MOMENTS AND HYBRID SUBCONVEXITY FOR SYMMETRIC-SQUARE $L$-FUNCTIONS
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Abstract. We establish sharp bounds for the second moment of symmetric-square $L$-functions attached to Hecke Maass cusp forms $u_j$ with spectral parameter $t_j$, where the second moment is a sum over $t_j$ in a short interval. At the central point $s = 1/2$ of the $L$-function, our interval is smaller than previous known results. More specifically, for $|t_j|$ of size $T$, our interval is of size $T^{1/5}$, while the previous best was $T^{1/3}$ from work of Lam. A little higher up on the critical line, our second moment yields a subconvexity bound for the symmetric-square $L$-function. More specifically, we get subconvexity at $s = 1/2 + it$ provided $|t_j|^{6/7 + \delta} \leq |t| \leq (2 - \delta)|t_j|$ for any fixed $\delta > 0$. Since $|t|$ can be taken significantly smaller than $|t_j|$, this may be viewed as an approximation to the notorious subconvexity problem for the symmetric-square $L$-function in the spectral aspect at $s = 1/2$.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background. The widely studied subconvexity problem for automorphic $L$-functions is completely resolved for degree $\leq 2$. For uniform bounds, over arbitrary number fields, this is due to Michel and Venkatesh [MV]; for superior quality bounds in various special cases, this is due to many authors, of which a small sample is [JM, BH, Bo, BHM, PY]. The next frontier is degree 3, but here the subconvexity problem remains a great challenge, save for a few spectacular successes. The first breakthrough is due to Xiaoqing Li [Li], who established subconvexity for $L(f, 1/2 + it)$ on the critical line ($t$-aspect), where $f$ is a fixed self-dual Hecke-Maass cusp form for $SL_3(\mathbb{Z})$. This result was generalized by Munshi [M1], by a very different method, to forms $f$ that are not necessarily self-dual. Munshi [M2] also established subconvexity for twists $L(f \times \chi, 1/2)$ in the $p$-aspect, where $\chi$ is a primitive Dirichlet character of prime modulus $p$. Subconvexity in the spectral aspect of $f$ itself is much harder, and even more so when $f$ is self-dual due to a conductor-dropping phenomenon. Blomer and Buttcane [BB] and Kumar, Mallesham, and Singh [KMS] have established subconvexity for $L(1/2, f)$ in the spectral aspect of $f$ in many cases, but excluding the self-dual forms.

A self-dual $GL_3$ Hecke-Maass cusp form is known to be a symmetric-square lift from $GL_2$ [S]. Let $u_j$ be a Hecke-Maass cusp form for the full modular group $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$, with Laplace eigenvalue $1/4 + t_j^2$. It is an outstanding open problem to prove subconvexity for the associated symmetric-square $L$-function $L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2)$ in the $t_j$-aspect. Such a bound would represent major progress in the problem of obtaining a power-saving rate of decay in the Quantum Unique Ergodicity problem [IS]. A related problem is that of establishing the
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Lindelöf-on-average bound
\begin{equation}
\sum_{T \leq u_j \leq T + \Delta} |L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + it)|^2 \ll \Delta T^{1+\epsilon}
\end{equation}
for $\Delta$ as small as possible. Such an estimate is interesting in its own right, and also yields by positivity a bound for each $L$-value in the sum. At the central point ($t = 0$), if (1.1) can be established for $\Delta = T^\epsilon$, it would give the convexity bound for $L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2)$; the hope would then be to insert an amplifier in order to prove subconvexity. While a second moment bound which implies convexity at the central point is known in the level aspect by the work of Iwaniec and Michel [IM], in the spectral aspect the problem is much more difficult. The best known result until now for (1.1) was $\Delta = T^{1/3+\epsilon}$ by Lam [La]. (Lam’s work actually involves symmetric-square $L$-functions attached to holomorphic Hecke eigenforms, but his method should apply equally well to Hecke-Maass forms.) Other works involving moments of symmetric square $L$-functions include [Bl, K, J, KD, BF, Ba, N].

1.2. Main results. One of the main results of this paper is an approximate version of the subconvexity bound for $L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2)$. Namely, we establish subconvexity for $L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + it)$ for $t$ small, but not too small, compared to $2t_j$. This hybrid bound (stated precisely below) seems to be the first subconvexity bound for symmetric-square $L$-functions in which the dominant aspect is the spectral parameter $t_j$. For comparison, note that bookkeeping the proofs of Li [Li] or Munshi [M1] would yield hybrid subconvexity bounds for $t_j$ (very) small compared to $t$. Our method also yields a hybrid subconvexity bound for $L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + it)$ when $t$ is larger (but not too much larger) than $2t_j$, but for simplicity we refrain from making precise statements. We do not prove anything when $t$ is close to $2t_j$, for in this case the analytic conductor of the $L$-function drops. In fact it is then the same size as the analytic conductor at $t = 0$, where the subconvexity problem is the hardest.

Our approach is to establish a sharp estimate for the second moment as in (1.1), which is strong enough to yield subconvexity in certain ranges.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $0 < \delta < 2$ be fixed, and let $U, T, \Delta > 1$ be such that
\begin{equation}
\frac{T^{3/2+\delta}}{\Delta^{3/2}} \leq U \leq (2 - \delta)T.
\end{equation}
We have
\begin{equation}
\sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} |L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + iU)|^2 \ll \Delta T^{1+\epsilon}.
\end{equation}

**Corollary 1.2.** Let $0 < \delta < 2$ be fixed. For $|t_j|^{6/7+\delta} \leq U \leq (2 - \delta)|t_j|$, we have the hybrid subconvexity bound
\begin{equation}
L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + iU) \ll |t_j|^{1+\epsilon}U^{-1/3}.
\end{equation}

**Proof.** The bound follows by taking $\Delta = T^{1+\delta}U^{-2/3}$ in Theorem 1.1 with $\delta$ chosen small enough. When $U \geq T^{6/7+\delta}$, this bound is subconvex. \hfill $\square$

Note that in Theorem 1.1, we are able to take $\Delta$ as small as $T^{1/3}$ at best. This requires $T \ll U \leq (2 - \delta)T$ and for instance yields the subconvexity bound $L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + it_j) \ll |t_j|^{2/3+\epsilon}$.

We might also speculate that the lower bound in (1.2) could plausibly be relaxed to $\Delta U \gg T^{1+\delta}$ (possibly with an additional term on the right hand side of (1.3), as in (12.10))
which would give subconvexity in the wider range \( T^{2/3+\delta} \leq U \leq (2-\delta)T \). For some reasoning on this, see the remark following (9.16).

For the central values we do not get subconvexity but we are able to improve the state of the art for the second moment. This is the other main result of this paper: we establish a Lindelöf-on-average estimate for the second moment with \( \Delta \) as small as \( T^{1/5+\epsilon} \).

**Theorem 1.3.** For \( \Delta \geq T^{1/5+\epsilon} \) and \( U \ll T^{\epsilon} \) we have

\[
\sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} |L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + iU)|^2 \ll \Delta T^{1+\epsilon}.
\]

It is a standing challenge to prove a Lindelöf-on-average bound in (1.5) with \( \Delta = 1 \).

Theorem 1.3 also has implications for the quantum variance problem. Specifically, by classical Rankin-Selberg theory, it gives a bound on

\[
\sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} |\langle u_j^2, E_U \rangle|^2,
\]

where \( E_U = E(z, 1/2 + iU) \). See [N] for more discussion on the quantum variance problem, as well as progress in the level aspect. The full quantum variance requires estimates for the projection onto the cuspidal spectrum, namely

\[
\sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} |\langle u_j^2, \varphi \rangle|^2,
\]

where \( \varphi \) is a (fixed) Hecke-Maass cusp form. In turn, by Watson’s formula [W], this boils down to the estimate

\[
\sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} L(\text{sym}^2 u_j \otimes \varphi) \ll \Delta T^{1+\epsilon}.
\]

It is plausible that the methods used to prove Theorem 1.3 should also generalize to show (1.8) for \( \Delta > T^{1/5+\epsilon} \), which would improve [J], but this requires a rigorous proof. For more discussion on this, see the discussion surrounding (1.12) below.

### 1.3. Overview.

We now give a rough sketch of our ideas for Theorems 1.1 and 1.3, both of which consider the second moment of the symmetric-square \( L \)-function. Let \( h(t) \) be a smooth function supported essentially on \( T < |t| < T + \Delta \), such as the one given in (6.2).

For \( 0 \leq U \leq (2-\delta)T \), the analytic conductor of \( L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + iU) \) is of size \( T^2(U + 1) \), so using an approximate functional equation, we have roughly

\[
\sum_{j \geq 1} |L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + iU)|^2 h(t_j) = \sum_{j \geq 1} \sum_{m,n \leq T^{1+(U+1)/2}} \frac{\lambda_j(m)\lambda_j(n)}{m^{1/2+iU}n^{1/2-iU}} h(t_j).
\]

Applying the Kuznetsov formula, the diagonal contribution is of size \( O(T^{1+\epsilon}\Delta) \), while the off-diagonal contribution is roughly

\[
\sum_{m,n \leq T^{1+\epsilon}(U+1)/2} \frac{1}{m^{1/2+iU}n^{1/2-iU}} \sum_{c \geq 1} S(m^2, n^2, c) \frac{c}{\zeta(2)} H\left(\frac{4\pi mn}{c}\right)
\]

for some transform \( H \) of \( h \), given in (6.6). We have by developing (6.11) that \( H(x) \) is essentially supported on \( x \geq T^{1-\epsilon}\Delta \) and roughly has the shape \( H(x) = \frac{T\Delta}{x^{1/2}} e^{i(x-T^2/x)} \). Thus
in the generic ranges $m, n \sim T(U + 1)^{1/2}$ and $c \sim \frac{mn}{T^{3/2}}$, writing $(n/m)^U = e(U \log(n/m)/2\pi)$ and not being very careful about factors of $\pi$ and such, the off-diagonal is

$$
\frac{\Delta^{3/2}}{U^{3/2}T^{3/2}} \sum_{m, n \sim T(U + 1)^{1/2}} \sum_{c \sim T(U + 1)/\Delta} S(m^2, n^2, c)e\left(\frac{2mn}{c}\right)e\left(-\frac{T^2c}{mn} + U \log(n/m)\right).
$$

The oscillatory factor $e(-\frac{T^2c}{mn} + U \log(n/m))$ behaves differently according to whether $U$ is large or small. When $U$ is large, the dominant phase is $U \log(n/m)$, while when $U$ is small, the dominant phase is $-\frac{T^2c}{mn}$. Consider one extreme end of our problem: the case $U = T$, so that the convexity bound is $T^{3/4+\epsilon}$. Since the diagonal after Kuznetsov is $O(T^{1+\epsilon}\Delta)$, the largest we can take $\Delta$ to establish subconvexity is $\Delta = T^{1/2-\delta}$ for some $\delta > 0$. Thus for the off-diagonal, what we need to prove is roughly

$$
\frac{1}{T^{9/4}} \sum_{m, n \sim T^{3/2}} \sum_{c \sim T^{3/2}} S(m^2, n^2, c)e\left(\frac{2mn}{c}\right)e(T \log(n/m)) \ll T^{3/2-\delta}.
$$

We split the $n$ and $m$ sums into residue classes modulo $c$ and apply Poisson summation to each. The off-diagonal then equals

$$
\frac{1}{T^{9/4}} \sum_{c \sim T^{3/2}} \sum_{k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{c^2} T(k, \ell, c) I(k, \ell, c),
$$

where

$$
I(k, \ell, c) = \int \int e\left(-\frac{kx - \ell y}{c}\right) + T \log x - T \log y)w\left(\frac{x}{T^{3/2}}, \frac{y}{T^{3/2}}\right) dx dy
$$

for some smooth weight function $w$ which restricts support to $x \sim T^{3/2}, y \sim T^{3/2}$, and

$$
T(k, \ell, c) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta \mod c} S(a^2, b^2, c)e\left(\frac{2ab + ak + b\ell}{c}\right).
$$

We compute this arithmetic sum and roughly get $T(k, \ell, c) = \epsilon_c c^{3/2} e\left(-\frac{k\ell}{c}\right)(\frac{k\ell}{c})$, where $\epsilon_c = 1$ if $c \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and $\epsilon_c = i$ if $c \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. This evaluation is only accurate when $(c, 2k\ell) = 1$, but we ignore this issue in the sketch. The integral is computed using stationary phase (see Section 4.1). We see that it is negligibly small unless $k, \ell \sim T$, in which case we get roughly $I(k, \ell, c) = T^2 e\left(\frac{3\ell}{4c}\right)(\frac{k\ell}{c})$ (see Lemma 9.14 for the rigorous statement). Thus we need to show

$$
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{k, \ell \sim T} \sum_{c \sim T^{3/2}} \left(\frac{k}{c}\right)^{iT} e\left(\frac{3k\ell}{4c}\right)(\frac{k\ell}{c}) \ll T^{3/2-\delta}.
$$

At this point we go beyond previous approaches to the second moment problem [IM, La] by finding cancellation in the $c$ sum. We split the $c$ sum into arithmetic progressions modulo $k\ell$ by quadratic reciprocity and apply Poisson summation, getting that the off-diagonal equals

$$
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{k, \ell \sim T} \left(\frac{k}{\ell}\right)^{iT} \sum_{q \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{k\ell} \sum_{a \mod k\ell} \left(\frac{a}{k\ell}\right)e\left(-\frac{aq}{k\ell}\right) \int \int e\left(\frac{3k\ell}{4x} + \frac{qx}{k\ell}\right) w\left(\frac{x}{T^{3/2}}\right) dx.
$$

This Poisson summation step leads to a simpler expression in two ways. Firstly, an integration by parts argument shows that the $q$-sum can be restricted to $q \sim T$, which is significantly shorter than the earlier $c$-sum of length $T^{3/2}$. A more elaborate stationary phase analysis of the integral shows that the integral is essentially independent of $k$ and $\ell$ (this can be
seen in rough form by the substitution $x \to x k\ell$). Evaluating the arithmetic sum and using stationary phase to compute the integral, we get that the off-diagonal equals

$$\frac{1}{T^{3/4}} \sum_{k,\ell \sim T} \sum_{q \sim T} e(\sqrt{q}) \left( \frac{q}{k\ell} \right) \frac{k}{i T} = \frac{1}{T^{3/4}} \sum_{q \sim T} e(\sqrt{q}) \left| \sum_{k \sim T} \left( \frac{q}{k} \right) k^{iT} \right|^2.$$ 

Finally, applying Heath-Brown’s [H-B] large sieve for quadratic characters, we get that the off-diagonal is $O\left(\frac{T^{5/4} + \varepsilon}{T^{5/4}}\right)$.

