \leq M \leq x^{1/2}$. Let $1 \leq D \leq x^{1/2 - \varepsilon}$. Let $s \geq 1$, $\Delta \geq 2$, and $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Then there exists a large constant $C = C(s, \Delta, \varepsilon)$ such that

$$
\sum_{D \leq d \leq 2D} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sum_{\psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \delta^{-1}; x/D)} \sup_{\psi} \left| \sum_{mn \leq x, M \leq m \leq 2M, \psi(n/d) = 0} a_m \psi((mn - c)/d) \right| \ll \delta x (\log x)^{O(1)},
$$

uniformly for sequences $|a_m| \leq d_3(m)(\log(2m))$.

**Proof.** We can assume that $s$ and $\Delta$ are fixed, so there is no need to track the dependence of constants on them. We may assume that $\delta < (\log x)^{-10}$, since otherwise the conclusion is trivial. We may also assume that $\delta > x^{-\varepsilon/2}$, since otherwise $\Psi_s(\Delta, \delta^{-1}; \delta^C, x/D)$ is empty if $C$ is chosen large enough. We need to bound the sum

$$
\Sigma := \sum_{D \leq d \leq 2D} \left| \sum_{mn \leq x, M \leq m \leq 2M, \psi(n/d) = 0} a_m \psi((mn - c)/d) \right|
$$

for any choice of $1 \leq c_d \leq d$ with $(c_d, d) = 1$ and $\psi_d \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \delta^{-1}; \delta^C, x/D)$. By the triangle inequality and Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$
\Sigma \leq \sum_{D \leq d \leq 2D} \sum_{M \leq m \leq 2M} \sum_{n \leq x/m, n \equiv c_d m^{-1} (\text{mod } d)} |a_m| \left| \psi_d((mn - c_d)/d) \right|
$$

$$
\ll (\log x)^{O(1)}(DM)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{D \leq d \leq 2D} \sum_{M \leq m \leq 2M} \sum_{n \leq x/m, n \equiv c_d m^{-1} (\text{mod } d)} \left| \psi_d((mn - c_d)/d) \right|^2 \right)^{1/2}.
$$

Let $T$ be the set of $(d, m) \in [D, 2D] \times [M, 2M]$ for which the inner sum over $n$ is at least $\delta^2 x/(DM)$. It suffices to show that

$$
|T| \ll \delta^{3}DM.
$$

\(^1\)Note that the proof of Proposition 4.1 is completely independent of this section.
Recall that $\psi_d = \varphi_d(g_d(n)\Gamma_d)$ for some Lipschitz function $\varphi_d$ on a nilmanifold $G_d/\Gamma_d$ and some polynomial sequence $g_d$, which is totally $\delta^C$-equidistributed for large enough $C$. For $(d, m) \in T$, consider the polynomial sequence $h_{d,m}$ defined by

$$h_{d,m}(n) := g_d(mn + b_{d,m}),$$

where $b_{d,m}$ is the unique number satisfying $1 \leq b_{d,m} \leq m$ and $db_{d,m} \equiv -c_d \pmod{m}$.

Then by a change of variables we have

$$\sum_{n \leq x/m \equiv c_d m^{-1} \pmod{d}} \psi_d((mn - c_d)/d) = \sum_{n \leq x/(md)} \varphi_d(h_{d,m}(n)\Gamma_d) + O(1).$$

If $(d, m) \in T$, then the sums above have size at least $\delta^3 x/(2DM)$, and thus the sequence $(h_{d,m}(n)\Gamma_d)_{1 \leq n \leq x/(DM)}$ fails to be totally $\delta^3$-equidistributed (in the sense of [16, Definition 1.2]). Hence by [16, Theorem 2.9], there is a nontrivial horizontal character $\chi_{d,m} : G_d \to \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ with $\|\chi_{d,m}\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ such that

$$\|\chi_{d,m} \circ h_{d,m}\|_{C^\infty(x/(DM))} \ll \delta^{-O(1)}.$$ 

Since the number of such characters is $\delta^{-O(1)}$, there is a subset $T' \subset T$ with $|T'| \gg \delta^{O(1)}|T|$ and a nontrivial horizontal character $\chi_d$ (not depending on $m$) with $\|\chi_d\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$, such that

$$\|\chi_d \circ h_{d,m}\|_{C^\infty(x/(DM))} \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$$

for all $(d, m) \in T'$. Suppose, for the purpose of contradiction, that $|T| \gg \delta^3 DM$, so that $|T'| \gg \delta^{O(1)}DM$. Then there is some $d$ such that $(d, m) \in T'$ for at least $\delta^{O(1)}M$ values of $m$. For this value of $d$, we will show that $g_d$ is not totally $\delta^C$-equidistributed, a contradiction.

Fix this choice of $d$ for the rest of the proof, and write $\chi = \chi_d$. For $(d, m) \in T'$, we may explicitly write

$$\chi \circ h_{d,m}(n) = \sum_{i=0}^s \beta_{d,m,i} n^i$$

for some coefficients $\beta_{d,m,i} \in \mathbb{R}$. Then by [16, Lemma 3.2], there is a positive integer $q = O(1)$ such that

$$\|q \beta_{d,m,i}\| \ll (x/DM)^{-i} \|\chi \circ h_{d,m}\|_{C^\infty(x/(DM))} \ll (x/DM)^{-i} \delta^{-O(1)}.$$ 

Using the definition of $h_{d,m}$, we see that

$$\chi \circ h_{d,m}(n) = \chi \circ g_d(mn + b_{d,m}).$$

Thus if we write

$$\chi \circ g_d(n) = \sum_{i=0}^s \alpha_{d,i} n^i$$

for some coefficients $\alpha_{d,i} \in \mathbb{R}$, then by the binomial formula we have the relations

$$\alpha_{d,i} n^i = \beta_{d,m,i} - m^i \sum_{i < j \leq s} \binom{j}{i} \alpha_{d,j} b_{d,m}^{j-i}.$$ 

We claim that there is a positive integer $k \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$, such that

$$\|k q \alpha_{d,i}\| \ll (x/D)^{-i} \delta^{-O(1)}.$$
for each $1 \leq i \leq s$. To prove the claim we proceed by induction. For $i = s$ we have $\alpha_{d,s}m^s = \beta_{d,m,s}$. From \[4.1\] we see that

$$\|q\alpha_{d,s}m^s\| \ll (x/(DM))^{-s}\delta^{O(1)}$$

for at least $\delta^{O(1)}M$ values of $m$. From standard recurrence results such as \[16\] Lemma 4.5 applied to the phase $q\alpha_{d,s}$, it follows that

$$\|kq\alpha_{d,s}\| \ll (x/D)^{-s}\delta^{O(1)}$$

for some positive integer $k \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$. This completes the proof of the base case $i = s$. Now take $1 \leq i < s$, and assume that \[4.3\] with some $k \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ has already been proven for larger values of $i$. By \[14\], \[4.2\] and the induction hypothesis, we see that

$$\|kq\alpha_{d,i}m^i\| \ll \|kq\beta_{d,m,i}\| + \sum_{i<j \leq s} M^j\|kq\alpha_{d,j}\| \ll (x/(DM))^{-i}\delta^{O(1)}.$$}

holds for at least $\delta^{O(1)}M$ values of $m$. By \[16\] Lemma 4.5] applied to the phase $kq\alpha_{d,i}$, there exists a positive integer $k' \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ such that

$$\|k'kq\alpha_{d,i}\| \ll (x/D)^{-i}\delta^{O(1)}.$$}

Replacing $k$ by $k'k$ completes the induction step, and finishes the proof of the claim.

Finally, \[4.3\] means that

$$\|kq\chi \circ g_d\|_{C^\infty(x/D)} \ll \delta^{-O(1)}.$$}

Since $kq\chi$ is nontrivial and $\|kq\chi\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ and $C$ can be chosen to be large enough, this contradicts the assumption that $g_d$ is totally $\delta^C$-equidistributed (cf. \[7\] Lemma 5.3]). \hfill \Box

5 Type II estimates

We proceed to the type II estimates, which are more delicate than the type I estimate. In particular, each of Theorems \[1.3\], \[1.4\] and \[1.6\] requires a different estimate.

**Proposition 5.1** (type II estimate with supremum). Let $x \geq 2$ and $M \in [x^{1/4}, x^{3/4}]$. Let $1 \leq D \leq M^{1/2-\varepsilon}$. Let $s \geq 1$, $\Delta \geq 2$, and $0 < \delta < 1/2$. Then for a large constant $C = C(s, \Delta, \varepsilon)$ we have

$$\sum_{D \leq d \leq 2D} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_4(\Delta, \Delta^{-1}, \delta^C, x/D)} \sum_{\substack{x < mn < 2x \\ M \leq m \leq 2M \\ mn \equiv c \pmod{d}}} a_mb_n\psi((mn-c)/d) \ll \delta x(\log x)^{O(1)}$$

uniformly for sequences $|a_n|, |b_n| \leq d_3(n)\log(2n)$.

