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$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { AbSTRACT. Let } g \text { be a fixed holomorphic cusp form of arbitrary level and nebentypus. Let } \\
& \chi \text { be a primitive character of prime-power modulus } q=p^{\gamma} \text {. In this paper, we prove the } \\
& \text { following hybrid Weyl-type subconvexity bound } \\
& \qquad L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, p, \varepsilon}((1+|t|) q)^{1 / 3+\varepsilon} \\
& \text { for any } \varepsilon>0 .
\end{aligned}
$$

## 1. Introduction

Backgrounds. It is a central problem in analytic number theory to bound a certain family of $L$-functions $L(s, \pi)$ on the critical line $\operatorname{Re}(s)=1 / 2$. The subconvexity problem is to improve (usually in a sub-family) the trivial convexity bound:

$$
L(1 / 2+i t, \pi)<_{\varepsilon} C(\pi, t)^{1 / 4+\varepsilon},
$$

where $C(\pi, t)$ is the so-called analytic conductor. See [IT] and [IK, §5].
Two classical results in the $\mathrm{GL}_{1}$ setting are the Weyl bound for the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ and the Burgess bound for the Dirichlet $L$-function $L(s, \chi)$ ( $\chi$ is a Dirichlet character of modulus $q$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta(1 / 2+i t)<_{\varepsilon}(1+|t|)^{1 / 6+\varepsilon} \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, \chi)<_{t, \varepsilon} q^{3 / 16+\varepsilon} \tag{1.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

See [Wey1, Wey2, Lit, Lan] and [Tit, Theorem 5.5] for (1.1) and [Bur1, Bur2] for (1.2). It is a consensus that the Weyl exponent $1 / 6$ in (1.1) and the Burgess exponent $3 / 16$ in (1.2) are two natural barriers in the subconvexity problem.

The first instances of hybrid subconvexity bounds for Dirichlet $L(1 / 2+i t, \chi)$ with both $t$ and $q$ varying were given by Heath-Brown [HB1, HB2], and in his second paper [HB2], the hybrid Burgess-type bound was achieved:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, \chi)<_{\varepsilon}((1+|t|) q)^{3 / 16+\varepsilon} . \tag{1.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^0]Heath-Brown's idea was to generalize and combine the methods of van der Corput and Burgess.

In the ground-breaking work of Conrey and Iwaniec [CI], by considering the cubic moment of $\mathrm{GL}_{2} \times \mathrm{GL}_{1} L$-central values $L\left(1 / 2, g \otimes \chi\right.$ ) over a $\mathrm{GL}_{2}$-spectral family ( $g$ is either Maass or Eisenstein), among other results, the Weyl-type bound was proven in the $q$-aspect:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, \chi)<_{t, \varepsilon} q^{1 / 6+\varepsilon} \tag{1.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

under the assumption that $\chi$ is quadratic and $q$ is square-free. Later, with the same assumption on $\chi$, Young [You] proved the hybrid Weyl-type bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, \chi)<_{\varepsilon}((1+|t|) q)^{1 / 6+\varepsilon} . \tag{1.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recently, Petrow and Young [PY1, PY2] showed successfully that the Weyl-type bound (1.5) holds for every $\chi$ unconditionally.

Thanks to the developments of the van der Corput method and the Bombieri-Iwaniec method (we refer the readers to the treatises [GK, Hux]), many sub-Weyl exponents for $\zeta(1 / 2+i t)$ have been obtained over the past century. Now Bourgain [Bou] has the best exponent $13 / 84 \approx 0.1547$. On the other hand, Milićević [Mil] has introduced a $p$-adic analogue of the van der Corput method only recently, and it enables him to achieve a subWeyl exponent $\approx 0.1645$ for the Dirichlet family $L(1 / 2, \chi)$ to $p$-power moduli $q=p^{\gamma}$ (for $\gamma$ large). However, these are currently the only two instances for which sub-Weyl subconvexity is known.

In the $\mathrm{GL}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{GL}_{2} \times \mathrm{GL}_{1}$ setting, the subconvexity problem has been investigated intensively since 1980's.