The Poisson summation argument in $c$ has some delicate features that are most easily described in the language of Dirichlet series. Let

$$Z(s) := \sum_{c=1}^{\infty} e^{-1} \left( \frac{k\ell}{c} \right) \frac{T(k, \ell, c)}{c^{2+s}}.$$ 

The insertion of the factor $e(k\ell/c)$ reflects the presence of $e(k\ell/(4c))$ in the smooth weight function. A simplified version of $Z(s)$ consists of summing over only the integers $c$ coprime to $2\ell$. Such a sum has a nice evaluation:

$$\sum_{(c, 2\ell)=1} e^{-1} \left( \frac{k\ell}{c} \right) \frac{T(k, \ell, c)}{c^{2+s}} = \sum_{(c, 2\ell)=1} \left( \frac{k\ell}{c} \right) c^{-s} \approx L(s, \chi_{k\ell}).$$ 

In particular, this Dirichlet series has analytic continuation to all $s \in \mathbb{C}$. This is very fortunate, because altering the behavior at $T(k, \ell, c)$ for $c = p^2$ or $p^3$, etc. could potentially destroy this (e.g. by multiplication of $\zeta^{-1}(2s)$ or $\zeta^{-1}(3s)$, etc.). The Poisson summation step (in the $c$-variable) sketched above is, when translated into the setting of Dirichlet series, equivalent to the functional equation of $L(s, \chi_{k\ell})$. Truncating the dual sum is accomplished by shifting the contour far to the left; for this reason it would be disadvantageous to have a Dirichlet series with infinitely many poles inside the critical strip. Luckily, $Z(s)$ essentially agrees with the above formula, except for finitely many “bad” Euler factors at the primes dividing $2\ell$. In the rigorous calculation of the necessary Dirichlet series, there is a “near miss” which avoids the presence of $\zeta^{-1}(2s)$, which can be seen in the passage from (11.15) to (11.16) (where the term $(1 - p^{-2s})$ is canceled in the numerator and denominator).

The treatment of the case $U \ll T^\varepsilon$ for Theorem 1.3 follows the same plan, but the details are changed a bit because the oscillatory factor in (1.9) behaves differently. In the end, one arrives roughly at an expression of the form

$$\Delta^{5/2} \sum_{q \sim \Delta^{1/2}} e(\phi(q, T)) \left| \sum_{k \sim \Delta^{1/2}} \left( \frac{k}{q} \right) k^{iT} \right|^2,$$

where $\phi(q, T)$ is some function of $q, T$ only. Again, Heath-Brown’s quadratic large sieve gives a bound of the form $\Delta^{-3/2}T^{3/2}$ for the off-diagonal, which is $O(\Delta T)$ for $\Delta \gg T^{1/5}$. It is a curious difference that the $q$-sum is now actually longer than the earlier $c$-sum, at least for $\Delta < T^{1/3}$, in contrast to the situation with $U = T$ presented earlier. However, the gain is that the variables $q$ and $k$ become separated in the exponential phase factor (indeed, $k$ is completely removed from the phase in (1.11)).
A heuristic argument indicates that analyzing the moment appearing in (1.8) leads to a modified version of (1.11), taking the form

\begin{equation}
\frac{\Delta^{5/2}}{\Gamma^{1/2}} \sum_{q \sim \frac{T^2}{4\pi}} e(\phi(q,T)) \left( \sum_{m \sim \frac{T^2}{4\pi}} \lambda_\varphi(m) \frac{\langle m \rangle}{\sqrt{m}} \right).
\end{equation}

Since the \( q \) and \( m \) sums are balanced, there is room to apply Cauchy’s inequality followed by Heath-Brown’s quadratic large sieve, and still obtain a sharp bound.

1.4. Notational Conventions. Throughout, we will follow the epsilon convention, in which \( \epsilon \) always denotes an arbitrarily small positive constant, but not necessarily the same one from one occurrence to another. As usual, we will write \( e(x) = e^{2\pi ix} \), and \( e_c(x) = e(x/c) \). If \( s \) is complex, an expression of the form \( O(p^{-\Re(s)}) \) should be interpreted to mean \( O(p^{-\Re(s)}) \). This abuse of notation will only be used on occasion with Euler products. For \( n \) a positive odd integer, we let \( \chi_n(m) = (\frac{m}{n}) \) denote the Jacobi symbol.

2. Automorphic forms

2.1. Symmetric-square \( L \)-functions. Let \( u_j \) be a Hecke-Maass cusp form for the modular group \( SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) with Laplace eigenvalue \( 1/4 + t_j^2 \), and \( n \)-th Hecke eigenvalue \( \lambda_j(n) \). It has an associated symmetric-square \( L \)-function defined by \( L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \lambda_{\text{sym}^2 u_j}(n)n^{-s} \), with \( \lambda_{\text{sym}^2 u_j}(n) = \sum_{a^2 = n} \lambda_j(b^2) \). Let \( \Gamma_\mathbb{R}(s) = \pi^{-s/2}\Gamma(s/2) \) and \( \gamma(\text{sym}^2 u_j, s) = \Gamma_\mathbb{R}(s)\Gamma_\mathbb{R}(s + 2it_j)\Gamma_\mathbb{R}(s - 2it_j) \). Then \( L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, s) \) has an analytic continuation to \( \mathbb{C} \) and satisfies the functional equation \( \gamma(\text{sym}^2 u_j, s)L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, s) = \gamma(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1 - s)L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1 - s) \). In particular, the analytic conductor of \( L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + it) \) equals

\begin{equation}
(1 + |t|)(1 + |t + 2t_j|)(1 + |2t_j - t|).
\end{equation}

2.2. The Kuznetsov formula.

**Lemma 2.1** (Kuznetsov’s formula [IK, Theorem 16.3]). Let \( h(z) \) be an even, holomorphic function on \( |\Im(z)| < \frac{1}{2} + \delta \), with decay \( |h(z)| \ll (1 + |z|)^2 - \delta \), for some \( \delta > 0 \). Let \( \{u_j : j \geq 1\} \) denote an orthonormal basis of Maass cusp forms of level \( q \) with Laplace eigenvalue \( \frac{1}{4} + t_j^2 \) and Fourier coefficients \( \rho_j(n) \) as given in [IK, (16.19)]. At each inequivalent cusp \( a \) of \( \Gamma_0(q) \), let \( E_a(\cdot, \frac{1}{2} + it) \) be the associated Eisenstein series, as given in [IK, page 388], with Fourier coefficients \( \tau_a(n, t) \) as given in [IK, (16.22)]. For any \( n, m > 0 \) we have

\begin{align*}
\sum_{j \geq 1} \rho_j(n)\overline{\rho_j(m)} \frac{h(t_j)}{\cosh(\pi t_j)} &+ \sum_{a} \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tau_a(n, t)\overline{\tau_a(m, t)} \frac{h(t)dt}{\cosh(\pi t)} \\
&= \delta_{(n=m)} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(t)\frac{\tanh(\pi t)}{\pi^2} dt + \frac{i}{\pi} \sum_{c \equiv 0 \mod q} S(n, m, c) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} J\left(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{nm}}{c}, t\right) h(t)\frac{\tanh(\pi t)}{\pi} dt,
\end{align*}

where \( J(x, t) = \frac{J_{2it}(x) - J_{-2it}(x)}{\sinh(\pi t)} \).

Later, we will need to use the Kuznetsov formula for level \( 2^d \). We will choose our orthonormal basis to include the level 1 Hecke-Maass forms, for which we may write

\begin{equation}
\rho_j(n)\overline{\rho_j(m)} \frac{h(t_j)}{\cosh(\pi t_j)} = \lambda_j(n)\overline{\lambda_j(m)} \frac{h(t_j)}{\cosh(\pi t_j)} |\rho_j(1)|^2.
\end{equation}
and note that $t_j^{-\epsilon} \ll \frac{|p_j(1)|^2}{\cosh(\pi t_j)} \ll t_j^{\epsilon}$ by [HM (30)] together with the fact that $L^2$-normalization in $\Gamma_0(2^4)$ and $\Gamma_0(1)$ is the same up to a constant factor.

3. The quadratic large sieve

We will have need of Heath-Brown’s large sieve inequality for quadratic characters:

**Theorem 3.1** (Heath-Brown [H-B]). Let $M, N \gg 1$. Then

\[(3.1) \quad \sum_{m \leq M} \left| \sum_{n \leq N} a_n \left( \frac{n}{m} \right) \right|^2 \ll (M + N)(MN)^{\epsilon} \sum_{n \leq N} |a_n|^2,\]

where the sums are restricted to odd squarefree integers.

We will need a corollary of Heath-Brown’s result, namely

\[(3.2) \quad \sum_{m \leq M} |L(1/2 + it, \chi_m)|^2 \ll (M + \sqrt{M(1 + |t|)})(M(1 + |t|))^{\epsilon},\]

This follows from an approximate functional equation, and a simple observation that the square parts of the inner and outer variables are harmless. Similarly, we obtain

\[(3.3) \quad \sum_{m \leq M} m^{-1/2} |L(1/2 + it, \chi_m)|^2 \ll \left( M^{1/2} + (1 + |t|)^{1/2} \right)(M(1 + |t|))^{\epsilon}.\]

4. Oscillatory integrals

We begin with certain families of functions defined by derivative bounds. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be an index set and $X = X_T : \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1}$ be a function of $T \in \mathcal{F}$.

**Definition 4.1.** A family $\{w_T\}_{T \in \mathcal{F}}$ of smooth functions supported on a product of dyadic intervals in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ is called $X$-inert if for each $j = (j_1, \ldots, j_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^d$ we have

\[(4.1) \quad C(j_1, \ldots, j_d) := \sup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} \sup_{(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d} X_T^{-j_1 - \cdots - j_d} \left| x_1^{j_1} \cdots x_d^{j_d} w_T(j_1, \ldots, j_d)(x_1, \ldots, x_d) \right| < \infty.\]

As an abuse, we might say that a single function is 1-inert (or simply inert) by which we should mean that it is a member of a family of 1-inert functions.

**Lemma 4.2** (Integration by parts bound [BKY]). Suppose that $w = w_T(t)$ is a family of $X$-inert functions, with compact support on $[Z, 2Z]$, so that $w^{(j)}(t) \ll (Z/X)^{-j}$. Also suppose that $\phi$ is smooth and satisfies $\phi^{(j)}(t) \ll \frac{Y}{Z}$ for some $Y/X \geq R \geq 1$ and all $t$ in the support of $w$. Let

\[I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} w(t)e^{i\phi(t)} dt.\]

If $|\phi'(t)| \gg \frac{Y}{Z}$ for all $t$ in the support of $w$, then $I \ll A Z R^{-A}$ for $A$ arbitrarily large.

**Lemma 4.3** (Stationary phase, [BKY [KPY]]). Suppose $w_T$ is $X$-inert in $t_1, \ldots, t_d$, supported on $t_1 \asymp Z$ and $t_i \asymp X_i$ for $i = 2, \ldots, d$. Suppose that on the support of $w_T$, $\phi = \phi_T$ satisfies

\[(4.2) \quad \frac{\partial^{a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_d}}{\partial t_1^{a_1} \cdots \partial t_d^{a_d}} \phi(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_d) \ll C_{\mathcal{F}} \frac{Y}{Z^{a_1} X_2^{a_2} \cdots X_d^{a_d}},\]
for all \(a_1, \ldots, a_d \in \mathbb{N}\). Suppose \(\phi''(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_d) \gg \frac{Y}{Z^2}\), (here and below, \(\phi'\) and \(\phi''\) denote the derivative with respect to \(t_1\)) for all \(t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_d\) in the support of \(w_T\), and there exists \(t_0 \in \mathbb{R}\) such that \(\phi'(t_0) = 0\) (note \(t_0\) is necessarily unique). Suppose that \(Y/X^2 \geq R \geq 1\). Then

\[
(4.3) \quad I = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i\phi(t_1, \ldots, t_d)} w_T(t_1, \ldots, t_d) dt_1 = \frac{Z}{\sqrt{Y}} e^{i\phi(t_0, t_2, \ldots, t_d)} W_T(t_2, \ldots, t_d) + O_A(ZR^{-A}),
\]

for some \(X\)-inert family of functions \(W_T\), and where \(A > 0\) may be taken to be arbitrarily large. The implied constant in (4.3) depends only on \(A\) and \(C_F\).

The following remark will be helpful for using Lemma 4.3 in an iterative fashion. First note that \(t_0\) is the unique function of \(t_2, \ldots, t_d\) implicitly defined by \(\phi'(t_0, \ldots, t_d) = 0\). In practice it might be an unwelcome task to explicitly solve for \(t_0\), and the following discussion will aid in avoiding this issue. Let

\[
(4.4) \quad \Phi(t_2, \ldots, t_d) = \phi(t_0, t_2, \ldots, t_d),
\]

so by the chain rule,

\[
(4.5) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \Phi(t_2, \ldots, t_d) = \phi'(t_0, t_2, \ldots, t_d) \frac{\partial t_0}{\partial t_j} + \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \phi(t_0, \ldots, t_d) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t_j} \phi(t_0, \ldots, t_d),
\]

and so on for higher derivatives. Hence the derivatives of \(\Phi\) have the same bounds as those on \(\phi\) (supposing uniformity with respect to the first variable \(t_1\)).

As a simple yet useful consequence of this, if \(\phi\) satisfies (4.2) (with \(Z\) replaced by \(X_1\), say) as well as \(\frac{\partial^j \phi(t_1, \ldots, t_d)}{\partial t_j^j} \gg \frac{Y}{Z^2}\) for \(j = 1, 2, \ldots, k\), uniformly for all \(t_1, \ldots, t_d\) in the support of \(w_T\), then

\[
(4.6) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} e^{i\phi(t_1, \ldots, t_d)} w_T(t_1, \ldots, t_d) dt_1 \ldots dt_k = \frac{X_1 \ldots X_k}{Y^{k/2}} e^{i\phi(v_0; t_{k+1}, \ldots, t_d)} W_T(t_{k+1}, \ldots, t_d),
\]

where \(v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^k\) is the solution to \(\phi'(v_0; t_{k+1}, \ldots, t_d) = 0\), where the derivative is with respect to the first \(k\) variables only (i.e. the first \(k\) entries of \(\nabla \phi\) are zero).

The following is an archimedean analog of the well-known change of basis formula from additive to multiplicative characters (compare with [IK (3.11)])

**Lemma 4.4.** Suppose that \(w_T\) is 1-inert, supported on \(x \asymp X\) where \(X \gg 1\). Then

\[
(4.7) \quad e^{-ix} w_T(x) = X^{-1/2} \int_{-t \asymp X} v(t) x^it dt + O(X^{-100}),
\]

where \(v(t) = v_X(t)\) is some smooth function satisfying \(v(t) \ll 1\). Moreover, \(v(t) = e^{-it \log(|t|/\epsilon)} W(t)\) for some 1-inert function \(W\) supported on \(-t \asymp X\).