**Remark 5.2.** In the case of the von Mangoldt or Möbius function, we may apply this for $D \leq x^{1/4-\varepsilon}$. Indeed, if we are considering Bombieri–Vinogradov estimates for $\Lambda(n)$, say, we may restrict to $x^{1-\varepsilon/2} \leq n \leq x$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and in this range Vaughan’s identity implies that the type II sums can be decomposed dyadically into $O((\log x)^2)$ terms of the form $\beta_i \ast \gamma_i(n)$, where for each $i$ either $\beta_i$ or $\gamma_i$ is supported on a dyadic interval $\subset [x^{1/2-\varepsilon}, x^{2/3}]$.
Proof. We may assume that \( \delta < (\log x)^{-10} \), since otherwise the conclusion is trivial. We may also assume that \( \delta > x^{-10/C} \), since otherwise \( \Psi_s(\Delta, \delta^{-1}; \delta^C, x/D) \) is empty. We need to bound the sum

\[
\Sigma := \sum_{D \leq d \leq 2D} \sum_{x \leq mn < 2x} \sum_{M \leq m \leq 2M, \quad mn \equiv c_d \pmod{d}} a_m b_n \psi_d((mn - c_d)/d)
\]

for any choice of \( 1 \leq c_d \leq d \) with \((c_d, d) = 1 \) and \( \psi_d \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \delta^{-1}; \delta^C, x/D) \). This can be rewritten as

\[
\Sigma = \sum_{x \leq mn < 2x} \sum_{M \leq m \leq 2M} a_m b_n F(mn),
\]

where the function \( F \) is defined by

\[
F(k) := \sum_{D \leq d \leq 2D} \sum_{x \leq k < 2x} \psi_d((k - c_d)/d).
\]

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we deduce

\[
\Sigma^2 \ll M(\log M)^{O(1)} \sum_{N/2 \leq n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} \left| b_{n_1} b_{n_2} \right| \sum_{x/n_1 \leq m \leq 2x/n_1, x/n_2 \leq m \leq 2x/n_2} F(mn_1)F(mn_2),
\]

where \( N = x/M \). By Cauchy–Schwarz, this is further

\[
\ll MN(\log x)^{O(1)} \left( \sum_{N/2 \leq n_1, n_2 \leq 2N} \left| b_{n_1} b_{n_2} \right| \sum_{x/n_1 \leq m \leq 2x/n_1, x/n_2 \leq m \leq 2x/n_2} F(mn_1)F(mn_2) \right)^{1/2}.
\]

Since \( 20D^2 \leq M \) and since \( \psi_d \) is totally \( \delta^C \)-equidistributed for large enough \( C \), we may apply [29 Lemma 3.3] to bound the double sum above by \( O(\delta^4 N^2 M^2) = O(\delta^4 x^2) \). The conclusion follows immediately. \( \square \)

For the well-factorable type II estimate, we first need a lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.** Let \( 0 < \delta < 1/2 \) be a parameter, and let \( k, d \geq 1 \), \( 0 < \varepsilon < \delta/2^k \). Let \( P(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \) be a polynomial of total degree \( d \) with real coefficients, and let \( J_1, \ldots, J_k \subset [\delta^{-C(d,k)}, \infty) \) be dyadic intervals, where \( C(d, k) \) is large enough. Suppose that for proportion \( \geq \delta \) of the integer tuples \((x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in J_1 \times \cdots \times J_k \) we have

\[
\|P(x_1, \ldots, x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon.
\]

Then there exists an integer \( 1 \leq q \ll \delta^{-O_{d,k}(1)} \) such that

\[
\|qP\|_{C^\infty(J_1 \times \cdots \times J_k)} \ll \varepsilon \delta^{-O_{d,k}(1)},
\]

where we define

\[
\|P\|_{C^\infty(J_1 \times \cdots \times J_k)} := \sup_{(i_1, \ldots, i_k) \in [1,d]^k} |J_1|^{i_1} \cdots |J_k|^{i_k} \|\alpha_{(i_1, \ldots, i_k)}\|,
\]

with \( \alpha_{(i_1, \ldots, i_k)} \) the coefficient of \( x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_k^{i_k} \) in \( P \).
Proof. We perform an induction on \( k \). The \( k = 1 \) case is precisely [16, Lemma 4.5]. Suppose that the case \( k \) has been proved and that we are considering case \( k + 1 \). Then we apply the \( k \) variable case to the polynomial \( Q_y \) given by \( Q_y(x_1, \ldots, x_k) = P(x_1, \ldots, x_k, y) \), for every choice of \( y \in J_{k+1} \) with the property that \( \|Q_y(x_1, \ldots, x_k)\| \leq \varepsilon \) for \( \delta/2 \)-proportion of \((x_1, \ldots, x_k) \in J_1 \times \cdots \times J_k \). The proportion of such \( y \in J_{k+1} \) is \( \geq \delta/2 \). The conclusion is that, for each such \( y \), there is \( 1 \leq q' = q'(y) \ll \delta^{-O_{d, k}(1)} \) such that

\[
\| q' Q_y \|_{C^{\infty}(J_1 \times \cdots \times J_k)} \ll \varepsilon \delta^{-O_{d, k}(1)}.
\]

By the pigeonhole principle, there exists a value of \( q' \ll \delta^{-O_{d, k}(1)} \) such that the above inequality holds for at least \( \delta^{-O_{d, k}(1)} \) proportion of \( y \in J_{k+1} \). Now, if \( \alpha(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1}) \) is the degree \((i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1})\) coefficient of the original polynomial \( P \) of \( k + 1 \) variables, then the previous bound can be written as

\[
\| q' \alpha(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1}) y^{i_{k+1}} \| \ll |J_1|^{-i_1} \cdots |J_k|^{-i_k} \varepsilon \delta^{-O_{d, k}(1)}
\]

for \( \gg \delta^{O_{d, k}(1)} \)-proportion of integers \( y \in J_{k+1} \). Now, applying [16, Lemma 4.5] again to this for each tuple \((i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1})\), we obtain the claim that for some \( 1 \leq q = q(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1}) \ll \delta^{-O_{d, k}(1)} \),

\[
\| q \alpha(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1}) \| \ll \varepsilon \delta^{-O_{d, k}(1)} \cdot |J_1|^{-i_1} \cdots |J_{k+1}|^{-i_{k+1}}.
\]

Finally, we can make this \( q \) independent of \((i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1})\) by taking it to be the product of all the \( q(i_1, \ldots, i_{k+1}) \). \( \square \)

**Proposition 5.4** (Well-factorable type II estimate). Let \( x \geq 2 \) and \( M \in [x^{1/4}, x^{3/4}] \) be large and let \( c \neq 0 \) be a fixed integer. Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \) be a small constant, and let \( (\lambda_d)_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \) be well-factorable. Let \( s \geq 1, \Delta \geq 2, 0 < \delta < 1/2 \). Then for a large constant \( C = C(s, \Delta, \varepsilon) \) and \( \psi \in \Psi_s(\Delta, \delta^{-1}, \delta^{C}, x) \), we have

\[
(5.1) \quad \left| \sum_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \lambda_d \sum_{\substack{x \leq mn \leq 2x \\ M \leq m \leq 2M \\ mn \equiv c \ (\text{mod} \ d)}} a_m b_n \psi(mn) \right| \ll \delta (\log x)^{O(1)},
\]

uniformly for sequences \( |a_n|, |b_n| \leq d_s(n)(\log(2n)) \).