The first result is the celebrated Weyl-type bound of Good [Goo]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g)<_{g, \varepsilon}(1+|t|)^{1 / 3+\varepsilon} \tag{1.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

for a fixed holomorphic cusp form $g$ of full level. Good used the spectral theory of automorphic functions.

The bound in (1.6) was recovered by Jutila in his treatise on $\mathrm{GL}_{2}$ exponential sums [Jut1] (see also [Hux, §§10, 20]), using Farey dissection, Voronoï summation, and van der Corput theory. Jutila's method became quite influential. It was developed in [Meu, Jut5, BMN |o extend (1.6) to the cases where $g$ is Maass or holomorphic of arbitrary level and nebentypus. Furthermore, Blomer and Milićević $[\mathbf{B M}]$ introduced the $p$-adic analogue of Jutila's method, especially the $p$-adic counterparts to Farey dissection and van der Corput theory, and they proved the Weyl-type bound in the $q$-aspect when $q$ is a $p$-power. More precisely, for a holomorphic or Maass form $g$ of full level and a primitive character of modulus $q=p^{\gamma}$ ( $p$ odd), Theorem 2 in $[\mathbf{B M}]$ reads

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, \varepsilon}(1+|t|)^{5 / 2} p^{7 / 6} q^{1 / 3+\varepsilon} \tag{1.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further, this was generalized to the case of arbitrary $g$ in Ass].
The purpose of this paper is to improve (1.7) and prove the hybrid Weyl-type bound in both the $t$ - and $q$-aspects. Before stating our theorem, however, we continue to discuss the history of some related $\mathrm{GL}_{2} \times \mathrm{GL}_{1}$ results and methods.

For the case of arbitrary $\chi$, the first subconvexity bound in the $q$-aspect is due to Duke, Friedlander, and Iwaniec [DFI1] (see also the note added at the end of [DFI2]):

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, \varepsilon}(1+|t|)^{2} q^{5 / 11+\varepsilon} \tag{1.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for holomorphic $g$ of full level. For this, they introduced a new $\delta$-symbol method (usually called the DFI $\delta$-method nowadays) and the amplification technique. Bykovskiur [Byk] used his trace formula for certain mean values involving $L(s, g \otimes \chi)$ to improve the right-hand side of $(1.8)$ into $(1+|t|)^{1 / 2+\varepsilon} q^{3 / 8+\varepsilon}$ for holomorphic $g$ of arbitrary level and trivial nebentypus. Blomer and Harcos $[\mathbf{B H}]$ pushed Bykovskiu's method to its limit and generalized his Burgess-type bound (in the $q$-aspect) to the general case that $g$ may be Maass and be allowed to have any nebentypus.

The first hybrid subconvexity bound was also obtained in Blomer-Harcos [BH]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, \varepsilon}((1+|t|) q)^{19 / 40+\varepsilon} \tag{1.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any newform $g$ (holomorphic or Maass) of trivial nebentypus; actually their bound also has an explicit dependence on the level of $g$. Munshi [Mun1] used the DFI $\delta$-method to improve the exponent $19 / 40$ in (1.9) into $4 / 9$ for general $g$ of arbitrary nebentypus but level co-prime to $q$. Following the seminal work of Michel and Venkatesh [MV] in which the $\mathrm{GL}_{2}$ subconvexity problem is settled (in all aspects), $\mathrm{H} . \mathrm{Wu}[\mathbf{W u}$ obtained (over number fields) the Burgess-like exponent $3 / 8+\theta / 4$, where $\theta$ is any exponent towards the Ramanujan-Petersson conjecture. Further, by the method of double Dirichlet series in [HH], C. I. Kuan [Kua] proved a Weyl-Burgess-like hybrid bound:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, \varepsilon}(1+|t|)^{1 /(3-2 \theta)+\varepsilon} q^{3 / 8+\theta / 4+\varepsilon}, \tag{1.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