**Proof.** Let \(f(x) = e^{-ix} w_T(x)\). By Mellin inversion,

\[
(4.8) \quad f(x) = \int_{(\sigma)} \widetilde{f}(-s) x^s ds, \quad \text{where} \quad \widetilde{f}(-s) = \int_0^\infty e^{-ix} x^{-s} w_T(x) \frac{dx}{x},
\]

Take \(\sigma = 0\), so \(s = it\). Lemma 4.2 allows us to restrict the support to \(-t \asymp X\), and Lemma 4.3 gives that

\[
(4.9) \quad \widetilde{f}(-it) = X^{-1/2} e^{-it \log(|t|/\epsilon)} W(t) + O(X^{-200}),
\]

where \(W\) is a 1-inert function. \(\square\)

For later use, we record some simple consequences of the previous lemmas.
Lemma 4.5. Let \( v(t) = e^{-it \log(|t|/e)} W(t) \) for some 1-inert function \( W \) supported on \(-t \asymp X\) with \( X \gg 1 \). Let \( \gamma(s) = \pi^{-s/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{s+\kappa}{2}\right) \) for \( \kappa \in \{0,1\} \). Let \( D(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s} \) be a Dirichlet series absolutely convergent for \( \Re(s) = 0 \) with \( \max_{t \in \mathbb{R}} |D(it)| \leq A \) for some \( A \geq 0 \). Let \( c_1, c_2, c_3 \) be some real numbers (which may vary with \( X \)) with \( 0 \leq c_1 \ll 1 \) and \( |c_2 X^3 + c_3| \ll X^{1-\delta} \) for some \( \delta > 0 \). For any \( Y \geq 1 \) we have

\[
X^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(t) e^{-c_1 t \log |t| + c_2 t^3 Y} D(it) dt \ll_{v, A} 1 \tag{4.10}
\]

and

\[
X^{-1/2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} v(t) e^{-c_1 t \log |t| + c_2 t^3} \frac{\gamma(1/2 - it + c_3)}{\gamma(1/2 + it + c_3)} Y^it D(it) dt \ll_{v, A} 1. \tag{4.11}
\]

The bounds depend only on \( v \) and \( A \).

Proof. Expanding out the Dirichlet series, and exchanging summation and integration, it suffices to prove the result with \( D(s) = 1 \). The first bound (4.10) is a statement of square-root cancellation and it follows in a straightforward way from Lemma 4.2 and 4.3. The leading phase points in the direction \(-t \log |t|\). For the second bound (4.11), we first observe that by Stirling’s formula we have we have

\[
\frac{\gamma(1/2 - it + c_3)}{\gamma(1/2 + it + c_3)} = W(t) e^{-i(t+c_3) \log |t+c_3| + c |it|} + O(X^{-200}),
\]

for some 1-inert function \( W \) and some \( c \in \mathbb{R} \). With the phase of this gamma ratio pointing in the same direction as \(-t \log |t|\), we can once again apply stationary phase to show square root cancellation. \( \square \)

We end this section with some heuristic motivation for the bound in (4.11), and how it is related to (4.10). Let \( w \) be a fixed inert function, \( C \gg 1 \) and \( P := A/C \gg 1 \). By Poisson summation, we have

\[
S := \sum_{c=1}^{\infty} e\left(-\frac{A}{c}\right) w(c/C) = \sum_{q} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e\left(-\frac{A}{t} - qt\right) w(t/C) dt, \tag{4.12}
\]

Integration by parts and stationary phase tells us that the sum is essentially supported on \( q \asymp \frac{A}{C} \) in which case the integral is bounded by \( \frac{A}{C} \). An alternative (and admittedly more roundabout!) way to accomplish this same goal is to use Lemma 4.4 with \( x = 2\pi \frac{A}{C} \), and the functional equation of the Riemann zeta function (shifting contours appropriately). The dual sum will have a test function of the form on the left hand side of (4.11) (with \( c_3 = 0 \) in fact), and the bound in (4.11) is consistent with the simpler Fourier analysis presented in this paragraph above. The reader may wonder, then, why we have proceeded in this more complicated fashion if the Fourier approach is simpler. The answer is that the actual sums we encounter in this paper are arithmetically much more intricate than the simplified one presented in (4.12). The Mellin transform approach is better-suited to handling the more complicated arithmetical features that are present in our problem, so on the whole, taking into account both the analytic and arithmetic aspects of the problem, the Mellin transform approach is simpler.
5. Character sum evaluations

We need the following elementary character sum calculations. Define the Gauss sum
\begin{equation}
G\left(\frac{a}{c}\right) = \sum_{x \pmod{c}} e_c(ax^2).
\end{equation}

We need to evaluate \(G(a/c)\). It is well known (e.g. see [IK, (3.22), (3.38)]) that
\begin{equation}
G\left(\frac{a}{c}\right) = \left(\frac{a}{c}\right) \epsilon_c \sqrt{c}, \quad \epsilon_c = \begin{cases} 
1, & c \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \\
 i, & c \equiv 3 \pmod{4} 
\end{cases},
\end{equation}
provided \((2a, c) = 1\). The case with \(c\) even is treated as follows.

**Lemma 5.1.** Suppose \(c = 2^k c_o\) with \(k \geq 2\) and \(c_o\) odd, and \((a, c) = 1\). Define \(\delta \in \{0, 1\} \) via \(k \equiv \delta \pmod{2}\). Then
\begin{equation}
G\left(\frac{a}{2^k c_o}\right) = \epsilon_{c_o} c_o^{1/2} \left(\frac{a}{c_o}\right) \begin{cases} 
1 + e_4(ac_o), & \delta = 0 \\
2^{1/2} e_8(ac_o), & \delta = 1.
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

**Proof.** First we note that if \(c = c_1 c_2\) with \((c_1, c_2) = 1\), then
\begin{equation}
G\left(\frac{a}{c_1 c_2}\right) = G\left(\frac{ac_2}{c_1}\right) G\left(\frac{ac_1}{c_2}\right).
\end{equation}

Suppose that \(c = 2^k\) with \(k \geq 2\). Let \(j\) be an integer so that \(2^j \geq k\), and write \(x = u + 2^j v\) with \(u\) running modulo \(2^j\) and \(v\) running modulo \(2^{k-j}\). Then
\begin{equation}
G\left(\frac{a}{2^k}\right) = \sum_{u \pmod{2^j}} e_{2^k}(au^2) \sum_{v \pmod{2^{k-j}}} e_{2^{k-j-1}}(auv) = 2^{k-j} \sum_{r \pmod{2^{2j-k+1}}} e_{2^{2j-k+2}}(ar^2).
\end{equation}

In the case that \(k\) is even, we make the choice \(j = k/2\), giving
\begin{equation}
G\left(\frac{a}{2^k}\right) = 2^{k/2} \sum_{r \pmod{2}} e_4(ar^2) = 2^{k/2}(1 + e_4(a)).
\end{equation}

If \(k\) is odd, we take \(j = \frac{k+1}{2}\), giving now
\begin{equation}
G\left(\frac{a}{2^k}\right) = 2^{k+1/2} \sum_{r \pmod{2^2}} e_{2^3}(ar^2) = 2^{k+1/2} e_8(a).
\end{equation}

Assembling the above facts, and using (5.2), now completes the proof. \(\square\)

**Lemma 5.2.** Let \(\chi\) be a Dirichlet character modulo \(q\), and suppose \(d|q\) and \((a, d) = 1\). Let
\begin{equation}
S_\chi(a, d, q) = \sum_{n \pmod{q} \atop n \equiv a \pmod{d}} \chi(n).
\end{equation}

Suppose that \(\chi\) is induced by the primitive character \(\chi^* \) modulo \(q^*\), and write \(\chi = \chi^* \chi_0\) where \(\chi_0\) is trivial modulo \(q_0\), with \((q_0, q^*) = 1\). Then \(S_\chi(a, d, q) = 0\) unless \(q^*|d\) in which case
\begin{equation}
S_\chi(a, d, q) = \frac{q}{d} \chi^*(a) \prod_{p|q_0 \atop p|d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right).
\end{equation}
Proof. Suppose \( q = q_1 q_2 \) with \( (q_1, q_2) = 1 \) and correspondingly factor \( d = d_1 d_2 \) and \( \chi = \chi_1 \chi_2 \) with \( \chi_i \) modulo \( q_i \). The Chinese remainder theorem gives \( S_\chi(a, d, q) = S_{\chi_1}(a, d_1, q_1) S_{\chi_2}(a, d_2, q_2) \).

Writing \( d = d^* d_0 \) where \( d^* | q^* \) and \( d_0 | q_0 \), we apply this with \( q_1 = q^* \), \( q_2 = q_0 \), \( \chi_1 = \chi^* \), \( \chi_2 = \chi_0 \), \( d_1 = d^* \), and \( d_2 = d_0 \). By the multiplicativity of the right hand side of (5.9), it suffices to prove it for \( \chi^* \) and \( \chi_0 \).

By [IK] (3.9), \( S_{\chi^*}(a, d^*, q^*) = 0 \) unless \( q^* | d^* \), in which case it is given by (5.9), so this case is done.

For the \( \chi_0 \) part, we simply use Möbius inversion, giving

\[
S_{\chi_0}(a, d_0, q_0) = \sum_{\ell | q_0} \mu(\ell) \sum_{\ell \equiv a \pmod{d_0}} 1.
\]

Since \( (a, d_0) = 1 \) by assumption, this means that \( (\ell, d_0) = 1 \), and then \( n \) is uniquely determined modulo \( d_0 \), which divides \( q_0 / \ell \), giving

\[
S_{\chi_0}(a, d_0, q_0) = \frac{q_0}{d_0} \sum_{\ell | q_0} \frac{\mu(\ell)}{\ell} = \frac{q_0}{d_0} \prod_{p | q_0} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right). \tag{5.11}
\]

For \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( c \geq 1 \), define

\[
T(a, b; c) = \sum_{x, y \pmod{c}} S(x^2, y^2; c)e_c(2xy + ax + by).
\]

For \( c_0 \) odd, write \( c_o = \prod_p p^{a_p} \prod_q q^{b_q} \) where each \( a_p \) is odd and each \( b_q \) is even. Let \( c^* = \prod_p p \) and \( c_0 = \prod_q q \). Then \( c^* \) is the conductor of the Jacobi symbol \( \left( \frac{a}{c} \right) \).

**Lemma 5.3.** Let \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z} \). Suppose \( c = 2^j c_o \) with \( j \geq 4 \) and \( c_o \) odd. Define \( a' = \frac{a}{(a, c)} \), \( b' = \frac{b}{(b, c)} \). Then \( T(a, b; c) = 0 \) unless \( 4 | (a, b) \) and \( (a, c) = (b, c) \), in which case

\[
T(a, b; c) = (a, \frac{c}{2^{2\delta}}) c^{3/2} |e_c(-ab/4)\left( \frac{a'b'}{c^*} \right) g_b(a', b', c_0) \delta(c^* | (a, c_0)^{c_0}) \prod_{p | q} \frac{c_0}{p^{a_p} (a, c_0)^{c_0}} (1 - p^{-1}), \tag{5.13}
\]

where \( g_b \) is some function depending on \( a', b', c_0 \) modulo \( 2^{2+\delta} \) that additionally depends on \( \left( \frac{c}{2^j}, 2^{2+\delta} \right) = (\frac{a}{(a, c)}, 2^{2+\delta}) \). In particular, we have that \( T(0, b; c) \ll c^{5/2} \delta(c^* = 1) \delta(c | b) \).

**Proof.** We have

\[
T(a, b; c) = \sum_{t \pmod{c}} \sum_{x, y \pmod{c}} e_c(t(x + \overline{7}y)^2 + ax + by).
\]

Changing variables \( x \to x - \overline{7}y \) and evaluating the resulting \( y \)-sum by orthogonality, we deduce

\[
T(a, b; c) = c \sum_{t \pmod{c}} \sum_{x \pmod{c}} e_c(tx^2 + ax). \tag{5.15}
\]

The congruence in the sum implies that \( T(a, b; c) = 0 \) unless \( (a, c) = (b, c) \), a condition that we henceforth assume. Changing variables \( x \to x + c/2 \) also shows that \( T(a, b; c) = 0 \) unless \( 2 | a \), so we assume this condition also.
Write $c$ uniquely as $c = c_1c_2$ where $c|c_2^2$, $c_2|c_1$ and $c_1/c_2$ is square-free. Let $x = x_1 + c_1x_2$, and let $Q(x) = tx^2 + ax$. Note that

$$(5.16) \quad Q(x_1 + c_1x_2) = Q(x_1) + Q'(x_1)c_1x_2 + \frac{Q''(c_1)}{2} c_1^2x_2^2 \equiv Q(x_1) + Q'(x_1)c_1x_2 \pmod{c}.$$ 

Thus

$$(5.17) \quad \sum_{x \pmod{c}} e_c(Q(x)) = \sum_{x_1 \pmod{c_1}} e_c(Q(x_1)) \sum_{x_2 \pmod{c_2}} e_{c_2}(Q'(x_1))x_2 = c_2 \sum_{x_1 \pmod{c_1}} e_c(Q(x_1)).$$

In our case, $Q'(x_1) = 2tx_1 + a$, so the congruence means $2x_1 \equiv -7a \pmod{c_2}$. Since $2|a$, this is equivalent to $x_1 \equiv -\frac{7a}{2} \pmod{\frac{c_2}{(2,c_2)}}$. Writing $x_1 = -\frac{7a}{2} + \frac{c_2}{(2,c_2)}v$, with $v$ running modulo $(2,c_2)\frac{a}{c_2}$, we obtain

$$(5.18) \quad \sum_{x \pmod{c}} e_c(Q(x)) = c_2e_c(-\frac{7a^2}{4}) \sum_{v \pmod{(2,c_2)\frac{a}{c_2}}} e\left(\frac{tv^2}{(2,c_2)^2c_1/c_2}\right).$$

If $(2,c_2) = 1$, the inner sum is clearly a Gauss sum modulo $c_1/c_2$ as defined in (5.1). If $(2,c_2) = 2$, then while the exponential in the inner sum has modulus $4c_1/c_2$, the sum is only over $0 \leq v \leq 2(c_1/c_2) - 1$. But observe that the exponential has the same values at $1 \leq -v \leq 2(c_1/c_2)$, so that the inner sum above is half of a Gauss sum in this case. Thus we get

$$(5.19) \quad T(a,b;c) = c\frac{c_2}{(2,c_2)} \sum_{t \pmod{c}} e_{c_0}(-\frac{7a^2}{4})G\left(\frac{t}{(2,c_2)^2c_1/c_2}\right).$$

By Lemma 5.1, we deduce

$$(5.20) \quad T(a,b;c) = c^{3/2}e_{c_0} \sum_{t \pmod{c}} e_{c}(-\frac{7a^2}{4})\left\{ \frac{t}{c_0} \right\} \begin{cases} 1 + e_4(tc_0), & \delta = 0 \\ 2\left(1/4\right) e_8(tc_0), & \delta = 1. \end{cases}$$

This formulation contains a few additional observations. We have used that the Jacobi symbol $\left(\frac{t}{(c_1/c_2)}\right)$ agrees with $\left(\frac{d}{c_0}\right)$ for $t$ coprime to $c$, where $n_0$ is the odd part of an integer $n$.