Proof. As before, we may assume that \( x^{-10/C} < \delta < (\log x)^{-10} \). Let \( N = x^{1/4} \). By symmetry we may assume that \( N \leq M \in [x^{1/2}, x^{3/4}] \). Let \( D = x^{1/2-\varepsilon} \). By the well-factorability of \( (\lambda_d)_{d \leq D} \), for any \( D_1, D_2 \in [1, D] \) with \( D = D_1 D_2 \), there exist \((\gamma_d), (\theta_d)\) with \(|\gamma_d|, |\theta_d| \leq 1 \) such that \( \lambda_d = \sum_{d = d_1 d_2} \gamma_d \theta_{d_2} \), and with \((\gamma_d)\) and \((\theta_d)\) being supported on \([1, D_1]\) and \([1, D_2]\), respectively. We will choose

\[
(5.2) \quad D_1 = N x^{-\varepsilon}, \quad D_2 = M x^{-1/2}
\]

for reasons that will become clear later. Thus, by splitting into dyadic intervals, the left-hand side of \( (5.1) \) can be bounded as

\[
(5.3) \quad \ll (\log x)^2 \sum_{U \leq u \leq 2U} \gamma_u \sum_{V \leq v \leq 2V} \theta_v \sum_{\substack{x \leq mn \leq 2x \\ M \leq m \leq 2M \\ mn \equiv c \ (\text{mod} \ uv)}} a_m b_n \psi(mn) := \Sigma
\]

for some \( U \leq D_1, V \leq D_2 \). By \( (5.2) \), we have the constraints

\[
(5.4) \quad U \leq N x^{-\varepsilon}, \quad V \leq M x^{-1/2}.
\]
By applying the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality and expanding, we get
\[(5.7) \left| \sum_{U \leq u \leq 2U} \sum_{M \leq m \leq 2M} |a_m| \sum_{V \leq v \leq 2V} \theta_v \sum_{x/m \leq n \leq 2x/m} b_n \psi(mn) \right|.\]

Then we must have
\[(5.6) \sum_{x/m \leq n \leq 2x/m} \psi(mn) \geq \delta^4 M \frac{V}{UV^2}.\]

Thus the contribution to (5.5) from those terms with \((v_1, v_2) > \delta^{-4}\) is negligible, and thus we can focus on those terms with \((v_1, v_2) \leq \delta^{-4}\). Let \(\Gamma\) be the set of \((n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2)\) with
\[
U \leq u \leq 2U, \quad V \leq v_1 \leq 2V, \quad N/2 \leq n_1 \leq 2N,
\]
\[(u, c) = (v_1, c) = 1, \quad (v_1, v_2) \leq \delta^{-4}, \quad n_1 \equiv n_2 \pmod{u(v_1, v_2)}\]
such that
\[(5.5) \left| \sum_{x/mn \leq n \leq 2x/mn} \psi(mn) \right| \geq \delta^4 M \frac{V}{UV^2}.\]
and \( \varphi \otimes \varphi : G \times G \to \mathbb{C} \) be the function defined by

\[
\varphi \otimes \varphi(x_1, x_2) := \varphi(x_1)\overline{\varphi(x_2)}
\]

for \( x_1, x_2 \in G \). After a change of variables, (5.6) implies that

\[
\left| \sum_{n \in I} (\varphi \otimes \varphi) \circ h(n) \right| \geq \frac{\delta^4 M}{UV^2},
\]

where \( I = I_{u,v_1,v_2,n_1,n_2} \) is an interval consisting of integers \( \approx M\ell/(uv_1v_2) \). By (5.4), we always have \( uv_1v_2 \leq UV^2 \leq Mx^{-\varepsilon} \) so that \( |I| \gg x^\varepsilon \). Moreover, since \( \ell \ll \delta^{-4} \), we have

\[
\frac{\delta^4 M}{UV^2} \gg \delta^8 |I|.
\]

Hence the polynomial sequence \((h(n))_{n \in I}\) fails to be \( O(1) \)-equidistributed, and hence by [16, Theorem 2.9], there is a nontrivial horizontal character \( \chi = \chi(n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2) \) on \( G \times G \) with \( \|\chi\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} \), such that

\[
(5.8) \quad \|\chi \circ h\|_{C^\infty(I)} \ll \delta^{-O(1)}.
\]

After pigeonholing (which potentially reduces the size of \( \Gamma_\ell \) but the lower bound in (5.7) remains valid), we may assume that \( \chi \) is independent of \( n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2 \). Write \( \chi = (\chi_1, \chi_2) \), where \( \chi_1, \chi_2 \) are horizontal characters on \( G \) with \( \|\chi_i\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} \), at least one of which, say \( \chi_1 \), is nontrivial. If we write

\[
\chi_1 \circ g(n) = \sum_{j=0}^s \alpha_j n^j, \quad \chi_2 \circ g(n) = \sum_{j=0}^s \beta_j n^j,
\]

then we can write

\[
\chi \circ h(n) = \sum_{j=0}^s \alpha_j (uv_1v_2/\ell \cdot n_1 n + n_1 B)^j + \sum_{j=0}^s \beta_j (uv_1v_2/\ell \cdot n_2 n + n_2 B)^j = \sum_{j=0}^s \gamma_j n^j
\]

for some coefficients \( \gamma_j = \gamma_j(n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2) \). In particular,

\[
\gamma_s(n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2) = \alpha_s(\ell u_2 n_1/\ell)^s + \beta_s(\ell u_2 n_2/\ell)^s.
\]

It follows from (5.8) that

\[
(5.9) \quad \|\gamma_j(n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2)\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(1)}}{|I|^s}
\]

for \((n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2) \in \Gamma_\ell\). Consider the polynomial

\[
Q(n_1, z, u, v_1, v_2) = \gamma_s(n_1, n_1 + u\ell z, u, \ell v_1, \ell v_2).
\]

By (5.9), we have

\[
\|Q(n_1, z, u, v_1, v_2)\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(1)}}{|I|^s} \ll \frac{UV^2}{M} \cdot \delta^{-O(1)}\bigg(\frac{UV^2}{M}\bigg)^s
\]

for \( \gg \delta^{O(1)} V^2 N^2 \) values of \((n_1, z, u, v_1, v_2)\), with \( n_1 \approx N, z \approx N/(\ell U) \), \( u \approx U, v_1, v_2 \approx V/\ell \). All of these variables have size \( \geq x^{\varepsilon/2} \), so Lemma 5.3 is applicable. Note that in \( Q \) the coefficient of \((u\ell v_1 v_2 n_1)^s\) is \((\alpha_s + \beta_s)\ell^s\), and the coefficient of \((u\ell v_1 v_2)^s(uz)^s\) is \(\beta_s \ell^{2s}\).
Applying Lemma 5.3 to the polynomial $Q$ shows that there exists $1 \leq q \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ such that
\[
\|q^s(\alpha_s + \beta_s)\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} \left( \frac{UV^2}{M} \right)^s \frac{1}{(UV^2N)^s} \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-s},
\]
\[
\|q^{2s} \beta_s\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} \left( \frac{UV^2}{M} \right)^{2s} \frac{1}{(UV^2N)^{2s}} \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-s}.
\]
Hence $q_s = q^{2s} \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ has the property that
\[
\|q_s \alpha_s\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-j}, \quad \|q_s \beta_s\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-j}.
\]
We then show by induction that for $1 \leq j \leq s$ and some $1 \leq q_j \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ with $q_{j+1} \mid q_j$, we have
\[
(5.10) \quad \|q_j \alpha_j\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-j}, \quad \|q_j \beta_j\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-j}.
\]
The case $j = s$ has been proved, so we may assume that all the cases $s \geq j' > j$ have been proved and that we are considering case $j$. The coefficient $\gamma_j(n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2)$ can be explicitly written as
\[
\gamma_j = \alpha_j(uv_1v_2n_1/\ell)^j + \beta_j(uv_1v_2n_2/\ell)^j + \sum_{j < j' \leq s} \binom{j'}{j} \left( \alpha_{j'}(uv_1v_2n_1/\ell)^{(n_1B)^{j'}-j} + \beta_{j'}(uv_1v_2n_2/\ell)^{(n_2B)^{j'}-j} \right)
\]
Since (5.10) holds for all indices $j' > j$, one easily verifies that
\[
\|q_j' \alpha_j' (uv_1v_2n_1/\ell)^{(n_1B)^{j'}-j}\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(1)}}{|I|^{j'}}, \quad \|q_j' \beta_j' (uv_1v_2n_2/\ell)^{(n_2B)^{j'}-j}\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(1)}}{|I|^{j'}}.
\]
Hence the coefficient $\gamma_j(n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2)$ may be written in the form
\[
\|q_{j+1} \gamma_j\| = \|q_{j+1} \alpha_j(uv_1v_2n_1/\ell)^j + q_{j+1} \beta_j(uv_1v_2n_2/\ell)^j\| + O(\delta^{-O(1)}|I|^{-j-1}).
\]
Thus by (5.9) we have
\[
\|q_{j+1} \alpha_j(uv_1v_2n_1/\ell)^j + q_{j+1} \beta_j(uv_1v_2n_2/\ell)^j\| \ll \frac{\delta^{-O(1)}}{|I|^{j'}}
\]
for $(n_1, n_2, u, v_1, v_2) \in \Gamma$. Precisely as in the case $j = s$ (with $s$ in that argument now replaced by $j$), this implies (5.10) for $j$. Now, for $q = q_1 \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$ we have for every $1 \leq j \leq s$ that
\[
\|q \alpha_j\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-j}, \quad \|q \beta_j\| \ll \delta^{-O(1)} x^{-j}.
\]
This implies $\|\chi_1 \circ g\|_{C^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \ll \delta^{-O(1)}$. But now recalling that $C = C(s, \Delta, \varepsilon)$ is large enough and applying Lemma 5.3, we reach a contradiction to the assumption that $g$ is totally $\delta^C$-equidistributed.
Case 2: Suppose next that \( U \geq x^{\varepsilon/2}, V \leq x^{\varepsilon/2} \) or vice versa. Then we can merge variables in (5.3) by writing \( u' = uv \), effectively reducing to the case when \( x^{\varepsilon/2} \leq U \leq D_1 x^{\varepsilon/2} = N x^{-\varepsilon/2} \) and \( V = 1 \) (with possibly a divisor function \( d(u') \) as a factor; by Cauchy–Schwarz we can get rid of this divisor function). This case works exactly as Case 1, since Lemma 5.3 remains applicable (since the relevant polynomial \( Q(n_1, z, u, v_1', v_2') \) becomes a polynomial of just the three variables \( n_1, z, u) \).