provided that $g$ is holomorphic and has trivial nebentypus. Recently, in the case that $q$ is prime ( $g$ is still arbitrary), via the Bessel $\delta$-method, Y. Fan and Q. Sun $[\mathbf{F S}]$ obtained the genuine Weyl-Burgess-type hybrid bound:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, \varepsilon}(1+|t|)^{1 / 3+\varepsilon} q^{3 / 8+\varepsilon} \tag{1.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the past decade, a new approach via variants of the $\delta$-symbol or circle method has been developed in a series of works by Munshi [Mun1, Mun2, Mun3, Mun4] to tackle the subconvexity problem for $\mathrm{GL}_{3}$. It turns out that his ideas are also successful in the $\mathrm{GL}_{2}$ setting. For example, they are used to recover
(1) the Burgess-type bound of Bykovskiĭ, Blomer, and Harcos for $L(1 / 2, g \otimes \chi)$ in Mun5, AHLS (for $q$ prime),
(2) the Weyl-type bound of Good for $L(1 / 2+i t, g)$ in [AKMS, AS, Agg, AHLQ],
(3) the Weyl-type bound of Blomer and Milićević for $L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)$ with $\chi$ of p-power moduli in [MS],
and, as mentioned earlier, to improve
(4) the hybrid bound of Blomer and Harcos for $L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)$ in [Mun1, FS].

In (3) the Weyl-type bound of Munshi and Singh [MS Theorem 1.2] reads:

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, t, \varepsilon} p^{(\gamma-[\gamma / 3]) / 2+\varepsilon \gamma} \tag{1.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $g$ of square-free level and $\chi$ of $p$-power modulus $p^{\gamma}$.
Finally, we remark that hybrid Weyl-type bounds were achieved for certain self-dual (twisted) $\mathrm{GL}_{2} L$-functions in [You, PY1, PY2], but the self-dual assumption is not required here. Moreover, in similar spirits, other Weyl-type bounds for $\mathrm{GL}_{2}$ (Rankin-Selberg) $L$ functions were obtained in [JM, LLY, BJN, Nel, BFW, WX].

Main results. Let $g \in S_{k}^{\star}(M, \xi)$ be a holomorphic cusp newform of level $M$, weight $k$, nebentypus character $\xi$, with the Fourier expansion

$$
g(z)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) n^{(k-1) / 2} e(n z), \quad e(z)=e^{2 \pi i z}
$$

for $\operatorname{Im}(z)>0$. Assume that $g$ is Hecke-normalized so that $\lambda_{g}(1)=1$. Let $\chi$ be a primitive character of $p$-power modulus $p^{\gamma}$. Recall that the twisted $L$-function $L(s, g \otimes \chi)$ is defined by

$$
L(s, g \otimes \chi)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n)}{n^{s}}
$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s)>1$; it extends to an entire function by analytic continuation.
In this paper, we prove the following hybrid bound for $L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)$ with Weyl strength in both the $t$ - and $q$-aspects.

Theorem 1.1. Let $g \in S_{k}^{\star}(M, \xi)$ and $\chi\left(\bmod p^{\gamma}\right)$ be as above. Suppose $(p, 2 M)=1$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{g, \varepsilon}(1+|t|)^{1 / 3+\varepsilon} p^{(\gamma-\lfloor\gamma / 3 \mid) / 2+\varepsilon \gamma}, \tag{1.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the implied constant depending only on $g$ and $\varepsilon$.
Theorem 1.1 will be deduced in $\S 8$ from the following estimate for twisted $\mathrm{GL}_{2}$ exponential sums with $\phi(x)=-\log x / 2 \pi$ and $T=t$.