We have also used that $(c_1/c_2)_0$ and $c_0$ have the same values modulo 8. Thus we can replace $e_{(c_1/c_2)}$, $e_4(t(c_1/c_2)_0)$, and $e_8(t(c_1/c_2)_0)$ with $e_{c_0}$, $e_4(tc_0)$, and $e_8(tc_0)$ respectively. These observations can easily be checked by using multiplicativity to reduce to the case when $c$ is a power of an odd prime. If $c = p^l$, then $c_1/c_2 = 1$ when $l$ is even, and $c_1/c_2 = p$ when $l$ is odd.

Next we turn to the $t$-sum in (5.20). Suppose first that $2|a$. Let $a' = \frac{a}{(a,c)}$, $b' = \frac{b}{(a,c)}$. The congruence $bt \equiv a \pmod{c}$ uniquely determines $t$ modulo $c/(a,c)$, since it is equivalent to $\bar{t} \equiv b\bar{a}' \pmod{c/(a,c)}$. Now in the $t$-sum, one can pair up $\bar{t}$ with $\bar{t} + c/2$ and observe that the corresponding values of the exponential $e_{c}(-\frac{7a^2}{4})$ will cancel out since $e_{c}(-\frac{7a^2}{4}) = -1$. Also, the values of $\left(\frac{t}{c_0}\right) = \left(\frac{\bar{t}}{c_0}\right)$, $e_4(tc_0) = e_4(\bar{t}c_0)$, and $e_8(tc_0) = e_8(\bar{t}c_0)$ remain the same under $\bar{t} \to \bar{t} + c/2$, since by assumption $2^4|c$. Therefore, $T(a,b,c)$ vanishes unless $4|a$ (and hence $4|b$), which we now assume to be the case. This allows the convenient simplification $e_{c}(-\frac{7a^2}{4}) = e_{c}(-ab/4)$. 


Breaking up the $t$-sum into congruence classes modulo $2^{2+\delta}$, to uniquely determine $e_{2^{2+\delta}}(tc_o)$, we obtain

\begin{equation}
T(a, b; c) = c^{3/2} e_{c_o} e_c(-ab/4) \sum_{v \pmod{2^{2+\delta}}}^* \left\{ 1 + e_4(vc_o) \over 2^{1/2} e_8(vc_o) \right\} \sum_{t \pmod{c}}^* \left( \frac{t}{c_o} \right).
\end{equation}

(5.21)

For the congruence $t \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{c}{(a, c)}}$ to be consistent with $t \equiv v \pmod{2^{2+\delta}}$, it is necessary and sufficient that $v \equiv \overline{a}a' \pmod {\frac{c}{(a, c)}, 2^{2+\delta}}$.

Suppose $c = 2^j c_o$, where $j \geq 4$. Then we have

\begin{equation}
\sum_{t \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{c}{(a, c)}}}^* \left( \frac{t}{c_o} \right) = \left( \sum_{t \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{2^j}{(a, 2^j)}}}^* \left( \frac{t}{c_o} \right) \right) \left( \sum_{t \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{2^{2+\delta}}{(a, c)}}}^* 1 \right).
\end{equation}

(5.22)

The sum modulo $2^j$ above equals, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem and the fact that the condition $(t, 2) = 1$ is automatic because $(v, 2) = 1$,

\[ \frac{2^j}{\left(\frac{2^j}{(a, 2^j)}, 2^{2+\delta}\right)} = (a, 2^{j-2-\delta}) \]

provided of course that $v \equiv \overline{a}a' \pmod {\frac{2^j}{(a, 2^j)}, 2^{2+\delta}}$.

Therefore, we have

\begin{equation}
T(a, b; c) = c^{3/2} e_{c_o} e_c(-ab/4) (a, 2^{j-2-\delta}) \sum_{v \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{2^j}{(a, 2^j)}, 2^{2+\delta}}}^* \left\{ 1 + e_4(vc_o) \over 2^{1/2} e_8(vc_o) \right\} \sum_{t \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{c}{(a, c)}, 2^{2+\delta}}}^* \left( \frac{t}{c_o} \right).
\end{equation}

By Lemma 5.2, we have

\begin{equation}
T(a, b; c) = c^{3/2} e_{c_o} e_c(-ab/4) (a, 2^{j+3}) \prod_{p \mid (c)} \left( 1 - p^{-1} \right) \sum_{v \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{2^j}{(a, 2^j), 2^{2+\delta}}}^* \left\{ 1 + e_4(vc_o) \over 2^{1/2} e_8(vc_o) \right\} \sum_{v \equiv \overline{a}' \pmod {\frac{2^{2+\delta}}{(a, c)}}}^* \left( \frac{t}{c_o} \right).
\end{equation}

(5.24)

times the delta function that $c^*$ divides $\frac{c_o}{(a, c)}$. The inner sum over $v$ is a function of $a', b', c_o$ modulo $2^{2+\delta}$ that additionally depends on $\left(\frac{2^j}{(a, 2^j)}, 2^{2+\delta}\right) = (\frac{c}{(a, c)}, 2^{2+\delta})$.

\[ \square \]

6. Start of proof

Let $0 \leq U \leq (2 - \delta)T$. By an approximate functional equation, dyadic decomposition of unity, and Cauchy’s inequality, we have

\begin{equation}
\mathcal{M} := \sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} \left| L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + iU) \right|^2 \ll \max_{1 \leq N \leq N_{\max}} T_{\epsilon} \sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} \left| \sum_n \lambda_j(n^2) n^{\epsilon} w_N(n) \right|^2,
\end{equation}

(6.1)
where \( w_N(x) \) is supported on \( x \asymp N \) and satisfies \( w_N^{(j)}(x) \ll_j N^{-j} \) and \( N_{\max} = (U+1)^{1/2}T^{1+\epsilon} \). To save some clutter in the notation, we want to simply write \( U \) instead of \( U+1 \) in all estimates involving \( U \). The reader may accept this as a convention or, when \( 0 \leq U \leq 1 \), we can write \( n^{-iv}w_N(n) = n^{-i(U+1)v}w_N(n) \) and absorb \( n^2 \) into \( w_N(n) \) by redefining the weight function. Thus we can henceforth assume that \( U \geq 1 \).

Next we insert a weight

\[
(6.2) \quad h(t) = \exp \left( -\frac{(t-T)^2}{\Delta^2} \right) + \exp \left( -\frac{(t+T)^2}{\Delta^2} \right),
\]

write \( \lambda_j(n^2) = \rho_j(n^2)/\rho_j(1) \) and over-extend (by positivity) the spectral sum to an orthonormal basis of all cusp forms of level \( 2^4 \), embedding the level 1 forms. We also form the obvious Eisenstein series variant on the sum. This leads to the inequality (see the remarks following Lemma 2.1)

\[
(6.3) \quad \mathcal{M} \ll \max_{1 \leq N \leq N_{\max}} \frac{T^\varepsilon}{N} \left( \sum_{u_j \text{ level 2}^4} \left| \sum_n \lambda_j(n^2) w_N(n) \right|^2 + \sum_a \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} h(t) \left| \sum_n \frac{T_{a,it}(n^2)}{n^{it}} w_N(n) \right|^2 dt \right).
\]

Opening the square and applying the Kuznetsov formula, we obtain

\[
(6.4) \quad \mathcal{M} \ll \Delta T^{1+\epsilon} + \max_{1 \leq N \leq N_{\max}} T^\varepsilon S(H),
\]

where

\[
(6.5) \quad S(H) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{c \equiv 0 \pmod{2^4}} \sum_{m,n} \frac{S(m^2,n^2;c)}{cm^itn^{-iv}} w_N(m) w_N(n) H\left( \frac{4\pi mn}{c} \right),
\]

\[
(6.6) \quad H(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} J(x,t) t \tanh(\pi t) h(t) dt,
\]

and \( J(x,t) \) is as defined in Lemma 2.1.

Writing \( H(x) \) as a sum of two integrals over \( \mathbb{R}^+ \), one involving \( J_{2it}(x) \) and the other \( J_{-2it}(x) \), using the power series expansion of \( J_{\pm2it}(x) \) [GR 8.402], and shifting the \( t \)-contours to \( \Im t = \mp 10 \) say, we get that \( H(x) \ll T^{2.10} \) for \( x \leq 1 \). Using this with \( x = 4\pi mn/c \), we can truncate \( c \) at some large power of \( T \), say \( c \leq T^{10} \), with an acceptable error term.

Using [GR 8.411 11] and the fact that the integrand in (6.6) is an even function of \( t \), one can derive as in [MM (3.13)] that \( H(x) = \frac{2}{\pi} \text{Re}(H_0(x)) \), where

\[
(6.7) \quad H_0(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ix\cosh v} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-2ivt} t \tanh(\pi t) h(t) dt dv.
\]

The inner \( t \)-integral above is

\[
(6.8) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-2ivt} t \tanh(\pi t) \left( \exp \left( -\frac{(t-T)^2}{\Delta^2} \right) + \exp \left( -\frac{(t+T)^2}{\Delta^2} \right) \right) dt = \Delta T(e^{-2ivT} + e^{2ivT})g(\Delta v),
\]
where \( g(y) = g_{\Delta,T}(y) \) behaves like a fixed (even) Schwartz-class function; namely it satisfies the derivative bounds \( g^{(j)}(y) \ll j,A (1 + |y|)^{-A} \), for any \( j,A \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). Hence

\[
H_0(x) = 2\Delta T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ix \cosh v} e^{-2ivT} g(\Delta v) dv.
\]

To bound \( S(H) \), it suffices to bound \( S(H_+) \), where

\[
H_+(x) = \Delta T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ix \cosh v} e^{-2ivT} g(\Delta v) dv = \Delta T e^{ix} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ix(\cosh v - 1)} - 2ivT g(\Delta v) dv.
\]

For convenience, let us write this as \( H_+(x) = \Delta T e^{ix} K_+(x) \), where

\[
K_+(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ix(\cosh v - 1)} - 2ivT g(\Delta v) dv.
\]

We may approximate \( H_+(x) \) quite well by truncating the integral at \( |v| \leq \Delta^{-1} T^\varepsilon \), and then use an integration by parts argument to see that \( H_+(x) \) is very small unless

\[
x \gg \Delta^{1-\varepsilon}.
\]

In our situation where \( x \approx N^2/x \), we conclude that we may assume

\[
c \ll T^\varepsilon N^2/\Delta T \ll T^\varepsilon UT/\Delta.
\]

For our purposes it is inconvenient to develop the \( v \)-integral further at this early stage.

Finally, we apply a dyadic partition of unity to the \( c \)-sum. To summarize, we have shown

\[
S(H_+) = \frac{\Delta T}{N} \sum_C \sum_{c \equiv 0 \pmod{2^j}} \sum_{m,n} \frac{S(m^2, n^2, c)e_c(2mn)}{cm^3 n^{-iU}} w(m, n, c) K_+ \left( \frac{4\pi mn}{c} \right) + O(T^{-100}),
\]

where the first sum is a sum over integers \( C \) equal to \( 2^{i/2} \) for \( 0 \leq j \ll \log T \) and \( w(x_1, x_2, x_3) = w_{N,C}(x_1, x_2, x_3) \) is 1-inert and supported on \( x_1 \approx x_2 \approx N \) and \( c \approx C \).

7. Double Poisson summation

Next we apply Poisson summation to the \( m \) and \( n \) sums in (6.14), giving

\[
S(H_+) = \frac{\Delta T}{N} \sum_C \sum_{c \equiv 0 \pmod{2^j}} \sum_{k,\ell} \frac{T(-k, \ell; c)}{c^3} I(k, \ell, c) + O(T^{-100}),
\]

where

\[
I(k, \ell, c) = \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty x^{-iU} y^{iU} e_c(kx - \ell y) K_+ \left( \frac{4\pi xy}{c} \right) w(x, y, c) dx dy.
\]