Case 3: Finally, suppose that \( U, V \leq x^{\varepsilon/2} \). We can again merge variables by writing \( u' = uv \leq x^\varepsilon \), and using Cauchy–Schwarz to get rid of a divisor function we reduce to estimating (5.3) with \( U \leq x^\varepsilon, V = 1 \). Now, this case clearly follows from Proposition 5.1. Now we have considered all possible cases, so the proposition follows.

\[
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \left| \sum_{x \leq mn \leq 2x} a_m b_n \psi(mn) \right| \leq \delta x (\log x)^{O(1)},
\]

uniformly for sequences \( |a_n|, |b_n| \leq d_3(n)(\log(2n)) \).

**Proof.** This is otherwise identical to the proof of Proposition 5.4 except that we take \( D_2 = 1 \) in (5.2) (which is always allowed, without any need for a well-factorability assumption). Hence also \( V = 1 \) in that argument, and the quantity \( U \) (that determines the upper bound for the moduli considered) is allowed to range up to \( N x^{-\varepsilon/2} \), in particular it is allowed to range up to \( x^{1/3-\varepsilon} \). Note that we can allow the number \( c \) in the proof of Proposition 5.4 to vary with \( u \) (although not with \( v \)), as needed here.

6 Combining the Type I and Type II Estimates

**Proof of Theorems 3.2, 3.3, 3.4.** Let us prove Theorem 3.2 by applying Propositions 4.1 and 5.1, the other two theorems are similarly deduced by using Proposition 5.5 or Proposition 5.4 for the type II information. Note that it suffices to prove a dyadic version of this theorem where we sum over \( x \leq n \leq 2x \) instead of \( n \leq x \), since \( [x, 2x] \) can be covered by \( \ll \log x \) dyadic intervals. Henceforth we consider the sum over \( x \leq n \leq 2x \).

By Vaughan’s identity, we may write \( \Lambda(n) \) or \( \mu(n) \) for \( x \leq n \leq 2x \) as a sum of \( O((\log x)^{O(1)}) \) convolutions of the form \( \alpha_i \ast 1(n) \) and \( \beta_i \ast \gamma_i(n) \), where each \( \alpha_i \) is supported on \( [M_i/2, M_i] \) with \( M_i \leq 2x^{1/3} \) and \( \beta_i, \gamma_i \) are supported on \( [M_i/2, M_i] \) and \( [N_i/2, N_i] \), respectively, with \( M_i, N_i \in [x^{1/3}, 2x^{2/3}] \). Furthermore, all of \( \alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i \leq d_3(n)(\log(2n)) \) in absolute value and \( M_i N_i \geq x \). Therefore, we can handle the type I sums by Proposition 4.1 and the type II sums by Proposition 5.1.

In view of the deduction in Section 3 this was enough to prove Theorems 1.3, 1.4, and 1.6.

We are now in a position to also conclude the proof of Theorem 3.5 that involves the functions \( d_k \) and \( 1_S \).

**Proof of Theorem 3.5.** As previously, it suffices to prove a dyadic version of Theorem 3.5 where we sum over \( x \leq n \leq 2x \) instead of \( n \leq x \). Let \( f(n) = d_k(n) \) with \( k \in \mathbb{C} \) fixed,
or \( f(n) = 1_S(n) \). We show that \( f \) can be decomposed into a sum of \( \ll (\log x)^{O(1)} \) type I convolutions \( \alpha_i \ast 1 \) plus \( \ll (\log x)^{O(1)} \) type II convolutions \( \beta_i \ast \gamma_i \) plus an error term \( E(n) \) that satisfies

\[
(6.1) \quad \sum_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sum_{x \leq n \leq 2x \atop n \equiv c \pmod{d}} |E(n)| \ll_{A} x / (\log x)^{A},
\]

and additionally all the \( \alpha_i(n), \beta_i(n), \gamma_i(n) \) are \( \ll (\log x)^{O(1)} d(n)^{O(1)} \) in absolute value and \( \alpha_i \) is supported on \([1, x^{1/2-\varepsilon}/2]\) and \( \beta_i \) is supported on \([x^{1-\varepsilon}/3, x^{2+\varepsilon}/3]\). Once we have shown this, we have formed a type I/II decomposition for \( f(n) \) that is of the same form as the one we used for \( \Lambda(n) \) to prove our main theorems, so Theorem \ref{thm:main} will follow.

To form this decomposition of Heath-Brown type, we adapt an argument from \cite{25} Section 5; this argument applies to any multiplicative function \( f \) that is divisor-bounded and eventually periodic on the primes. The conclusion is that \( d_k(n) \) and \( 1_S(n) \) can be written as the sum of \( \ll (\log x)^{O(1)} \) convolutions of the form \( \alpha_1 \ast \cdots \ast \alpha_R \) plus \( O(E(n)) \), where \( R \ll 1 \) and

(i) all the \( \alpha_i(n) \) are \( \ll (\log x)^{O(1)} d(n)^{O(1)} \) in absolute value;
(ii) all the \( \alpha_i \)'s are supported on intervals of the form \([y_i, y'_i]\) with \( y'_i \leq 2y_i \), and if \( y_i \geq x^{1/60} \), then we have \( \alpha_i(n) = 1\{y_i, y'_i\}(n) \) or \( \alpha_i(n) = (\log n)1\{y_i, y'_i\}(n) \) or \( \alpha_i(n) = \chi(n)1\{y_i, y'_i\}(n) \) or \( \alpha_i(n) = \chi(n) (\log n)1\{y_i, y'_i\}(n) \), where \( \chi \) is the non-principal Dirichlet character \( \mod{4} \) (and this \( \chi(n) \) can occur only in the case of \( f(n) = 1_S(n) \));
(iii) \( E(n) = (1_{\exists p > w : p^2 | n} + 1_{\exists m > x^{1/60} : m | n, m \text{ is } w \text{-smooth}})d_{|k|}(n) \), where \( w = x^{1/(10 \log \log x)} \).

Since \( n \) is supported on \([x, 2x]\), we must have \( y_1 \cdots y_R \ll x \). If \( y_i \geq x^{2/3} \) for some \( i \), then \( \alpha_i \) satisfies property (ii) above. We can take \( \alpha = \alpha_i \) and \( \beta = \alpha_1 \ast \cdots \ast \alpha_i \ast 1 \ast \alpha_{i+1} \ast \cdots \ast \alpha_R \) (or \( \beta(n) = 1_{n=1} \) if \( R = 1 \)), and now this is essentially a type I sum with the free variable corresponding to \( \alpha(n) \) having length \( y_i \geq x^{2/3} \). The only difference here is that we may have a \( \log n \) or \( \chi(n) \log n \) weight for \( \alpha(n) \), but the \( \log n \) weight is harmless by partial summation and \( \chi(n) \) is harmless by splitting into residue classes \( \mod{4} \). If \( y_i \in [x^{1/3}, x^{2/3}] \) for some \( i \), then we form a type II convolution by setting \( \alpha, \beta \) as before (here \( \alpha(n), \beta(n) \ll (\log n)^{O(1)} d_{|k|}(n)^{O(1)} \), as opposed to \( \ll d_3(n)(\log 2n) \) in our type I and type II propositions, but clearly the proof works without modification in this more general case). If all \( y_i \leq x^{1/3} \), then choose \( j \) to be the smallest index with \( y_1 \cdots y_j \geq x^{1/3} \). We also must have \( y_1 \cdots y_j \ll x^{2/3} \) since \( y_j \leq x^{1/3} \), so taking \( \alpha = \alpha_1 \ast \cdots \ast \alpha_j \) and \( \beta = \alpha_{j+1} \ast \cdots \ast \alpha_R \) we have formed the desired type II convolution.