Theorem 1.2. Let the setting be as in Theorem 1.1. Let $N, T, \Delta \geqslant 1$. Let $V(x) \in$ $C_{c}^{\infty}[1,2]$. Assume that its total variation $\operatorname{Var}(V) \ll 1$ and that $V^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j} \Delta^{j}$ for $j \geqslant 0$. For $\phi(x) \in C^{\infty}(1 / 2,5 / 2)$ satisfying $\left|\phi^{\prime \prime}(x)\right| \gg 1$ and $\phi^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j} 1$ for $j \geqslant 1$, define

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(x)=T \phi(x / N) \tag{1.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{f, \chi}(N)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) e(f(n)) V\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \tag{1.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{f, \chi}(N)<_{g, \phi, \varepsilon}(1+\Delta / T) T^{1 / 3} p^{(\gamma-\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor) / 2} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}+\frac{(1+\Delta / T)^{1 / 2} N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{1 / 6} p^{[\gamma / 3] / 2}} \tag{1.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the implied constant depending only on $g, \phi$ and $\varepsilon$.
The Rankin-Selberg bound in (2.1) implies that $S_{f, \chi}(N)=O_{g}(N)$, so (1.16) yields a non-trivial result in the range

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1+\Delta / T)^{3} p^{2} N^{\varepsilon}<T p^{\gamma}<\frac{N^{3 / 2-\varepsilon}}{(1+\Delta / T)^{3} p} \tag{1.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

So in our arguments we may assume the wider but simpler range:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(T+\Delta) p^{\gamma+1}<N^{3 / 2} \tag{1.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

By choosing $V(x)$ to be a suitable weight function with sharp cut-offs, the following corollary will be proven in $\S 7$

Corollary 1.3. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{f, \chi}^{\sharp}(N)=\sum_{n \leqslant N} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) e(f(n)) . \tag{1.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then for $T^{5}<p^{3[\gamma / 3\rfloor}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{f, \chi}^{\sharp}(N)<_{g, \phi, \varepsilon} T^{1 / 3} p^{(\gamma-\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor) / 2} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}+\frac{p^{(\gamma-\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor) / 4} N^{3 / 4+\varepsilon}}{T^{1 / 3}}+\frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{4 / 9} p^{\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor / 3}}, \tag{1.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for $T^{5} \geqslant p^{3\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{f, \chi}^{\sharp}(N)<_{g, \phi, \varepsilon} T^{1 / 3} p^{(\gamma-\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor) / 2} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}+\frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{1 / 6} p^{[\gamma / 3\rfloor / 2}} . \tag{1.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Our idea is to incorporate the Bessel $\delta$-method [AHLQ] into the approach of [MS]. The analysis in [AHLQ] is simple enough to enable us to obtain a strong Weyl-type bound in the $t$-aspect, and to even go beyond the so-called Weyl barrier [HMQ (there is an application to the sub-Weyl subconvexity problem, though not enough for a solution). Also, we take the chance to give a corrected version of [MS, Lemma 5.2] (see $\$ 5.1$ ).

Finally, we comment that, in view of the work [ $\mathbf{F S}$ ], our results are also valid for Maass cusp forms.
1.1. Comparison with the results of Blomer and Milićević. Let $g$ be a holomorphic or Maass cusp form of full level. It is proven by Blomer and Milićević [BM, Theorem 1] that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) W\left(\frac{n}{N}\right)<_{g, \varepsilon} Z^{5 / 2} p^{7 / 6+\gamma / 3+\varepsilon \gamma} N^{1 / 2} \tag{1.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $W(x) \in C_{c}^{\infty}[1,2]$ with $W^{(j)}(x) \ll Z^{j}$. Now, in the setting of Theorem 1.2, on choosing $W(x)=e(T \phi(x)) V(x)$ and $Z=T+\Delta$, the bound in (1.22) turns into

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{f, \chi}(N) \ll_{g, \phi, \varepsilon}(1+\Delta / T)^{5 / 2} T^{5 / 2} p^{7 / 6+\gamma / 3+\varepsilon \gamma} N^{1 / 2} \tag{1.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that (1.16) is better than (1.23) for $N<(T+\Delta)^{4-\varepsilon} T^{4 / 3} p^{5 / 3+\gamma}$.
Another result of Blomer and Milićević in [BM, (1.5)] reads:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n \leqslant N} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) \ll_{g, \varepsilon} p^{1 / 3+2 \gamma / 21+\varepsilon \gamma} N^{6 / 7} \tag{1.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