By Lemma 5.3, \( T(-k, \ell; c) = 0 \) unless \((k, c) = (\ell, c)\) and \( 4|(k, \ell) \), in which case

\[
T(-k, \ell, c) = c^{3/2} (k, 2^{-2-\delta} c) e_c(k\ell/4) \left( \frac{k\ell'}{c^*} \right) g_\delta(k', \ell', c, c) \delta(c^* | \frac{c_0}{(k, c, o)}) \prod_{p|\ell, p^{co}_{(k,c,o)}} (1 - p^{-1}),
\]

where \( k' = \frac{k}{(k,c)} \), \( \ell' = \frac{\ell}{(\ell,c)} \), and other notation is carried over from Lemma 5.3 (here the function \( g_\delta \) has the same properties as the one appearing in Lemma 5.3 but may not agree with it).
Write
\begin{equation}
(7.4) \quad c = 2^\lambda c_0, \quad k = 2^{\nu}k_0, \quad \ell = 2^\gamma\ell_0,
\end{equation}
with \((k_0, c_0, 2) = 1\). The condition \((k, c) = (\ell, c)\) now becomes \(\min(\lambda, \nu) = \min(\lambda, \gamma)\), and \((k_0, c_0) = (\ell_0, c_0)\). The condition \(4|(k, \ell)\) now means \(\nu, \gamma \geq 2\). We also write
\begin{equation}
(7.5) \quad c_o = qr_1^2r_2^2
\end{equation}
where \(q\) is square-free, \(r_1|q^\infty\), and \((q, r_2) = 1\). With this notation, \(c^* = q\) and \(c_o\) shares the same prime factors as \(r_2\). Additionally, the condition \(c^*|c_o\) means \(q|qr_1^2\), which is equivalent to \((k_o, qr_1^2)|r_1^2\). Then
\begin{equation}
(7.6) \quad S(H_+) = \sum_c \frac{\Delta T}{NC^3/2} \sum_{\nu, \gamma \geq 2, \lambda \geq 4 \atop \min(\lambda, \nu) = \min(\lambda, \gamma)} (2^\nu, 2^{\lambda-2-\delta}) \sum_{(r_1, r_2, 2) = 1 \atop (q, r_2) = 1} \sum_{(k_o, c_o) = 1} \sum_{(\ell, c)} \sum_{(k_o, c_o) = 1} \sum_{(\ell, c)} \prod_{p|\ell, p \neq (k_o, c_o)} (1 - p^{-1}) \left( \frac{k^e}{c^*} \right) (k_o, c_o) c(k\ell/4)g_\delta(k, \ell, c_0)I(k, \ell, c) + O(T^{-1000}),
\end{equation}
where in places to simplify the notation we did not display the substituted values such as \(c_o = qr_1^2r_2^2\). We remark that the statement that \(g_\delta(k', \ell', c_o)\) depends additionally on \((\frac{k}{c_o}, 2^{\lambda+\delta})\) means it depends on \((2^{\lambda-\min(\lambda, \nu)}, 2^{\lambda+\delta})\). In particular, \(g_\delta\) depends additionally on \(\lambda, \nu\), but only lightly in the sense that it falls in the four following cases:
\begin{equation}
(7.7) \quad \text{i) } \lambda \leq \nu, \quad \text{ii) } \lambda = \nu + 1, \quad \text{iii) } \lambda = \nu + 2, \quad \text{iv) } \lambda \geq \nu + 3.
\end{equation}
Next we want to give a variable name to \((k_o, c_o)\), etc. We have \((k_o, c_o) = (k_o, qr_1^2)(k_o, r_2^2)\), and similarly \((\ell_o, c_o) = (\ell_o, qr_1^2)(\ell_o, r_2^2)\). Let
\begin{equation}
(7.8) \quad (k_o, qr_1^2) = (\ell_o, qr_1^2) = g_1, \quad \text{and } (k_o, r_2^2) = (\ell_o, r_2^2) = g_2.
\end{equation}
Here \(g_1\) runs over divisors of \(r_1^2\) and \(g_2\) runs over divisors of \(r_2^2\). Let
\begin{equation}
(7.9) \quad k_o = g_1g_2k_o', \quad \ell_o = g_1g_2\ell_o',
\end{equation}
where \((k_o', q_{g_1^2}) = 1\) and \((k_o', q_{g_2^2}) = 1\). In our context, the presence of the Jacobi symbol \((\frac{k^e}{q})\) means that we may automatically assume \((k_o', e', q) = 1\) which implies \((k_o', e', q_{g_1^2}) = 1\). Note that \(k_o' = k_o'2^{\nu-\min(\nu, \lambda)}\) and \(e' = e'2^{\gamma-\min(\gamma, \lambda)}\). We also apply quadratic reciprocity, giving \((\frac{k^e}{q}) = (\frac{q}{k_o'})\) times a function depending on \(k_o', e', q'\) modulo 8 (which only alters the definition of \(g\)). Making these substitutions, we obtain
\begin{equation}
(7.10) \quad S(H_+) = \sum_c \frac{\Delta T}{NC^3/2} \sum_{\nu, \gamma \geq 2, \lambda \geq 4 \atop \min(\lambda, \nu) = \min(\lambda, \gamma)} (2^\nu, 2^{\lambda-2-\delta}) \sum_{(r_1, r_2, 2) = 1 \atop (q, r_2) = 1} \sum_{g_1g_2} \prod_{p|\ell, p \neq (k_o', c_o)} (1 - p^{-1}) \sum_{q, q_{r_1^2}|q^\infty} \sum_{(k_o', c_o) = 1} \sum_{(k_o', c_o) = 1} \left( \frac{q}{k^e_o'} \right) c(k\ell/4)g_{\lambda, \nu, \gamma, \delta}(k_o', \ell_o', q)I(k, \ell, c) + O(T^{-1000}),
\end{equation}
where \(g_{\lambda, \nu, \gamma, \delta}\) is some new function modulo 8.
Finally, we decompose $g$ into Dirichlet characters modulo 8, leading to a formula of the form

$$|S(H_+)| \ll \max_{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3} |S_\eta(H_+)|,$$

where

$$S_\eta(H_+) = \sum_C \frac{\Delta T}{NC^{3/2}} \sum_{\nu, \gamma \geq 2, \lambda \geq 4, \lambda / \gamma = \min(\lambda, \gamma)} (2^\nu, 2^{\lambda-2-\delta}) \sum_{g_1g_2} \prod_{p \mid r_2, \nu, \gamma} (1 - p^{-1})$$

$$\sum_{\eta_1(k'_o)\eta_2(\ell'_o)\eta_3(q)} \eta(q/r_2) \frac{(q, 2r_2)}{(q, 2q_2)} e_{c}(k\ell/4)I(k, \ell, c) + O(T^{-100}).$$

### 8. The behavior of $I(k, \ell, c)$

Using (6.11), we have

$$I(k, \ell, c) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(\Delta v) e^{-2ivT} \int_0^\infty x^{-iU} y^{-iU} e_c(kx - \ell y + 2xy(cosh v - 1))w(x, y, c)dxdydv.$$

Let $A, B$ be real numbers with $\epsilon > 0$, and $N$ and $U$ as before, and consider the integral

$$I(A, B, U, \epsilon, N) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} e^{i\phi(x, y)} w_N(x, y)dxdy,$$

where $w_N$ is 1-inert, supported on $x \asymp y \asymp N$ with $N \gg 1$, and

$$\phi(x, y) = -U \log x + U \log y + Ax - By + \epsilon xy.$$

In our case,

$$A = \frac{2\pi k}{c}, \quad B = \frac{2\pi \ell}{c}, \quad \epsilon = 4\pi \frac{\cosh(v) - 1}{c}.$$

**Lemma 8.1.** Suppose that $\epsilon N^2 = o(U)$, with $U \to \infty$. Then $I(A, B, U, \epsilon, N) \ll C NU^{-C}$ with $C > 0$ arbitrarily large, unless

$$A \asymp B \asymp \frac{U}{N},$$

Under this assumption, we have

$$I = \frac{N^2}{U} e^{i\phi(x_0, y_0)} W(\cdot) + O(N^2 U^{-C}),$$

where $(x_0, y_0)$ is the unique solution to $\phi'(x_0, y_0) = 0$, $W$ is 1-inert (in terms of the ambient parameters). Finally, $\phi(x_0, y_0)$ has the asymptotic expansion

$$\phi(x_0, y_0) = U \log(A/B) + \sum_{j=0}^J c_j U \left( \frac{\epsilon U}{AB} \right)^{1+2j} + O\left( U \left( \frac{\epsilon U}{AB} \right)^{3+2J} \right),$$

with $c_0 = 1$, $c_1 = -\frac{1}{3}$, etc.
Note that \( \frac{\epsilon U}{AB} \ll \frac{\epsilon N^2}{U} = o(1) \), so that (8.7) is an asymptotic expansion. We also remark that the assumption \( \epsilon N^2 = o(U) \) means that the dominant part of \( \phi \) comes from \(-U \log x + U \log y\), and \( \epsilon xy \) is a smaller perturbation.

**Proof.** The integration by parts lemma (Lemma 4.2) shows the integral is small unless (8.5) holds. Assuming (8.5) holds, then Lemma 4.3 may be iteratively applied (using the remarks following Lemma 4.3) which gives the form (8.6), with a 1-inert function \( W \).

It only remains to derive the Taylor expansion for \( \phi(x_0, y_0) \). We have

\[
(8.8) \quad \phi(Ux/A, Uy/B) = U \log(A/B) + U \Phi(x, y),
\]

where

\[
(8.9) \quad \Phi(x, y) = -\log x + \log y + x - y + \delta xy, \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \frac{\epsilon U}{AB} = o(1).
\]

By a simple calculation, we have that \( \Phi'(x_0, y_0) = 0 \) if and only if \( x_0 = 1 - \delta x_0 y_0 \) and \( y_0 = 1 + \delta x_0 y_0 \). Thus

\[
(8.10) \quad x_0 + y_0 = 2, \quad \text{and} \quad y_0 - x_0 = 2\delta x_0 y_0.
\]

Letting \( r_0 = x_0 y_0 \), we see that it satisfies the relation \( r_0 = (1 - \delta r_0)(1 + \delta r_0) = 1 - \delta^2 r_0^2 \). Solving this explicitly, we see that \( r_0 \) is an even function of \( \delta \), analytic for \(|\delta| < 1/2\). Note \( r_0 = 1 - \delta^2 + O(\delta^3) \). Then we have

\[
(8.11) \quad \Phi(x_0, y_0) = \log(y_0/x_0) + x_0 - y_0 + \delta x_0 y_0 = \log\left(\frac{1 + \delta r_0}{1 - \delta r_0}\right) - \delta r_0,
\]

which is an odd function of \( \delta \), with power series expansion of the form \( \Phi(x_0, y_0) = \delta - \frac{1}{3} \delta^3 + \ldots \). Translating back to the original notation gives (8.7).

**Lemma 8.2.** Suppose that \( \frac{U}{\epsilon N^2} = o(1) \). Then \( I(A, B, U, \epsilon, N) \ll C N^{-C} \) with \( C > 0 \) arbitrarily large, unless

\[
(8.12) \quad |A| \asymp |B| \asymp \epsilon N
\]

and \( A < 0, B > 0 \). Under these assumptions, then

\[
(8.13) \quad I = \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{i \phi(x_0, y_0)} W(\cdot) + O(N^2 U^{-C}),
\]

where \((x_0, y_0)\) is the unique solution to \( \phi'(x_0, y_0) = 0 \) and \( W \) is 1-inert (in terms of the ambient parameters). Finally, \( \phi(x_0, y_0) \) has the following Taylor expansion

\[
(8.14) \quad \phi(x_0, y_0) = \frac{AB}{\epsilon} \left[ \sum_{j=0}^{J} c_j \left( \frac{U \epsilon}{AB}\right)^{2j} + O\left( \frac{U \epsilon}{AB} \right)^{2J+2} \right] + U \log\left( \frac{-A}{B} \right),
\]

with \( c_0 = 1, c_2 = 3 \), etc.

The condition \( U = o(\epsilon N^2) \) means that the dominant phase in \( \phi \) is \( \epsilon xy \), and the phase \(-U \log x + U \log y\) is a perturbation.

**Proof.** Considering the \( x \)-integral, Lemma 4.2 shows that \( I \ll N^{-C} \) unless

\[
(8.15) \quad \left| \frac{A}{\epsilon N} + \frac{y}{N} \right| \ll \frac{U}{\epsilon N^2} = o(1).
\]
Since $1 \ll \frac{1}{N} \ll 1$ (with certain absolute implied constants), this means that $|A| \approx |\epsilon|N$ with $A$ having the opposite sign of $\epsilon$ (i.e., $A < 0$). Similarly, considering the $y$-integral shows that $I$ is small unless $|B| \approx \epsilon N$ with $B$ having the same sign as $\epsilon$ (i.e., $B > 0$).

Next we wish to apply Lemma 4.3 to $I$. There is a minor technical issue from the fact that the second derivative with respect to $x$ (or $y$) of $\epsilon xy$ vanishes, even though this should be viewed as the dominant phase. This issue may be circumvented by a simple change of variable to diagonalize this quadratic form. Precisely, if we let $x = u + v$ and $y = u - v$, then

$$\varphi(u, v) := \phi(u + v, u - v) = \epsilon u^2 + \alpha u - \epsilon v^2 + \beta v + U \log \left(\frac{u-v}{u+v}\right),$$

for certain $\alpha, \beta$ whose values are immaterial. Then a simple calculation gives

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2} \varphi(u, v) = 2 \epsilon + U \left(\frac{-1}{(u-v)^2} + \frac{1}{(u+v)^2}\right) = 2 \epsilon (1 + O(\epsilon^{-1} N^{-2} U)) \gg |\epsilon|.$$

A similar calculation shows $|\frac{\partial^2}{\partial v^2} \varphi(u, v)| \gg |\epsilon|$. Once we know that stationary phase can be applied after this linear change of variables, we can then revert back to the original variables $x, y$, giving

$$I = \frac{1}{\epsilon} e^{i \phi(x_0, y_0)} W_T(\cdot) + O(N^{-C}),$$

where $\phi'(x_0, y_0) = 0$. We have

$$\phi(Bx/\epsilon, -Ay/\epsilon) = -\frac{AB}{\epsilon} \Phi(x, y) + U \log \left(\frac{-A}{B}\right),$$

where

$$\Phi(x, y) = xy - x - y + \delta \log(y/x), \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \frac{U \epsilon}{AB} \gg \frac{U}{\epsilon N^2} = o(1).$$

A simple calculation shows $\Phi'(x_0, y_0) = 0$ if and only if

$$x_0 = 1 - \frac{\delta}{y_0}, \quad y_0 = 1 + \frac{\delta}{x_0}.$$

Solving these explicitly, we obtain

$$\begin{align*}
x_0 &= \frac{1 - 2\delta + \sqrt{1 + 4\delta^2}}{2}, \\
y_0 &= \frac{1 + 2\delta + \sqrt{1 + 4\delta^2}}{2},
\end{align*}$$

and thus

$$\Phi(x_0, y_0) = -\frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + 4\delta^2}}{2} - \delta \log \left(\frac{1 + 2\delta + \sqrt{1 + 4\delta^2}}{1 - 2\delta + \sqrt{1 + 4\delta^2}}\right) = -\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j \delta^j,$$

which is analytic in $\delta$ for $|\delta| < 1/2$, and also even with respect to $\delta$. We have $c_0 = 1, c_2 = 3, c_4 = -\frac{7}{2},$ etc. 

Remark. Lemmas 8.1 and 8.2 have some close similarities. In both cases, the stationary phase method may be applied, and the stationary point can be explicitly found by solving a quadratic equation. In each case, only one of the two roots is relevant, and the other is outside the support of the test function. We expect, but did not confirm rigorously, that when $U \approx \epsilon N^2$, then both roots of the quadratic equation are relevant. This situation is more complicated because the two roots may approach each other in which case a cubic...
Taylor approximation to the phase function is more applicable as with the Airy function, for instance).

9. Cleaning up some terms

In this section we take the opportunity to deal with some ranges of parameters for which relatively easy methods suffice. This will simplify our exposition for the more difficult cases.

With the aid of the analysis from Section 8 we can now treat some ranges of $c$. We begin with some discussion on the $v$-integral appearing in (6.11) and subsequent formulas.

**Lemma 9.1.** Suppose that

\[ x \geq T^{2-\varepsilon}. \]  

Then

\[ K_+(x) = \int_{|v| \ll x^{-1/2}T^\varepsilon} e^{ix(c\cosh(v) - 1) - 2iT\varepsilon g(\Delta v)\eta(v)}dv + O((xT)^{-100}), \]

where $\eta$ is supported on $|v| \ll x^{-1/2}T^\varepsilon$ and satisfies property (4.1) for a 1-inert function.