It remains to verify that the error term \( (6.1) \) coming from \( E(n) \) is small. By estimating trivially the number of \( n \) in a progression that are divisible by a prime square \( p^2 > w^2 \), we see that for \( d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon} \) the number of \( n \leq 2x \) with \( n \equiv c \pmod{d} \) and \( p^2 | n \) for some \( p > w \) is \( \ll x/(dw) \), which gives an admissible contribution to \( (6.1) \). If \( \rho_w(n) \) denotes the indicator function of \( w \)-smooth numbers, then by a bilinear Bombieri–Vinogradov estimate \cite[Theorem 17.4]{21} and the fact that \( \rho_w(n) \) satisfies the Siegel–Walfisz condition (by \cite{6}), we have

\[
(6.2) \quad \sum_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sum_{x \leq n \leq 2x \atop n \equiv c \pmod{d}} \sum_{n=n_1n_2} \rho_w(n_1) \ll_{A} x / (\log x)^{A},
\]
To deal with the range $n_2 > 2x^{1-\varepsilon/10}$ not included in the previous sum, we can just sum over the variable $n_2$ first and use the fact that the constant function 1 has level of distribution 1. By the Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem for smooth numbers [6], we can deal with the missing range $n_1 > 2x^{1-\varepsilon/10}$, obtaining

$$
\sum_{d \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}} \max_{(c,d)=1} \sum_{x_1 < n \leq 2x} \sum_{n_1 \leq n_2 \leq x^{\varepsilon/10}} \rho_\varepsilon(n_1) \ll_A x/(\log x)^A.
$$

By Cauchy–Schwarz, we obtain (6.2) and (6.3) also when the sums there are weighted by $d|\kappa(n)$. Hence, $E(n)$ satisfies (6.1), so $f(n)$ obeys the desired decomposition. The result follows. 

7 Sieve lemmas

The rest of the paper is devoted to the proofs of our applications (Theorems 2.3, 2.5 and 2.7). We first formulate weighted versions of the sieves of Maynard and Chen, which will be needed subsequently.

**Definition 7.1.** We say that a $k$-tuple $(h_1, \ldots, h_k)$ of integers is admissible if for every prime $p$ there exists $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $p \nmid a + h_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.

**Proposition 7.2** (Maynard’s sieve). For any $\theta \in (0,1)$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exist $C = C(\theta)$ and $\rho = \rho(\theta,k)$ such that the following holds.

Let $(\omega_n)_{n \leq x}$ be any sequence of nonnegative real numbers with $x \geq x_0(\theta,k)$, and let $(h_1, \ldots, h_k)$ be an admissible $k$-tuple with $|h_i| \leq \log x$. Suppose that $(\omega_n)$ satisfies the following hypotheses:

(i) (Prime number theorem) For all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and some $\delta > 0$ we have

$$
\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \geq \frac{\delta}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n;
$$

(ii) (Well-distribution in arithmetic progressions) We have

$$
\sum_{r \leq x^\theta} \max_{c \mod r} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \equiv c \mod r} \omega_n - \frac{1}{r} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \right| \ll \frac{\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n}{(\log x)^{101k^2}}.
$$

(iii) (Bombieri–Vinogradov) For all $1 \leq i \leq k$ we have

$$
\sum_{r \leq x^\theta} \max_{(c+h_i,r)=1} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \equiv c \mod r} \omega_n - \frac{1}{\varphi(r)} \sum_{n \leq x \atop n+h_i \equiv \mathbb{P}} \omega_n \right| \ll \frac{\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n}{(\log x)^{101k^2}}.
$$

(iv) (Brun–Titchmarsh) We have

$$
\max_{c \mod r} \sum_{n \leq x \atop n \equiv c \mod r} \omega_n \ll \frac{1}{r} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n,
$$

uniformly for $r \leq x^\theta$. 

Then we have
\[
\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \gg_k \theta, \delta \frac{\mathcal{S}(h_1, \ldots, h_k)}{(\log x)^k} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n,
\]
where the singular series \(\mathcal{S}(h_1, \ldots, h_k)\) is given by
\[
\mathcal{S}(h_1, \ldots, h_k) := \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-k} \left(1 - \left\lfloor \frac{\{h_1, \ldots, h_k\} \pmod{p}\} \right\rfloor \right) > 0.
\]

**Proof.** This is [23, Theorem 6.2], which adds weights to the corresponding statement in [27].

**Proposition 7.3** (Chen’s sieve). Let \((\omega_n)_{n \leq x}\) be any sequence of nonnegative real numbers, and let \(x\) be large enough. Let \(\varepsilon > 0\) be a small enough absolute constant. Suppose that \((\omega_n)\) satisfies the following hypotheses:

(i) (Bombieri–Vinogradov with well-factorable weights) We have
\[
\sum_{r \leq x^{1/2 - \varepsilon}} \frac{\mu(r)^2 \lambda_r \left( \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n - \frac{1}{\varphi(r)} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \right)\left| \frac{n}{\log(n+1)} \right|^2 \leq \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \]

for any \(\lambda_r\) that is either well-factorable of level \(x^{1/2 - \varepsilon}\) or a convolution of the form \(\lambda = 1_{p \leq [P, P']} \ast \lambda'\) with \(\lambda'\) a well-factorable function of level \(\varphi(r)\) and \(2P \geq P' \geq P \in [x^{1/10}, x^{1/3 - \varepsilon}]\).

(ii) (Bombieri–Vinogradov for almost primes with well-factorable weights) For \(j \in \{1, 2\}\) we have
\[
\sum_{r \leq x^{1/2 - \varepsilon}} \frac{\mu(r)^2 \lambda_r \left( \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n - \frac{1}{\varphi(r)} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \right)\left| \frac{n}{\log(n+1)} \right|^2 \leq \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \]

where \(\lambda_r\) is as above and
\[
B_1 = \{p_1 p_2 p_3 : x^{1/10} \leq p_1 \leq x^{1/3 - \varepsilon}, x^{1/3 - \varepsilon} \leq p_2 \leq \left(\frac{2x}{p_1}\right)^{1/2}, p_3 \geq x^{1/10}\},
\]
\[
B_2 = \{p_1 p_2 p_3 : x^{1/3 - \varepsilon} \leq p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \left(\frac{2x}{p_1}\right)^{1/2}, p_3 \geq x^{1/10}\}.
\]

(iii) \((\omega_n)\) is not concentrated on almost primes: For \(j \in \{1, 2\}\) we have
\[
\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \leq (1 + \varepsilon) |B_j \cap [1, x]| \cdot \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n.
\]

Then we have
\[
\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \geq \frac{\delta_0}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n - O\left(x^{0.9} \max_n \omega_n\right),
\]
for some absolute constant \(\delta_0 > 0\).
This is [23, Theorem 6.4], which adds weights to Chen’s sieve argument. The $1+\varepsilon$ factor in Hypothesis (iii) was $1+o(1)$ there, but inspecting the proof in [23, Appendix A] (in particular Subsection A.5), this relaxation makes no difference.

8 Bounded gaps between primes in a Bohr set

We prove Theorem 2.3 in this section. In the proof we may assume that $\rho>0$ is sufficiently small. Further, by restricting to the smaller generalized Bohr set $B'=B\cap(W\mathbb{Z}+1)$, where $W=\prod_{p\leq w} p$ and $w$ is a large absolute constant, we may restrict to polynomials $Q$ having the form

$$Q(x) = \alpha_s x^s + \cdots + \alpha_1 x + \alpha_0, \quad \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}) \cup \{0\}, \quad \alpha_s \neq 0.$$  

(8.1)

In particular, the leading coefficient $\alpha_s$ of $Q$ is irrational. When proving Theorem 2.3, we allow our implied constants to depend on the polynomial $Q$. In what follows, we set $x=q^2$, where $q$ is such that $\|q\alpha_j\| \leq q^{-1/s}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s$; by the multidimensional version of Dirichlet’s approximation theorem there exist infinitely many such $q$, so $x$ is tending to infinity along a subset of the integers. Observe now that whenever $\alpha_j \neq 0$, we have

$$\|r\alpha_j\| \geq \frac{1}{2q} \geq x^{-1/2}/2$$

for all $1 \leq r \leq x^{1/(2s)}/2$.

We impose the hierarchy

$$k \ll \rho^{-1} \ll K \ll P$$

on the parameters appearing in the proof, with each parameter large enough in terms of the ones to the left of it. Here $P$ will be considered to be fixed but large, whereas $x$ will tend to infinity. These parameters will be introduced in the course of the proof.

We begin with a lemma that provides a convenient minorant function for $1_{\|x\|<\rho}$.

**Lemma 8.1** (Vinogradov). For any $\rho \in (0,1/2)$ and $\eta \in (0,1)$, there exists a minorant function $0 \leq g(x) \leq 1_{\|x\|<\rho}$ such that

(i) $g(x)$ is $1$-periodic and $g(x) = 0$ for $x \in [-1/2,1/2] \setminus (-\rho,\rho)$.