In Theorem 1.2, by letting $T=1$ and absorbing $e(\phi(x))$ into $V(x)$, the proof of Corollary 1.3 yields the following bound:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n \leqslant N} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) \ll_{g, \varepsilon} p^{(\gamma-\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor) / 4} N^{3 / 4+\varepsilon}+\frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{p^{\lfloor\gamma / 3] / 3}} \tag{1.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that (1.24) beats the trivial bound if $N>p^{7 / 3+2 \gamma / 3+\varepsilon \gamma}$, and so does (1.25) in a slightly larger range $N>p^{2 / 3+2 \gamma / 3+\varepsilon \gamma}$ (up to the factor $N^{\varepsilon}$ ). Moreover, in this range (1.25) is better than (1.24) for $N<p^{7 / 9+13 \gamma / 9}$.

We remark that the Jutila method has its advantages over the Bessel $\delta$-method when $N$ is large. This is due to the nature and the limitation of the Bessel $\delta$-method or any $\delta$ or circle method-it is less beneficial to separate the oscillations if either their measure is decreasing or the length of summation is increasing.

[^1]Notation. Subsequently, unless otherwise specified, we shall reserve the letter $q$ for primes, instead of the modulus of the character $\chi$. The notation $y \sim Y$ stands for $y \in[Y, 2 Y]$ (according to the context, $y$ can be integers, primes, or real numbers).

Let $\varepsilon$ or $A$ be an arbitrarily small or large real number, respectively, whose value may differ from one occurrence to another.

## 2. Preliminaries

Let $S_{k}^{\star}(M, \xi)$ denote the set of (Hecke-normalized) holomorphic newforms of level $M$, weight $k$ and nebentypus $\xi$. We have necessarily $\xi(-1)=(-1)^{k}$. Let $g \in S_{k}^{\star}(M, \xi)$. For its Fourier coefficients $\lambda_{g}(n)$, we have the Rankin-Selberg bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n \leqslant N}\left|\lambda_{g}(n)\right|^{2}<_{g} N \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, the Ramanujan conjecture for holomorphic cusp forms is well-known ( $[\mathbf{D e l}$, DS $]$ ):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{g}(n) \ll n^{\varepsilon} . \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

2.1. The Voronoï summation. The following Voronoï summation formula ([AHLQ, Lemma 2.1]) is a special case of [KMV, Theorem A.4].

Lemma 2.1 (The Voronoï Summation Formula). Let $g$ be a holomorphic newform in $S_{k}^{\star}(M, \xi)$. Let $a, \bar{a}, c$ be integers such that $c \geqslant 1,(a, c)=1, a \bar{a} \equiv 1(\bmod c)$ and $(c, M)=$ 1. Let $F(x) \in C_{c}^{\infty}(0, \infty)$. Then there exists a complex number $\eta_{g}$ of modulus 1 (the AtkinLehner pseudo-eigenvalue of $g$ ) such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) e\left(\frac{a n}{c}\right) F(n)=\frac{\eta_{g} \xi(-c)}{c \sqrt{M}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\lambda_{g}(n)} e\left(-\frac{\bar{a} n}{c}\right) \check{F}\left(\frac{n}{c^{2} M}\right) \tag{2.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\check{F}(y)$ is the Hankel transform of $F(x)$ defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\check{F}(y)=2 \pi i^{k} \int_{0}^{\infty} F(x) J_{k-1}(4 \pi \sqrt{x y}) \mathrm{d} x \tag{2.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $J_{k-1}(x)$ is the Bessel function of the first kind.
The Voronoï summation formula in [KMV] Theorem A.4] is more general, where it is only required that $((c, M), M /(c, M))=1$.

For the Farey dissection in the method of Jutila [Jut1] or its $p$-adic analogue in Blomer-Milićević [BM], the fraction $a / c$ has to be arbitrary, so the Voronoï in [KMV] works only if $M$ is square-free; thus in [BMN], they need a more general Voronoï even without the restriction $((c, M), M /(c, M))=1$.

For the circle method of Kloosterman used in Munshi-Singh [MS] (with conductor lowering), one needs $c=p^{\alpha} q$ for any $q \leqslant Q$, and hence the square-free condition on $M$ is imposed there.