**Proof.** This follows from the integration by parts lemma. □

**Lemma 9.2.** The contribution to $S(H_+)$ from $C \ll \frac{N^2T^\varepsilon}{T^2}$ is bounded by $\Delta T^{1+\varepsilon}$.

**Proof.** Let $S$ be the contribution to $S(H_+)$ from $C \ll \frac{N^2T^\varepsilon}{T^2}$. Since $x \asymp \frac{N^2}{c}$, the assumption of the lemma means that Lemma 9.1 may be applied. In this case, we have $\frac{2xy}{c}(\cosh(v) - 1) \ll T^\varepsilon$ and so in the notation of (8.4), we have $\epsilon N^2 \ll T^{2\varepsilon}$. Now suppose that $U \gg T^{3\varepsilon}$. In this case, $\epsilon N^2 = o(U)$, and so Lemma 8.1 may be applied to show

\[ I(k, \ell, c) \ll NC^{1/2}T^\varepsilon \left(1 + \frac{|k|N}{CU}\right)^{-100} \left(1 + \frac{|\ell|N}{CU}\right)^{-100}. \]

Moreover, $I(k, \ell, c)$ is very small unless $|k| \asymp |\ell| \asymp \frac{CU}{N}$ (in particular, $k$ and $\ell$ are nonzero). Inserting this bound into (7.10), we obtain

\[ |S| \ll \frac{\Delta T T^\varepsilon}{UC} \sum_{\nu, \gamma \geq 2, \lambda \geq 4} (2^\nu, 2^\lambda - 2^\delta) \sum_{\nu, \gamma \geq 2, \lambda \geq 4} \frac{g_1 g_2}{\min(\lambda, \nu)} \left(1 + \frac{|k|N}{CU}\right)^{-100} \left(1 + \frac{|\ell|N}{CU}\right)^{-100}, \]

Thus

\[ |S| \ll \frac{\Delta T C^2U}{N} T^\varepsilon \ll \frac{\Delta U N^2}{T^3} T^\varepsilon \ll \Delta T U^2 T^\varepsilon, \]

which is acceptable since $U \ll T$.

Next we indicate the changes needed to handle the range $U \ll T^{3\varepsilon}$. By integration by parts (Lemma 4.2), the same bound (9.3) holds in this case, but the difference from before is that we no longer have the condition $k, \ell \neq 0$. Indeed, we may assume $|k|, |\ell| \ll \frac{CU}{N}T^\varepsilon \ll \frac{\Delta T U^2}{T^2} T^\varepsilon$. 

\[ |S| \ll \frac{\Delta T C^2U}{N} T^\varepsilon \ll \frac{\Delta U N^2}{T^3} T^\varepsilon \ll \Delta T U^2 T^\varepsilon, \]
Thus we only need to consider \( k = \ell = 0 \). Using the final sentence of Lemma 5.3, we see that the contribution to \( S \) from \( k = \ell = 0 \) is bounded by

\[
\sum_{r_2 \asymp C^{1/2}} C \ll \frac{\Delta T}{U} C^{1/2} \ll \frac{\Delta N}{U} T^\varepsilon \ll \Delta T^{1+\varepsilon}.
\]

In light of Lemma 9.2, for the rest of the paper we may assume that

\[
C \gg \frac{N^2}{T^2} T^\varepsilon.
\]

Lemma 9.3. Suppose (9.7) holds, and let

\[
V_0 = \frac{TC}{N^2}.
\]

Then with \( x = \frac{4\pi m n}{c} \asymp \frac{N^2}{c} \), we have

\[
K_+(x) = \int_{v \ll V_0} e^{ix(cosh(v)-1)-2iTv} g(\Delta v)\eta(v)dv + O((xT)^{-100}),
\]

where \( \eta \) is a \( 1 \)-inert function supported on \( v \asymp V_0 \).

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.2.

Lemma 9.4. Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 1.1 hold, as well as (6.13). Then

\[
I(k, \ell, c) = \frac{NC^{1/2}}{U} \left( \frac{k}{\ell} \right)^{itU} \exp \left( -\frac{2\pi iT^2k\ell}{U^2c} \right) W(\cdot) + O(T^{-100}),
\]

where \( W \) is \( 1 \)-inert (in all ambient variables), and supported on

\[
k \asymp \ell \asymp \frac{CU}{N}.
\]

Proof. We begin by making some simple deductions from the conditions of Theorem 1.1.

First we note that (1.2) directly implies \( U\Delta \geq T^{1+\delta} \). Since (6.13) holds, we additionally deduce

\[
C \ll \frac{U N^2}{T^2} T^{-\delta},
\]

for some \( \delta > 0 \). Another consequence of (1.2) is that

\[
\frac{T^3}{U^2 \Delta^3} \ll T^{-3\delta}.
\]

From the fact that \( U \ll T \), we also deduce that

\[
\Delta \gg T^{1/3+\delta}.
\]

Using (9.8), the condition (9.12) means that \( \frac{\epsilon N^2}{U} \asymp \frac{V_0^2 N^2}{U^2} \asymp \frac{T^2 C}{U N^2} \ll T^{-\delta} \), so that Lemma 8.1 applies. Moreover, the conditions to apply Lemma 9.3 are met. Note that

\[
\frac{\epsilon U}{AB} = \frac{(cosh v - 1)Uc}{\pi k\ell} \asymp \frac{UCV_0^2}{k\ell} \asymp \frac{UC(TC/N^2)^2}{(CU/N)^2} = \frac{T^2 C}{U N^2} \ll \frac{T}{U \Delta} T^\varepsilon,
\]

since \( k \asymp \ell \asymp \frac{CU}{N} \), \( v \asymp V_0 \), and \( C \ll \frac{N^2}{T^2} T^\varepsilon \). Therefore,

\[
U \left( \frac{\epsilon U}{AB} \right)^3 \ll U \left( \frac{T}{U \Delta} \right)^3 T^\varepsilon \ll \frac{T^3}{U^2 \Delta^3} T^\varepsilon \ll T^{-\delta},
\]
for some $\delta' > 0$. This calculation shows that in (8.7), the terms with $j \geq 1$ can be absorbed into the inert weight function. This is where we use the condition (1.2) which can likely be relaxed to $U\Delta \gg T^{1+\delta}$, since this condition is sufficient to show that (8.7) is a good asymptotic expansion. Therefore,

$$I(k, \ell, c) = \frac{N^2}{U} \left( \frac{k}{\ell} \right)^i \int_{v=V_0} \exp \left( -2iTv + \frac{U^2 c (\cosh v - 1)}{\pi k \ell} \right) W(v, \cdot) dv,$$

plus a small error term. Next we can apply $\cosh(v) - 1 = v^2/2 + O(v^4)$ and absorb the $v^4$ terms into the inert weight function, using (6.13) and (9.14) as follows:

$$U^2 CV_0^4 \frac{\Delta^4}{N^6} \ll \frac{T}{\Delta^3} \ll T^{-\delta'}.$$

Finally, by stationary phase we obtain the desired estimate. □

Next we simplify our expression for $I(k, \ell, c)$ under the conditions of Theorem 1.3, when $U$ is small.

**Lemma 9.5.** Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 1.3 hold, as well as (9.7). Then $I(k, \ell, c)$ is very small unless

$$-k \approx \ell \approx \frac{C^2T^2}{N^3},$$

in which case

$$I(k, \ell, c) = \frac{N^4}{CT^2} \left( -k/\ell \right)^i e^{-\frac{2\pi k}{c}} \int_{v=V_0} e^{-2ivT + \frac{2\pi k\ell}{c} W(v, \cdot)} dv + O(T^{-100}).$$

Remark. Although it is possible to also evaluate the asymptotic of the $v$-integral in (9.20), we prefer to save this step for later, in Section 10.

**Proof.** We have that (recall the notation (8.2))

$$I(k, \ell, c) = \int_{v=V_0} \eta(v) g(\Delta v) e^{-2ivT} I \left( \frac{2\pi k}{c}, \frac{2\pi \ell}{c}, U, \epsilon, N \right) dv,$$

with $\epsilon = 4\pi \frac{\cosh(v)-1}{c} \times \frac{V_0^2}{c} \times \frac{C T^2}{N^4}$. Since (9.7) holds, this means that $\frac{U^2}{N^2} \times \frac{U^2 N^2}{CT^2} \ll T^{-\epsilon}$, so that Lemma 8.2 may be applied. This directly implies that $I(k, \ell, c)$ is very small unless (9.19) holds. Note that

$$\frac{AB}{\epsilon} = \frac{\pi k \ell}{c (\cosh v - 1)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \left| \frac{AB}{\epsilon} \right| \left( \frac{U \epsilon}{AB} \right)^2 = \frac{U^2 \epsilon}{AB} \ll \frac{U^2 N^2}{CT^2} \ll T^{-\epsilon}.$$

The latter calculation shows that the terms with $j \geq 1$ in (8.14) may be absorbed into the inert weight function. We thus conclude that

$$I(k, \ell, c) = \frac{N^4}{CT^2} \left( -k/\ell \right)^i \int_{v=V_0} e^{-2ivT + \frac{\pi k \ell}{c (\cosh v - 1)} W(v, \cdot)} dv + O(T^{-100}).$$

Finally we observe the Taylor approximation

$$\frac{1}{\cosh v - 1} = \frac{2}{v^2} - \frac{1}{6} + O(v^2),$$

and that

$$\frac{k \ell}{c} v^2 \ll \frac{C^5 T^6}{N^{10}} \ll \frac{T}{\Delta^5} T^\epsilon \ll T^{-\delta'},$$
for some \( \delta' > 0 \). This lets us absorb the lower-order terms in the Taylor expansion into the inert weight function. Therefore, (9.20) holds.

\[ \boxdot \]

10. Mellin inversion

We recall that we have the expression (7.10), in which is contained a smooth (yet oscillatory) weight function of the form

\[ f(k, \ell, c) = e_c(k\ell/4)I(k, \ell, c). \]

In the conditions of Theorem 1.1, we have that \( I \) is given by Lemma 9.4 while in the conditions of Theorem 1.3, we have that \( I \) is given by Lemma 9.5. In both cases, the function \( f \) is very small except when \( k \) and \( \ell \) are fixed into dyadic intervals. We may therefore freely insert an inert weight function that enforces this condition.

First consider the setting relevant for Theorem 1.1. The function \( \tilde{f} \) has phase as given in Lemma 9.4 modified to include \( e_c(k\ell/4) \) which is strictly smaller in size due to the assumption \( U \leq (2 - \delta)T \). We apply Lemma 4.4 to the phase function, and apply Mellin inversion to the inert part. We therefore obtain

\[ f(k, \ell, c) = \frac{\Phi}{\sqrt{P}} \left( \frac{k'}{\ell'} \right)^{iu} \int_{-\tau/2}^{\tau/2} \int (T^2g_1^2g_2^2k_o'\ell_o')^s \left(1 - \frac{U^2}{4T^2}\right)^s v(t) \tilde{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3) \]

\[ \left( \frac{C}{q_1^2r_2^2\ell'} \right)^{u_1} \left( \frac{K}{k_o'g_1g_2^2} \right)^{u_2} \left( \frac{K}{\ell_o'g_1g_2^2} \right)^{u_3} du_1du_2du_3ds, \]

plus a small error term, where \( s = it \), and where

\[ \Phi = \frac{N\sqrt{C}}{U}, \quad P = \frac{CT^2}{N^2}, \quad K = \frac{CU}{N}. \]

By standard Mellin inversion of an inert function, the function \( \tilde{w} \) is entire and has rapid decay on any vertical line. However we do not specify the vertical contour in the integral above (and in several instances below). Also we have absorbed constants such as \( \frac{1}{2\pi} \) and the like into the weight functions. We recall that \( k = 2^\nu g_1g_2k_o', \ell = 2^\gamma g_1g_2\ell_o', \) and \( c = 2\lambda q_1^2r_2^2 \). We recall from Lemma 4.4 that \( v(t) \) is supported on \(-t \asymp P, \), is \( O(1) \), and has phase \( e^{-it\log(|t|/c)} \).

We can also apply these steps to \( I \) given by Lemma 9.5 which will have a similar structure but with an extra \( v \)-integral. We obtain

\[ f(k, \ell, c) = \frac{\Phi_0}{\sqrt{P}} \int_{v \asymp v_0} e^{-2ivT} \left( \frac{-k_o'}{\ell'} \right)^{iu} \int_{-\tau/2}^{\tau/2} \int (g_1^2g_2^3k_o'|\ell_o'|^s \left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\right)^s v(t) \tilde{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3) \]

\[ \left( \frac{C}{q_1^2r_2^2\ell'} \right)^{u_1} \left( \frac{K}{k_o'|g_1g_2^2} \right)^{u_2} \left( \frac{K}{\ell_o'|g_1g_2^2} \right)^{u_3} du_1du_2du_3dsdv, \]

plus a small error term, where this time

\[ \Phi_0 = \frac{N^4}{CT^2}, \quad P = \frac{CT^2}{N^2}, \quad K = \frac{C^2T^2}{N^3}, \quad V_0 = \frac{CT}{N^2}. \]