(ii) We have a Fourier expansion

$$g(x) = 2(1-\eta)\rho + \sum_{|j|>0} c_j e(jx),$$

where $|c_j| \ll_\eta \rho$.

(iii) We have

$$\sum_{|j|>K} |c_j| \ll_\eta \frac{1}{K}$$

for $K \geq \rho^{-1}(\log 1/\rho)^2$.

**Proof.** See [32, Section 3].

Let $k$ be a large integer, let $\eta = 1 - 1/(10000k)$, and fix a function $g$ that satisfies Lemma 8.1 with parameters $\rho$ and $\eta$. Also let $K = K(\rho,k)$ be a fast growing function of $k$ and $\rho$. In order to apply Maynard’s sieve, we first need to fix an admissible $k$-tuple $(h_1, \ldots, h_k)$. Note that it is not the case that for an arbitrary such tuple the intersection $(B-h_1) \cap \cdots \cap (B-h_k)$ is nonempty. The next lemma guarantees the existence of
admissible tuples \((h_1, \ldots, h_k)\) for which the intersection of \((B - h_1) \cap \cdots \cap (B - h_k)\) does have nearly the expected density.

**Lemma 8.2.** For every \(k \geq 1\), there exists an admissible \(k\)-tuple \((h_1, \ldots, h_k)\) with \(|h_i| \ll_{k, \rho, \kappa} 1\) such that
\[
\sum_{n \leq x} g(Q(n + h_1)) \cdots g(Q(n + h_k)) \geq 0.99(2p)^k x
\]
for \(x \geq x_0(k, \rho)\) large enough.

**Proof of Lemma 8.2.** Note that any tuple \((p_1, \ldots, p_k)\) of distinct primes \(p_i > k\) is admissible. Write \(Q(x) = \alpha_0 x^k + \cdots + \alpha_0\) as in (8.1). By Dirichlet's approximation theorem, we can find infinitely many pairs \((a', q')\) of coprime integers such that \(|\alpha_s - a'/q'| \leq 1/q'^2\).

Choose a pair for which \(q'\) is large enough in terms of \(k, \rho, \kappa\). Take \(P = q'^2\).

Now, by the pigeonhole principle, the claim of the lemma would follow from
\[
\sum_{p \leq p_1, \ldots, p_k \leq 2^P} \sum_{n \leq x} g(Q(n + p_1)) \cdots g(Q(n + p_k)) \geq 0.999(2p)^k x \cdot (\pi(2P) - \pi(P))^k.
\]
By writing out the Fourier series for \(g(x)\) from Lemma 8.1, the left-hand side of (8.4) becomes
\[
(2p(1 - \eta))^{k} x \cdot (\pi(2P) - \pi(P))^k + \sum_{|j_1| \leq K} c_{j_1} \cdots c_{j_k} \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{i = 1}^{k} \sum_{p \leq 2^P} e(j_i Q(p + n))
\]
\[
+ O_k((\pi(2P) - \pi(P))^k \frac{x}{K}).
\]
The error term here is \(\leq 10^{-10}(2p)^k x(\pi(2P) - \pi(P))^k\) by the assumption that \(K\) is large enough in terms of \(\rho, k\). Then by applying bounds for exponential sums of Waring–Goldbach type (see [24, Theorem 1.3]) with \(H = x\), although weaker results would suffice as well\(^2\), to \(p \mapsto j_i Q(p + n)\), the expression (8.5) becomes
\[
(2p(1 - \eta))^{k} x \cdot (\pi(2P) - \pi(P))^k + O_k(xP^{1 - \delta_k}) \geq 0.99(2p)^k x \cdot (\pi(2P) - \pi(P))^k
\]
for some \(\delta_k > 0\), for \(x\) large enough and for \(P\) large enough in terms of \(k\). The lemma is proved.

**Lemma 8.3.** Let \(k \geq 1\), and let \(h_1, \ldots, h_k\) be integers of modulus \(\leq \log x\). Then for any \(1 \leq i \leq k\) and for \(x\) large enough we have
\[
\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \quad \text{such that} \quad n + h_i \in \mathbb{P}}} g(Q(n + h_1)) \cdots g(Q(n + h_k)) = \frac{1 + O^*(K^{-1/2})}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} g(Q(n + h_1)) \cdots g(Q(n + h_k)),
\]
where \(O^*(Z)\) denotes a quantity that is \(\leq Z\) in absolute value.

\(^2\)In [24, Theorem 1.3] the saving in the exponential sum is a power of logarithm, but clearly the same proof works with a small power-saving in the error term if the conclusion on the coefficients is weakened to \([q_i \alpha_j] \ll N^\alpha/N\) with \(q_i \ll N^\kappa\) and \(\kappa > 0\) small but absolute.
Proof. By expanding the left-hand side as a Fourier series and applying the prime number theorem, it becomes

\[
\sum_{|j_1|, \ldots, |j_k| \leq K} c_{j_1} \cdots c_{j_k} \sum_{n \leq x} e(j_1 Q(n + h_1) + \cdots + j_k Q(n + h_k)) + O_k \left( \frac{x}{K \log x} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{|j_1|, \ldots, |j_k| \leq K} c_{j_1} \cdots c_{j_k} \sum_{p \leq x} e(j_1 Q(p + h_1 - h_i) + \cdots + j_k Q(p + h_k - h_i)) + O_k \left( \frac{x}{K \log x} \right)
\]

Here the error term is negligible. By an estimate for exponential sums involving polynomial phases over the primes (see \cite[Theorem 1.3]{24}) and \cite[(8.2)]{6}, the inner sum over \( p \) is \( \ll x^{1-\delta_k} \) for some \( \delta_k > 0 \), unless the polynomial

\[
j_1 Q(x + h_1 - h_i) + \cdots + j_k Q(x + h_k - h_i)
\]

is constant. Let \( \mathcal{J} \) be the collection of \( (j_1, \ldots, j_k) \) for which the polynomial above is constant. Then the contribution to \cite[(8.6)]{4} of the tuples \( (j_1, \ldots, j_k) \notin \mathcal{J} \) is negligible, whereas for the tuples \( (j_1, \ldots, j_k) \in \mathcal{J} \) we can apply the prime number theorem to compare their contribution to the corresponding sum without the condition \( n + h_i \in \mathbb{P} \). The conclusion then is that \cite[(8.6)]{4} equals to

\[
\frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{(j_1, \ldots, j_k) \in [-K, K]^k \cap \mathcal{J}} c_{j_1} \cdots c_{j_k} \sum_{n \leq x} e(j_1 Q(n + h_1) + \cdots + j_k Q(n + h_k)) + O_k \left( \frac{x}{K (\log x)} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\log x} \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_k} c_{j_1} \cdots c_{j_k} \sum_{n \leq x} e(j_1 Q(n + h_1) + \cdots + j_k Q(n + h_k)) + O_k \left( \frac{x}{K \log x} \right),
\]

where on the second line we used standard estimates for Weyl sums \cite[(Lemma 4.4)]{16} to include the contribution of \( (j_1, \ldots, j_k) \notin \mathcal{J} \) into the error term. Now, rewriting this last Fourier series in terms of \( g(x) \), and recalling that \( K \) can be chosen large in terms of \( k \), we obtain the claimed estimate.

Proof of Theorem 2.3. We apply the weighted version of Maynard’s sieve in the form of Proposition 7.2. We set our weight \( \omega_n \) to be

\[
\omega_n = g(Q(n + h_1)) \cdots g(Q(n + h_k));
\]

this is a nonnegative minorant for the function \( 1_B(n + h_1) \cdots 1_B(n + h_k) \), and here \( (h_1, \ldots, h_k) \) is an admissible tuple such that \cite[(8.3)]{4} holds.

Now, if we verify the hypothesis of Proposition 7.2 for the weight \( \omega_n \) (with level of distribution \( \theta = 1/3 - \varepsilon \) for small enough but fixed \( \varepsilon \) and some fixed \( \delta > 0 \)), we obtain the desired conclusion in the form

\[
\sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \gg_{k, \rho} \frac{\mathcal{S}(h_1, \ldots, h_k)}{(\log x)^k} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \gg_{k, \rho} \frac{x}{(\log x)^k},
\]

for some absolute constant \( C \geq 1 \). By choosing \( k \) to be a large enough absolute constant, this then proves that gaps of length at most \( \max_{i,j \leq k} |h_i - h_j| \) occur infinitely often in the set \( B \cap \mathbb{P} \).
We begin inspecting the hypotheses (i)-(iv). By Lemmas 8.3 and 8.2 we have
\[ \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n = \frac{1 + O((K^{-1/2})}{\log x} \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \geq 0.98(2\rho)^k \frac{x}{\log x}, \]
which confirms hypothesis (i). The three remaining hypotheses on \( \omega_n \) are:

(ii) Level of distribution \( 1/3 - \varepsilon \) for \( \omega_n \):
\[ \sum_{r \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon}} \max_{c \pmod{r}} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \pmod r} \omega_n - \frac{1}{r} \sum_{x \leq n \leq 2x} \omega_n \right| \ll \sum_{n \leq x} \omega_n \left( \frac{\log x}{x} \right)^{101k^2}; \]

(iii) Level of distribution \( 1/3 - \varepsilon \) for \( \omega_n 1_{n+h_i \in \mathbb{P}} \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq k \):
\[ \sum_{r \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon}} \max_{c \pmod{r}} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \pmod r} \omega_n - \frac{1}{\varphi(r)} \sum_{n \leq x \pmod r} \omega_n \right| \ll \sum_{x \leq n \leq 2x} \omega_n \left( \frac{\log x}{x} \right)^{101k^2}; \]

(iv) A Brun–Titchmarsh type bound for \( \omega_n \):
\[ \max_{c \pmod{r}} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \pmod r} \omega_n \right| \ll \frac{1}{r} \sum_{x \leq n \leq 2x} \omega_n, \]
uniformly for \( 1 \leq r \leq x^{1/3-\varepsilon} \).

By Lemma 8.1 we may expand out \( \omega_n \) as a Fourier series:
\[ \omega_n = (2\rho(1-\eta))^k + \sum_{j_1, \ldots, j_k} c_{j_1} \cdots c_{j_k} e(j_1Q(n+h_1) + \cdots + j_kQ(n+h_k)). \]

Note that any constant sequence satisfies hypothesis (ii)-(iv) by the Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem and the Brun–Titchmarsh inequality. By truncating the Fourier series of \( g(x) \) from height \( M := (\log x)^{102k^2} \) and recalling properties (ii) and (iii) of the Fourier expansion of \( g(x) \), it suffices to inspect the hypotheses with \( \omega_n \) replaced by \( \omega'_n := e(nQ(n+h_1) + \cdots + Q(n+h_k)) \) for any tuple \( (j_1, \ldots, j_k) \) with \( |j_i| \leq M \), and for which \( R(x) := j_1Q(x+h_1) + \cdots + Q(x+h_k) \) is non-constant, and with (iv) now modified to the form
\[ (8.7) \quad \max_{c \pmod{r}} \left| \sum_{n \leq x \pmod r} \omega'_n \right| = o \left( \frac{x}{(\log x)^{102k^3}} \right), \]
and also \( (\log x)^{-101k^2} \) is now replaced with \( (\log x)^{-102k^3} \) in (ii) and (iii).

Recall that \( x = q^2 \), where \( q \) is such that for some \( a \) coprime to \( q \) we have \( |a_n - a/q| \leq q^{-2} \). Now by the Erdős–Turán inequality (which is a quantitative form of Weyl’s criterion) and a standard bound for Weyl sums [16 Lemma 4.4], it follows that the nilsequence \( e(R(n)) \) of degree \( \leq s \) is totally \( \delta \)-equidistributed on \( [x, 2x] \) with \( \delta = x^{-c_s} \), for some small \( c_s > 0 \). Then hypothesis (iii) follows from our Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem for equidistributed nilsequences, Theorem 3.3.

Similarly, we see that any \( m \mapsto \omega'_{rm+c} \) is a degree \( s \) nilsequence that is \( \delta \)-equidistributed on \( [x, 2x] \) for \( \delta = x^{-c_s} \) for some small \( c_s > 0 \), so (8.7) holds, in fact in a stronger form where the right-hand side is replaced with \( o((x/r)^{1-c_s}) \). This stronger form in fact implies
(ii) as well (with $(\log x)^{-102k^3}$ on the right). Now hypotheses (i)-(iv) have been checked, so Theorem 2.3 follows.

9 Chen primes in Bohr sets

Our task in this section is to prove Theorem 2.5 on Chen primes in nil-Bohr sets.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. The set \( \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \|Q(n)\| < n^{\theta_s} \} \) contains the set \( \{ n \in \mathbb{N} : \|Q(Wn)\| < (Wn)^{-\theta_s} \} \) for any \( W \geq 1 \), so similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.3 we may assume that

\[
Q(x) = \alpha_s x^s + \cdots + \alpha_0, \quad \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_s \in (\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}) \cup \{0\}, \quad \alpha_s \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q},
\]

with the value of \( s \geq 1 \) here possibly smaller than in Theorem 2.5. By Dirichlet’s approximation theorem, we can find infinitely many pairs \( (a,q) \) of coprime integers with

\[
|\alpha_s - a/q| \leq \frac{1}{q^2}.
\]

Restrict to those \( x \) that can be written as \( x = q^2 \) for some such \( q \); this is a sequence of \( x \)'s that tends to infinity.

Let \( \theta_s = 100^{-s} \). Let \( g(x) \) be the minorant function arising from Lemma 8.1 with \( \rho = x^{\theta_s} \) and \( \eta = 1/2 \). Then we can estimate

\[
\sum_{p \leq x \atop p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Chen}}} 1_{\|Q(p)\| < p^{-\theta_s}} \geq \sum_{p \leq x \atop p \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{Chen}}} g(Q(p)).
\]

(9.1)

By applying Chen’s sieve result in the form of Proposition 7.3, we see that the right-hand side of (9.1) is

\[
\gg \frac{1}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{n \leq x} g(Q(n)),
\]

(9.2)

provided that hypotheses (i)-(iii) of Proposition 7.3 are satisfied.

Expanding out the Fourier series of \( g(x) \) and truncating it from height \( K = x^{\theta_s} (\log x)^C \) for large \( C \), the lower bound (9.2) becomes

\[
\geq 0.49 x^{-\theta_s} \frac{x}{(\log x)^2} + \frac{1}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{0 < |j| \leq K} c_j \sum_{n \leq x} e(jQ(n)) \geq 0.48 x^{-\theta_s} \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}
\]

for \( x \) large enough by standard estimates on Weyl sums [16, Lemma 4.4] and the assumption that \( x = q^2 \) with \( |\alpha_s - a/q| \leq 1/q^2 \).

It now suffices to verify hypotheses (i)-(iii) of Proposition 7.3 for \( \omega_n = g(Q(n)) \). Since

\[
\omega_n = x^{-\theta_s} + \sum_{|j| > 0} c_j e(jQ(n))
\]

with \( |c_j| \ll x^{-\theta_s} \) and since any constant sequence satisfies (i)-(iii), it suffices to verify these hypotheses for \( e(jQ(n)) \) for \( 0 < |j| \leq K = x^{\theta_s} (\log x)^C \) (with \( (\log x)^{-10} \) replaced by \( (\log x)^{-A} \) in these hypotheses).

Hypothesis (iii) is seen to hold similarly to the proof of Lemma 8.3 (since we have similar bounds for exponential sums over the set of almost primes in \( B_j \); as for the primes themselves; in particular, we can apply type I and type II estimates for sums weighted by \( e(Q(n)) \) given by [24 Proposition 2.1 and Proposition 2.2]).

Hypothesis (i) in the case of a well-factorable weight \( \{\lambda_r\} \) is seen to hold similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.3, but this time using our Bombieri–Vinogradov estimate for nilsequences with well-factorable weights, Theorem 3.4.
Hypothesis (ii) in the case of a well-factorable weight \( \{ \lambda_r \} \) follows along similar lines, since the indicator function \( 1_{B_r}(n) \) evidently satisfies a similar Heath-Brown type decomposition as \( 1_{P}(n) \), so our type I Proposition 4.1 and type II Proposition 5.4 are applicable to polynomial phase twists of these indicators.

Let us then consider condition (i) in the case of a weight \( \lambda \) that is not quite well-factorable, but is of the form \( \lambda = 1_{p \in [P,P')} * \lambda' \) as stated in hypothesis (i). Note that in the proof of the type II Proposition 5.4 we only ever required the definition of well-factorability with the parameter choices \( D_1 = N x^{-\varepsilon}, D_2 = M x^{-1/2} \), where \( M, N \in [x^{1/4}, x^{3/4}] \) with \( MN = x \) and \( N \leq M \) such that the two sequences in our type II convolution \( \alpha * \beta(n) \) are supported on \([1, M]\) and \([1, N]\), respectively. If \( P = x^\theta \) with \( 1/10 \leq \theta \leq 1/3 - \varepsilon \), the well-factorability of \( \lambda' \) allows us to decompose \( \lambda \) into a convolution \((1_{p \in [P,P']} * \beta) * \gamma, \) with \( 1_{p \in [P,P']} * \beta \) supported on \([1, 2 x^{\theta+\varepsilon}]\) and \( \gamma \) supported on \([1, x^{1/2-\theta-\varepsilon-\varepsilon}]\), for any \( \xi \in (0, 1/2 - \theta - \varepsilon) \). As \( \xi \) ranges over \((0, 1/2 - \theta - \varepsilon)\), the pair \((2 x^{\theta+\varepsilon}, x^{1/2-\theta-\varepsilon-\varepsilon})\) covers all possible pairs \((D_1, D_2)\) mentioned above, so Proposition 5.4 can still be applied.