Here, \( \tilde{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3) \) is implicitly an inert function of \( v \). It is the Mellin transform (in the suppressed variables, but not in \( v \)) of the function \( W(v, \cdot) \) which was introduced in Lemma 9.5.
At this point, we finally asymptotically evaluate the \( v \)-integral. We are considering
\[
\int_{v \gg V_0} e^{-2i\nu T - 2s \log v + s \log(1 + \frac{v^2}{6})} W(v, \cdot) dv,
\]
where we recall \( s = it, -t \gg P \). We first observe that \( s \log(1 + \frac{v^2}{6}) = sv^2/6 + O(sv^4) \), and note
\[
|sv^4| \approx PV_0'^4 \ll \frac{T^{1+\varepsilon}}{\Delta^5} \ll T^{-\delta},
\]
by the assumption \( \Delta \gg T^{1/5+\varepsilon} \). Therefore, the term with \( sv^4 \) can be absorbed into the inert weight function at no cost. We are therefore considering an oscillatory integral with phase
\[
\Phi = \int_{v \gg V_0} e^{-2i\nu T - 2s \log v + sv^2/6} W(v, \cdot) dv = \frac{V_0}{\sqrt{P}} e^{-2i\nu T} e^{is^2 T/2} W(\cdot),
\]
for some constant \( a' \). We observe that \( \frac{P^5}{T^4} \ll \frac{T^{1+\varepsilon}}{\Delta^5} \ll T^{-\delta} \), so quantities of this size (or smaller) may be safely discarded. We conclude
\[
\phi(v_0) = -2s \log(\frac{|s|}{T}) + 2s + as^3 T/2 + O\left(\frac{P^5}{T^4}\right),
\]
for some new constant \( a \). Therefore,
\[
\int_{v \gg V_0} e^{-2i\nu T - 2s \log v + s \log(1 + \frac{v^2}{6})} W(v, \cdot) dv = \frac{V_0}{\sqrt{P}} e^{-2i\nu T} e^{is^2 T/2} W(\cdot),
\]
for some inert function \( W \) and constant \( a \). Therefore, we deduce a formula for \( f \) in the form
\[
f(k, \ell, c) = \frac{\Phi}{\sqrt{P}} \left( \frac{-k'}{\ell'_o} \right)^i u \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \left( \frac{g_1 g_2}{q r_1^2 r_2^2 3^{2\gamma-3}} \right)^s v(t) e^{-2i\nu T} e^{is^2 T/2} \tilde{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3)
\cdot \left( \frac{C}{q r_1^2 r_2^2 3^{2\gamma}} \right)^{u_1} \left( \frac{K}{k'_o g_1 g_2 2^{2\gamma}} \right)^{u_2} \left( \frac{K}{\ell'_o g_1 g_2 2^{2\gamma}} \right)^{u_3} du_1 du_2 du_3 ds dv,
\]
where now
\[
\Phi = \frac{N^4 V_0}{CT^2 P^{1/2}} = \frac{N^3}{C^{1/2} T^{2}}, \quad P = \frac{CT^2}{N^2}, \quad K = \frac{C^2 T^2}{N^3}, \quad V_0 = \frac{CT}{N^2}.
\]
This expression for \( f(k, \ell, c) \) is similar enough to \( (10.2) \) that we can proceed in parallel. We mainly focus on the proof of Theorem 1.1

Inserting \( (10.2) \) into \( (7.12) \), we obtain
\[
S_\eta(H_+) = \sum_C \frac{\Delta T}{NC^{3/2}} \frac{\Phi}{\sqrt{P}} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \left( \frac{C^2 T^2}{N^3} \right)^s v(t) \tilde{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3)
\cdot \left( \frac{C^2 T^2}{N^3} \right)^{u_3} Z(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) du_1 du_2 du_3 ds.
\]
where $Z = Z_\eta$ is defined by

\begin{equation}
Z(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) = \sum_{\nu, \gamma \geq 2, \lambda \geq 4 \atop \min(\nu, \gamma) = \min(\lambda, \gamma)} \frac{(2^\nu, 2^{\lambda-2-\delta})}{2^{\lambda(u_1+s)+\nu(u_2-iU-s)+\gamma(u_3+iU-s)}} \sum_{g_1 g_2 | } \sum_{g_1 g_2 | } (1 - p^{-1}) \sum_{q | r_1 | q \infty \atop (q, 2r_2) = 1} \sum_{(k'_\alpha, \ell'_\alpha, 2) = 1} \sum_{(k'_\beta, \ell'_\beta, 2 \frac{3}{2}) = 1} \frac{\eta_1(k'_\alpha, \ell'_\alpha, \ell'_\beta, q) \prod_{p | r_2, p' | \frac{3}{2} q} (1 - p^{-1})}{(k'_\alpha)^{u_2-iU-s}(\ell'_\alpha)_{u_3+iU-s} q^{u_1+s}(r_1^2 r_2^2) u_1+s (g_1 g_2)^{u_2+iU-2s-1}}.
\end{equation}

We initially suppose that $\text{Re}(s) = 0$ and $\text{Re}(u_i) = 2$ for each $i$, securing absolute convergence of the sum. An obvious modification, using (10.12) in place of (10.1), gives the corresponding formula for $U$ small, namely

\begin{equation}
S_\eta(H_+) = \sum_C \frac{\Delta T}{N C^{3/2}} \frac{\Phi}{\sqrt{P}} \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty \int_{-\infty}^\infty e^{-2 \pi t \log \left( \frac{|t|}{t} \right) + \frac{3}{4} \left( \frac{3}{2} \right)^2 v(t)} \hat{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3) \sum_{u_1, u_2, u_3} C^{u_1} K^{u_2+u_3} Z(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) du_1 du_2 du_3 ds,
\end{equation}

where the parameters correspond with (10.13), and the formula for $Z$ is slightly different (multiplied by $\eta_1(-1)$ to account for changing variables $k'_\alpha \rightarrow -k$, with $k \geq 1$).

### 11. Properties of the Dirichlet series $Z$

Throughout this section we assume that $\text{Re}(s) = 0$. For simplicity of notation only, we also take $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3)$ to be trivial, as the same proof works in the general case.

**Lemma 11.1.** Let $\alpha = u_2 + u_3 - 2s - 1$ and $\beta = u_1 + s$. For $\text{Re}(u_2) > 1$ and $\text{Re}(u_3) > 1$, we have an expression for $Z$ in the form

\begin{equation}
Z(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) = Z^{(2)}(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) \sum_{(k, \ell, 2)} \frac{Z_{k, \ell}(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) \ell_{u_2-iU-s}(u_3+iU-s)}{k_{u_2-iU-s}(u_3+iU-s)},
\end{equation}

with the following properties. First, $Z_{k, \ell}$ and $Z^{(2)}$ have meromorphic continuation to the region

\begin{equation}
\begin{cases}
\text{Re}(\alpha + 2\beta) > 1 \\
\text{Re}(2\alpha + 2\beta) > 1
\end{cases} \iff \begin{cases}
\text{Re}(2u_1 + u_2 + u_3) > 2 \\
\text{Re}(u_1 + u_2 + u_3) > 3/2.
\end{cases}
\end{equation}

In the region $\text{(11.2)}$, $Z^{(2)}$ is bounded, and $Z_{k, \ell}$ has a pole only at $\beta = 1$ when $\chi_{k, \ell}$ is trivial. Moreover, $Z_{k, \ell}(\alpha, \beta)$ has a factorization of the form

\begin{equation}
L(\beta, \chi_{k, \ell}) D(\alpha, \beta, \chi_{k, \ell}) \zeta(2\alpha + 2\beta) \prod_{p | k, \ell} (1 + O(p^{-2})),
\end{equation}

where the coefficients in the product over $p$ dividing $k, \ell$ are functions of $\alpha, \beta$, bounded in $\text{(11.2)}$, and

\begin{equation}
D(\alpha, \beta, \chi_{k, \ell}) = \sum_{(n, 2) = 1} \frac{\mu^2(n)}{n^{\alpha+2\beta}} \sum_{a, b = 1} \frac{\mu(b) \chi_{k, \ell}(c)}{b^{1+\alpha} c^{1+\alpha + \beta}}.
\end{equation}

In particular, $D(\alpha, \beta, \chi_{k, \ell})$ remains bounded in closed half-planes contained in $\text{(11.2)}$. 
One may easily check that we have, with (11.8)

\[
Z_k, \ell (s, u_1, u_2, u_3) = \sum_{(r_1 r_2) = 1} \sum_{g_1 | r_1^2} \sum_{g_2 | r_2^2} \sum_q^\infty \left( \frac{q}{k \ell} \right) \prod_{p \mid r_2} p^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 - p^{-1})^r \]

and

\[
Z^{(2)} = \sum_{\nu, \gamma \geq 2, \lambda \geq 4, \min(\lambda, \nu) = \min(\lambda, \gamma) = 1} \frac{(2^\nu, 2^\lambda - 2 - \delta)}{2^\lambda (u_1 + s + \nu (u_2 - iU - s) + \gamma (u_3 + iU - s)).}
\]

One may easily check that \(Z^{(2)}\) is absolutely convergent and bounded in the region (11.2).

The Dirichlet series \(Z_k, \ell\) has an Euler product, say \(Z_k, \ell = \prod_{(p, 2) = 1} Z^{(p)}\). For \((p, 2k \ell) = 1\), we have, with \(\chi(n) = \left(\frac{n}{k \ell}\right)\),

\[
Z^{(p)}(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{\min(r_1, r_2) = 0} \sum_{0 \leq g_1 \leq 2r_1} \sum_{0 \leq g_2 \leq 2r_2} (1 - p^{-1})^{\delta g_2 = 2r_2} \chi(p^q) \prod_{p \mid r_2} p^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 - p^{-1})^{\delta g_2 = 2r_2} \]

We write this as \(\sum_{r_2 = 0} + \sum_{r_2 \geq 1}\), where the latter terms force \(q = r_1 = 0\). We have

\[
\sum_{r_2 \geq 1} = \sum_{r_2 = 1}^{\infty} p^{-2\beta r_2} \left( \sum_{0 \leq g_2 \leq 2r_2 - 1} p^{-\alpha g_2} (1 - p^{-1}) p^{-2\alpha r_2} \right) = \sum_{r_2 = 1}^{\infty} p^{-2\beta r_2} \left( \frac{1 - p^{-2\alpha r_2}}{1 - p^{-\alpha}} + (1 - p^{-1}) p^{-2\alpha r_2} \right).
\]

This evaluates as

\[
(1 - p^{-\alpha})^{-1} \left( \frac{p^{-2\beta}}{1 - p^{-2\beta}} - \frac{p^{-2\beta - 2\alpha}}{1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta}} \right) + (1 - p^{-1}) \frac{p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta}}{1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta}},
\]

which simplifies as

\[
\frac{p^{-2\beta}}{1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta}} \left[ 1 + p^{-\alpha} + (1 - p^{-1}) p^{-2\alpha} (1 - p^{-2\beta}) \right].
\]

In turn this becomes

\[
\frac{p^{-2\beta}}{(1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta})(1 - p^{-2\beta})} \left[ 1 + p^{-\alpha} + (1 - p^{-1}) p^{-2\alpha} (1 - p^{-2\beta}) \right].
\]

Likewise, we compute

\[
\sum_{r_2 = 0}^{\infty} = \sum_{r_1 = 0}^{\infty} \sum_{0 \leq g_1 \leq 2r_1} \sum_{0 \leq q < 1}^{\infty} \sum_{\infty \geq q \geq 1} \chi(p^q) \prod_{p \mid (q + 2r_1 + 2r_2) + \alpha g_1} = 1 + \sum_{r_1 = 0}^{\infty} \sum_{0 \leq g_1 \leq 2r_1} \chi(p) \prod_{p \mid (1 + 2r_1 + 2r_2) + \alpha g_1},
\]

by separating out the cases \(q = 0\) and \(q = 1\). We calculate this as

\[
1 + \chi(p) p^{-\beta} \sum_{r_1 = 0}^{\infty} p^{-2\beta r_1} \frac{1 - p^{-\alpha (2r_1 + 1)}}{1 - p^{-\alpha}},
\]
which can be expressed as
\[
1 + \frac{\chi(p)p^{-\beta}}{1 - p^{-\alpha}} \left( \frac{1}{1 - p^{-2\beta}} - \frac{p^{-\alpha}}{1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta}} \right) = 1 + \frac{\chi(p)p^{-\beta}(1 + p^{-\alpha - 2\beta})}{(1 - p^{-2\beta})(1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta})}.
\]

Putting the two calculations together, we obtain
\[
Z(p)(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{(1 + \chi(p)p^{-\beta})(1 + p^{-\alpha - 2\beta}) + \chi(p)p^{-\beta}(1 + p^{-\alpha - 2\beta}) + p^{-2\beta}(1 + p^{-\alpha} + (1 - p^{-1})(p^{-2\alpha} - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta}))}{(1 - p^{-2\beta})(1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta})}.
\]

Distributing out the numerator and canceling like terms, we obtain
\[
Z(p)(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{(1 + \chi(p)p^{-\beta})(1 + p^{-\alpha - 2\beta}) - p^{-1 - 2\alpha - 2\beta}(1 - p^{-2\beta})}{(1 - p^{-2\beta})(1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta})}
\]
\[
= \frac{1 + p^{-\alpha - 2\beta} - p^{-1 - 2\alpha - 2\beta} + \chi(p)p^{-1 - 2\alpha - 3\beta}}{(1 - \chi(p)p^{-\beta})(1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta})}.
\]

This shows that
\[
\prod_{p|2k\ell} Z(p)(\alpha, \beta) = L(\beta, \chi_{k\ell})\zeta(2k\ell)(2\alpha + 2\beta) \prod_{p|2k\ell} (1 + p^{-\alpha - 2\beta} - p^{-1 - 2\alpha - 2\beta} + \chi(p)p^{-1 - 2\alpha - 3\beta}).
\]

Next, we need to consider the primes \(p|k\ell\). At such a prime we must have \((q, p) = 1\) (or else \((\frac{q}{k\ell}) = 0\)) which implies \(r_1 = 1\) and \(g_2 = r_2^2\). Thus
\[
\prod_{p|k\ell} Z(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) = \prod_{p|k\ell} \sum_{r_2 \geq 0} \frac{(1 - p^{-1})^{\delta_{r_2 > 0}}}{p^{r_2}(2\beta + 2\alpha)} = \prod_{p|k\ell} \frac{1 - p^{-1 - 2\alpha - 2\beta}}{1 - p^{-2\alpha - 2\beta}}.
\]

Putting the formulas together completes the proof. \(\square\)

Next we investigate how \(Z_{k, \ell}\) and \(Z\) behave after an application of the functional equation of \(L(\beta, \chi_{k\ell})\). Suppose that \(\chi_{k\ell}\) is induced by the primitive character \(\chi^*\) of conductor \((k\ell)^*\). We have
\[
\Lambda(s, \chi^*) = ((k\ell)^*)^{s/2} \eta(s)L(s, \chi^*) = \Lambda(1 - s, \chi^*),
\]
where \(\gamma(s) = \pi^{-s/2}\Gamma(\frac{s + \delta}{2})\), where \(\delta \in \{0, 1\}\) reflects the parity of \(\chi\). We therefore deduce the asymmetric form of the functional equation:
\[
L(s, \chi_{k\ell}) = ((k\ell)^*)^{\frac{s}{2}} \frac{\gamma(1 - s)}{\gamma(s)} L(1 - s, \chi_{k\ell}) \prod_{p|k\ell} \frac{(1 - \chi^*(p)p^{-s})}{(1 - (\chi^*(p)p^{s - 1})}.
\]

**Lemma 11.2.** Let notation be as in Lemma 11.1. Suppose that (11.2) holds, and additionally that \(\text{Re}(\beta) < 0\). Then we have
\[
Z_{k, \ell} = ((k\ell)^*)^{\frac{s}{2} - \beta} \frac{\gamma(1 - \beta)}{\gamma(\beta)} \sum_{q = 1}^{\infty} \frac{(k\ell)}{q} \prod_{p|k\ell} \frac{(1 - \chi^*(p)p^{-\beta})}{(1 - (\chi^*(p)p^{\beta - 1})} D(\alpha, \beta, \chi_{k\ell})\zeta(2\alpha + 2\beta) \prod_{p|k\ell}(1 + O(p^{-2}))
\]

**Proof.** This follows immediately from applying the functional equation and expressing \(L(1 - \beta, \chi_{k\ell})\) in terms of its absolutely convergent Dirichlet series. \(\square\)
Lemma 11.3. Let notation be as above. Suppose that $\text{Re}(\beta) = \text{Re}(u_1) < 0$, \ref{11.2} holds, and that $\text{Re}(u_2)$ and $\text{Re}(u_3)$ are sufficiently large. Then $Z$ is a finite linear combination of sums of the form

$$\frac{\gamma(1 - \beta)}{\gamma(\beta)} \sum_{(r,2) = 1, (q,2) = 1} \sum_{q^*} q^{r-1} c_{q,r} L(u_1 + u_2 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{qr}\nu)L(u_1 + u_3 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{qr}\nu'),$$

where $\nu$, $\nu'$ are Dirichlet characters modulo 8, $\sum^*$ means that the sum runs only over square-free integers, and $c_{q,r}$ are some coefficients (depending on $s, u_1, u_2, u_3, U$) that are analytic in the intersection of the region \ref{11.2} with the region

$$\text{Re}(u_1) + 2 \min(\text{Re}(u_2), \text{Re}(u_3)) > 1,$$

wherein it satisfies the bound

$$c_{q,r} \ll r^{-\min(u_1,1-u_1)-2 \min(u_2,u_3)+\varepsilon}.$$

Proof. Applying Lemma \ref{11.2} into \ref{11.1}, we deduce

$$Z(s, u_1, u_2, u_3) = Z^{(2)}(2\alpha + 2\beta) \sum_{(k\ell,2) = 1} \frac{((k\ell)^*)^{\frac{1}{2} - \beta} D(\alpha, \beta, \chi_{k\ell}) \gamma(1 - \beta)}{\gamma(\beta)} \sum_{q = 1}^{\infty} \frac{(\frac{q}{k\ell})}{q^{1-\beta}} \prod_{p|k\ell} \frac{1 - \chi^*(p)p^{-\beta}}{1 - \chi^*(p)p^{\beta-1}} \prod_{p|k\ell} (1 + O(p^{-2})).$$

We next wish to focus on the sums over $k$ and $\ell$. One small issue is that the parity of the character $\chi_{k\ell}$ (and hence the formula for $\gamma(s)$) may vary. However, the parity only depends on $k$ and $\ell$ modulo 8. Also, $q$ may be even, but we can factor out the 2-part of $q$ and directly evaluate its summation. Likewise, we can apply quadratic reciprocity (again!) to give that $(q/k\ell)$ equals $(k\ell/q)$ times a function that depends only on $q, k, \ell$ modulo 4. Similarly, In this way we can express $Z$ as a finite linear combination, with bounded coefficients, of sums of the form

$$Z^{(2)}(2\alpha + 2\beta) \frac{\gamma(1 - \beta)}{\gamma(\beta)} \sum_{(k\ell,2) = 1} \frac{((k\ell)^*)^{\frac{1}{2} - \beta} \nu_1(k)\nu_2(\ell) D(\alpha, \beta, \chi_{k\ell})}{k u_2 - iU - s \ell u_3 + iU - s} \sum_{(q,2) = 1} \frac{(\frac{k\ell}{q})\nu_3(q)}{q^{1-\beta}} \prod_{p|k\ell} \frac{1 - \chi_p((k\ell)^*)\nu_4(p)p^{-\beta}}{1 - \chi_p((k\ell)^*)\nu_5(p)p^{\beta-1}} \prod_{p|k\ell} (1 + O(p^{-2})),$$

for Dirichlet characters $\nu_i$ modulo 8. For notational simplicity, we consider the case $\nu_i = 1$ for all $i$, as the general case is no more difficult. Then we need to evaluate a sum of the form

$$A = \sum_{(k\ell,2) = 1} \frac{(k\ell)^*}{k u_2 - iU - s \ell u_3 + iU - s} \prod_{p|k\ell} \frac{1 - \chi_p((k\ell)^*)p^{-\beta}}{1 - \chi_p((k\ell)^*)p^{\beta-1}} \prod_{p|k\ell} (1 + O(p^{-2})).$$

We expand $D(\alpha, \beta, \chi_{k\ell})$ into its Dirichlet series, and similarly for the Euler product over $p|k\ell$ involving $\chi^*$, giving

$$A = \sum_{(abcde,2) = 1} \frac{\mu^2(abc)\mu(b)\mu(d)}{(abc)^{\alpha + 2\beta}b_1^{\alpha + \beta}c_1^{\alpha + \beta}d_1^{\beta}e^{1 - \beta}} A_c,$$
where

\[
A_c = \sum_{k \ell \equiv 0 \pmod{d}} \frac{(k \ell)^*}{p p_i} \frac{(k \ell)^*}{p p_i} \frac{1}{p p_i} \prod_{p|k \ell} (1 + O(p^{-2})).
\]

Now \(A_c\) has an Euler product, taking the form

\[
A_c^{(p)} = \sum_{k + \ell \geq v_p(d)} \frac{(p^{k+\ell})^*}{p^{k+\ell}} \frac{(p^{k+\ell})^*}{p^{k+\ell}} \frac{1}{p^{k+\ell}} \prod_{p|k \ell} (1 + O(p^{-2})).
\]

where \(a_p = 1 + O(p^{-2})\) (and which depends on \(\alpha, \beta\) only). If \(p \nmid de\), then we obtain

\[
A_c^{(p)} = 1 + \left( \frac{p}{cqde} \right) \left[ \frac{1}{p_{u_1+u_2-iU-\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{1}{p_{u_1+u_3+iU-\frac{1}{2}}} \right] (1 + O(p^{-\min(2u_2,2u_3)})) + O(p^{-\min(2u_2,2u_3)}),
\]

and hence

\[
\prod_{p|de} A_c^{(p)} = L(u_1 + u_2 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{cqde}) L(u_1 + u_3 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{cqde}) B
\]

where \(B\) is an Euler product that is absolutely convergent and bounded for

\[
\text{Re}(u_2), \text{Re}(u_3) > \max(1/2, 1 - \text{Re}(u_1)).
\]

If \(p|de\), then \((\frac{p^{k+\ell}}{de})^* = 0\) unless \((p^{k+\ell})^* = 1\), so we can assume that \(k + \ell\) is even. From such primes we obtain \(A_c^{(p)} = O(p^{-\min(2u_2,2u_3)})\), and hence

\[
\prod_{p|de} A_c^{(p)} \ll ((de')^{-2})^{\min \text{Re}(u_2, u_3)},
\]

where \((de') = \prod_{p|de} p\). Thus

\[
A_c = \prod_{p} A_c^{(p)} = L(u_1 + u_2 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{cqde}) L(u_1 + u_3 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{cqde}) C(\cdot)
\]

where \(C \ll ((de')^{-2})^{\min \text{Re}(u_2, u_3)}\) (assuming \((11.33)\) holds as well). This expression gives a meromorphic continuation of \(A_c\) to the region \((11.33)\).

Next we examine the meromorphic properties of \(A\) that may be inferred by the substitution of \((11.35)\) into \((11.28)\). We continue to assume that \((11.2)\) holds. We obtain that

\[
A = \sum_{(abcde, 2) = 1} D(a, b, c, d, e) L(u_1 + u_2 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{cqde}) L(u_1 + u_3 + iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_{cqde}),
\]

where

\[
D(a, b, c, d, e) = \frac{\mu^2(abc) \mu(b) \mu(d)}{(abc)^{\alpha+2\beta} b^1 + \alpha e^1 + \alpha + \beta d^1 e^1 - \beta} C(\cdot).
\]
Replacing \( cde = r \) by a new variable, which may be taken to be square-free by summing the square part separately, we obtain that

\[
(11.38) \quad \sum_{a,b,c,d,e \atop cde=r} |D(a, b, c, d, e)| \ll \sum_{cde=r} \frac{1}{e^{\alpha+2\beta+1+\alpha+\beta}d^{\beta+2\min(u_2,u_3)}e^{1-\beta+2\min(u_2,u_3)}}.
\]

In a similar way, we may take \( q \) to be square-free. From this we may easily finish the proof.

**12. Completion of the proof of Theorem 1.1**

Aided by the properties of \( Z \) developed in the previous section, we are now ready to finish the proof. We pick up from the expression (10.14), where we begin with \( \text{Re}(u_2) = \text{Re}(u_3) = 2 \), and shift \( u_1 \) to the line \(-\varepsilon\). This is allowed by Lemma 11.1. There is a pole at \( u_1 + s = 1 \) when \( k\ell \) is a square. However, since \( \text{Im}(s) \asymp P \) and \( P \gg T^\varepsilon \), the weight function is very small at this height and the contribution from such poles are negligible. Next we use Lemma 11.3 whereby we obtain

\[
(12.1) \quad S(H_+) = \sum_C \frac{\Delta T}{NC^{3/2}} \frac{\Phi}{\sqrt{P}} \int_{t>0} \int \int \left( \frac{T}{u^2} - \frac{1}{4} \right)^s v(t)\bar{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3)C^{u_1}K^{u_2+u_3} \frac{\gamma(1-u_1-s)}{\gamma(u_1+s)}u_1du_2du_3ds,
\]

plus a small error term, as well as additional terms with the characters twisted modulo 8. Since all our estimates hold verbatim for these additional twists, we suppress this from the notation. Next we want to truncate the sums over \( q \) and \( r \). To do so, we move \( u_1 \) far to the left, keeping \( \text{Re}(u_2) = \text{Re}(u_3) = -\text{Re}(u_1) + 100 \). Note that we stay within the domain (11.2), that (11.23) holds, and that the coefficients \( c_{q,r} \) are \( O(1) \) here as well. Note that

\[
(12.2) \quad \left| \frac{\gamma(1-u_1-s)}{\gamma(u_1+s)} \right| \ll P^{\frac{1}{2}-\text{Re}(u_1)}.
\]

In terms of the \( u_1 \)-variable, the integrand in (12.1) is bounded by

\[
(12.3) \quad \left( \frac{Cq}{PK^2} \right)^{\text{Re}(u_1)}.
\]

Therefore, we may truncate \( q \) at \( q \leq Q \) where

\[
(12.4) \quad Q = \frac{PK^2}{C^{1-\varepsilon}}.
\]

After enforcing this condition, we shift the contours of integration so that \( \text{Re}(u_1) = 1/2 \) and \( \text{Re}(u_2) = \text{Re}(u_3) = 1/2 + \varepsilon \). We then bound everything with absolute values. We then obtain

\[
(12.5) \quad S(H_+) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_C \frac{\Delta T}{NC^{3/2}} \frac{\Phi}{\sqrt{P}} \int_{t>0} \int \int \max_{x>0} \left| \int_{t>x} x^tv(t)c_{q,r}dt \right| |\bar{w}(u_1, u_2, u_3)|C^{1/2}K \sum_{q \leq Q} q^{-1/2}|L(u_1 + u_2 - iU - \frac{1}{2}, \chi_q)|^2du_1du_2du_3.
\]
By Lemma 4.5, keeping in mind that $c_{q,r}$ is given by a Dirichlet series, we have

$$\max_{x>0} \left| P^{-1/2} \int x^{it} \frac{\gamma(1 - u_1 - it)}{\gamma(u_1 + it)} v(t) c_{q,r} dt \right| \ll 1. \quad (12.6)$$

Applying (3.3), we then obtain

$$S(H_+) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_c \frac{\Delta T}{NC} \Phi_K(Q^{1/2} + U^{1/2}), \quad Q = \frac{PK^2}{C} T^\varepsilon. \quad (12.7)$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$S(H_+) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_c \frac{\Delta T}{NC} \Phi_K \left( \frac{P^{1/2} K}{C^{1/2}} + U^{1/2} \right) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_c \frac{\Delta T}{NC} \frac{N \sqrt{C} U}{N} \left( \frac{TCU}{N^2} + U^{1/2} \right). \quad (12.8)$$

This simplifies as

$$S(H_+) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_c \frac{\Delta T}{N \sqrt{C}} \left( \frac{TCU}{N^2} + U^{1/2} \right) \ll T^\varepsilon \left( \frac{T^{1/2} U}{\Delta^{1/2}} + (\Delta T)^{1/2} \right). \quad (12.9)$$

This implies

$$\sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} |L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2 + iU)|^2 \ll T^\varepsilon (\Delta T + \frac{T^{1/2} U}{\Delta^{1/2}}). \quad (12.10)$$

We have $\Delta T \gg \frac{T^{1/2} U}{\Delta^{1/2}}$ if and only if $\Delta \gg \frac{U^{1/3}}{T^{1/3}}$. This inequality holds because one of the conditions of Theorem 1.1 requires $\Delta \gg \frac{T}{U^{1/3}}$, and $\frac{T}{U^{1/3}} \gg \frac{U^{1/3}}{T^{1/3}}$ because $T \gg U$.

### 13. Proving Theorem 1.3

The overall idea is to follow the same steps as in Section 12, though picking up with (10.16) instead of (10.14). The only structural difference between the two formulas is the additional phase of the form

$$e^{-2it \log \left( \frac{|t|^{1/3} + a}{T^{1/3}} \right)}. \quad (13.1)$$

This only affects the argument in bounding (12.6), but Lemma 4.5 gives the same bound with the above additional phase. Referring to (12.7), we thus obtain

$$S(H_+) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_c \frac{\Delta T}{NC} \Phi_K \left( \frac{P^{1/2} K}{C^{1/2}} + U^{1/2} \right) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_c \frac{\Delta T}{NC} \frac{N^3}{C^{1/2} T^2} \frac{C^2 T^2}{N^3} \left( \frac{T^3 C^2}{N^4} + 1 \right). \quad (13.2)$$

This simplifies as

$$S(H_+) \ll T^\varepsilon \max_c \frac{\Delta T}{N} C^{1/2} \left( \frac{T^3 C^2}{N^4} + 1 \right) \ll T^\varepsilon \left( \frac{T^{3/2}}{\Delta^{3/2}} + (\Delta T)^{1/2} \right). \quad (13.3)$$

Thus in all we obtain

$$\sum_{T < t_j < T + \Delta} |L(\text{sym}^2 u_j, 1/2)|^2 \ll T^\varepsilon \left( \Delta T + \frac{T^{3/2}}{\Delta^{3/2}} \right). \quad (13.4)$$

The second term is smaller than the first term if and only if $\Delta \gg T^{1/5}$. 
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