Finally, to deal with hypothesis (ii) involving \( \lambda' \), we argue as follows. The indicator \( 1_{B_r}(n) \) is already (after separation of variables) a type II sum, where one of the variables (namely \( p_2 \)) is supported on \([x^{1/3-\varepsilon}, x^{1/2}]\), so Proposition 5.4 can be applied in the same way as for condition (i).

\[ \square \]

10 Linear equations in primes in arithmetic progressions

We now turn to the proof of Theorem 2.7, which also includes the proof of Theorem 2.9.

Proof of Theorem 2.7. We adapt some arguments from [14]. Let \( w = w(x) \) be a positive integer that tends to \(+\infty\) slowly enough. By dividing the variables \( n \) into residue classes modulo \( \mathcal{P}(w) \), it suffices to show that the result holds when \( \mathcal{P}(w) \mid q \), with \( O_A(Q(\log x)^{-A}) \) exceptions. The details of this reduction is similar to the argument in [14] Section 5.

Henceforth assume that \( \mathcal{P}(w) \mid q \). By the generalized von Neumann theorem [14] Proposition 7.1 and the relative version of the inverse theorem for the Gowers norms [14] Proposition 10.1] (see also [67 Theorem 1.3]), we have (2.3), provided that the following two conditions hold.

(i) For all but \( \ll_A Q(\log x)^{-A} \) choices of \( q \leq Q \) the following holds. For each invertible residue class \( a \) (mod \( q \)), the function \( \Lambda_{a,q}(n) := \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \Lambda(qn + a) \) is majorized by \( C q \nu(n) \), where \( \nu \) is \( D \)-pseudorandom with \( D \) large enough in terms of \( t, d, M \) (see [14] Section 6) for the definition of the pseudorandomness conditions).

(ii) For all but \( \ll_A Q(\log x)^{-A} \) choices of \( q \leq Q \) we have the Gowers norm bound \( \| \Lambda_{a,q} - 1 \|_{U^k(x)} = o_{w \to \infty}(1) + o_{w \to \infty}(1) \) for all \( k \geq 1 \). (This is precisely the content of Theorem 2.9)

Verifying (i): For showing condition (i), we follow [14] Appendix D that establishes the analogous claim for \( q = 1 \), indicating the necessary modifications (see also [3] Proposition 6.1) that handles the case \( q \ll_A (\log x)^A \). Let

\[ Q := \{ q \leq Q : \Omega(q) \leq C \log \log x \}, \]
where \( C \) is a large enough constant and \( \Omega(q) \) denotes the number of prime factors of \( q \) with multiplicities. We have

\[
\left| [1, Q] \setminus Q \right| \ll 2^{-C \log \log x} \sum_{q \leq Q} 2^{\Omega(q)} \ll Q (\log x)^{-C/2},
\]

so it suffices to prove condition (i) for \( q \in Q \).

As in \cite[Appendix D]{14}, we define

\[
\nu(n) := \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\nu}(n),
\]

with 

\[
\tilde{\nu}(n) = \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \Lambda_{\chi,R,2}(qn + a) := \frac{\varphi(q)}{q} (\log R) \left( \sum_{d \mid n + a} \mu(d) \chi \left( \frac{\log d}{\log R} \right) \right)^2,
\]

where \( \chi \) is a smooth function compactly supported in \([-1, 1] \) and \( \chi(0) = 1 \), with \( 0 \leq \chi(y) \leq 1 \) everywhere. Note that since \( \mathcal{P}(w) \mid q \), the \( W \)-trick is already incorporated in the definition of \( \Lambda_{\chi,R,2} \).

Let \( N \) be a prime of size \((CD + o(1))x \) for large enough \( CD > 0 \), and extend \( \nu(n) \) to \([1, N]\) by defining it to be \( \nu \equiv 1 \) elsewhere. Embed \( \nu(n) \) into the cyclic group \( \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z} \) in the obvious way. Then the function \( \nu \) is our choice of a pseudorandom measure.

We will inspect that the Goldston–Yildirim estimate of \cite[Theorem D.3]{14} (with \( N = x \)) holds for the family of linear forms \( n \mapsto (L_1(qn + a), \ldots, L_t(qn + a)) \). The case \( q = 1 \) is \cite[Theorem D.3]{14}. We will then deduce the linear forms and correlation conditions for \( \tilde{\nu}(n) \) by following \cite[pp. 75–77]{14}. Both of these arguments (\cite[Theorem D.3]{14} and \cite[pp. 75–77]{14}) go through in our setting with the following minor modifications:

- The factor \( e^{O(X)(\log R)^{-1/2}} \) in \cite[Theorem D.3]{14} is \( o(1) \) and therefore harmless, since

\[
X \ll_{t,d,L} 1 + \sum_{p \mid q} p^{-1/2} \ll \log \log \log N
\]

by the assumption \( q \in Q \) and the fact that the “exceptional” primes \( p \) in \cite[Theorem D.3]{14} are either \( O_{d,t,L}(1) \) or divide \( q \).

- In the proof of \cite[Theorem D.3]{14} there are a few conditions (such as \( \alpha(p, B) = 1/p \) and \( \beta_p = 1 + O(1/p) \)) that only hold for the primes \( p \nmid q \) in our setting (as opposed to all large enough primes). This makes little difference in the argument, since we can separate the contribution of the primes \( p \mid q \) from the rest and the contribution of the rest of the primes gives the correct local factors, whereas for \( p \mid q \) quantities such as \( E_{p,\xi} \) in \cite[Lemma D.5]{14} are easy to compute, which ultimately leads to the value \( \beta_q = p/\varphi(p) \) for \( p \mid q \), as desired.

- When verifying the linear forms and correlation conditions in \cite[pp. 75–77]{14}, one should replace \( W \) with \( q \) and conditions such as \( p \leq w \) with \( p \mid q \) and \( p > w \) with \( p \nmid q \). The estimates in \cite[p. 77]{14} go through verbatim with these modifications.

Thus Condition (i) has been checked.
Verifying (ii): We utilize Theorem 1.3, which implies that for any $A \geq 2$ we have

$$\max_{(a,q)=1} \sup_{\psi \in \Psi_{\Delta,\log x}} \frac{q}{\varphi(q)} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda_{a,q}(n) \psi(n) \right| \leq \frac{\varphi(q)V}{\varphi(qV)} \sum_{n \leq x} \psi(n) \ll_{k,A,\Delta,\varepsilon} \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},$$

for all but $O(Q(\log x)^{-A})$ values of $q \leq Q$, where $V = \mathcal{P}((\log x)^B)$ for some sufficiently large constant $B = B(A, k, \Delta) > 0$. Let

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{a,q}(n) = \frac{\varphi(q)V}{\varphi(qV)} \cdot 1_{(qn+a, V)=1}$$

be the function appearing in the second sum in (10.1). We claim that this function (embedded to a cyclic group) is $D$-pseudorandom for any fixed $D$. To see this, let $\chi$ be a smooth function supported on $[-1, 1]$ with $\chi(y) = 1$ for $|y| \leq 1/2$ and $0 \leq \chi(y) \leq 1$ everywhere. Let

$$\Lambda^{(V)}_{\chi,R,2}(n) := (\log R) \left( \sum_{d|n} \mu(d) \chi \left( \frac{\log d}{\log R} \right) \right)^2,$$

where $R = N^\gamma$ for small enough $\gamma > 0$. Then we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_{a,q}(n) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\varphi(q)V}{\varphi(qV)(\log R)} \Lambda^{(V)}_{\chi,R,2}(qn+a) + O\left( \frac{\varphi(q)V}{\varphi(qV)} E(qn+a) \right),$$

where

$$E(n) = d(n)^2 1_{\exists m |n, m \geq R^{1/2}, m \text{ is } V\text{-smooth}}.$$
\( a \in (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^d \) and every finite complexity tuple \( \Psi = (L_1(n), \ldots, L_t(n)) \) of non-constant affine-linear forms in \( d \) variables of size \( \|\Psi\| \leq M \) we have

\[
\sum_{n \in [1,x]^d} \mu(L_1(qn + a)) \cdot \cdots \cdot \mu(L_t(n + a)) = o_{t,d,M}(x^d).
\]

(10.2)
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