In comparison, the Bessel $\delta$-method is very flexible on the modulus (the reader may compare it with the Jutila $\delta$-method [Jut2, Jut3, Jut4] used in [Mun1])—we may choose $q \sim Q$ to be prime so that $(M p, q)=1$ and in our application $c=p^{\alpha} q$ or $p^{\alpha}$ for $\alpha \leqslant$ $2\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor$. Therefore, Lemma 2.1 may be applied under the mild assumption $(p, M)=1$ (as in Theorem 1.1, 1.2). It is not hard to see that this technical assumption is removable, as one may resort to [KMV Theorem A.4] for the case $\alpha \geqslant \operatorname{ord}_{p}(M)$ and to $\mathbf{B M N}$ Lemma 2.4] for the remaining case $0<\alpha<\operatorname{ord}_{p}(M)$.
2.2. A stationary phase lemma. Among the three stationary phase lemmas in Appendix A of [AHLQ], only Lemma A. 1 (recorded below) will be used in our paper. However, we need their results (Lemma 5.1, 5.5) for which Lemmas A. 2 and A. 3 (the 1- and 2-dimensional second derivative test $\mathbb{L}^{2}$ ) are required.

Lemma 2.2. Let $w \in C_{c}^{\infty}[a, b]$ and $f \in C^{\infty}[a, b]$ be real-valued. Suppose that there are parameters $P, U, Y, Z, R>0$ such that

$$
f^{(i)}(x) \ll_{i} Y / P^{i}, \quad w^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j} Z / U^{j},
$$

for $i \geqslant 2$ and $j \geqslant 0$, and

$$
\left|f^{\prime}(x)\right| \gg R
$$

Then for any $A \geqslant 0$ we have

$$
\int_{a}^{b} e(f(x)) w(x) \mathrm{d} x<_{A}(b-a) Z\left(\frac{Y}{R^{2} P^{2}}+\frac{1}{R P}+\frac{1}{R U}\right)^{A} .
$$

2.3. The Bessel $\delta$-method. Fix a (non-negative valued) bump function $U \in C_{c}^{\infty}(0, \infty)$ with support in [1,2]. For $a, b>0$ and $X>1$, consider the Bessel integral

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{k}(a, b ; X)=\int_{0}^{\infty} U(x / X) e(2 a \sqrt{x}) J_{k-1}(4 \pi b \sqrt{x}) \mathrm{d} x \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Subsequently, the implied constants will always depend on $k$ and $U$, and we shall suppress $k, U$ from the subscripts of $O, \ll$ or $\gg$ for simplicity.

Let $\tilde{U}$ denote the Mellin transform of $U$. For $a^{2} X>1$, AHLQ, Lemma 3.1] states that

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{k}(a, a ; X)=\frac{(1+i) i^{k-1} \tilde{U}(3 / 4) X}{4 \pi\left(a^{2} X\right)^{1 / 4}}+O\left(\frac{X}{\left(a^{2} X\right)^{3 / 4}}\right) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

For our problem, the error term in (2.6) is undesirable, so we shall replace it by the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3. We may write

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{k}(a, a ; X)=\frac{i^{k} X}{2 \pi} I_{k}(a \sqrt{X}), \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that $I_{k}(x) \in C^{\infty}(0, \infty)$ has bounds

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{j} \frac{\mathrm{~d}^{j}}{\mathrm{~d} x^{j}} \frac{1}{I_{k}(x)}<_{j} \sqrt{x}, \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

for any $x \gg 1$.
Remark 2.4. Alternatively, a cumbersome asymptotic formula of $I_{k}(a, a ; X)$ is obtained by contour shift in Proposition 1.1 of [ $\mathbf{F S}]$.

Proof. Recall from [AHLQ, §3.2] that

$$
I_{k}(a, a ; X)=\frac{X}{2 \pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} \tilde{U}(s) \frac{2 i^{k-1}}{\sqrt{\pi}(-8 \pi i a \sqrt{X})^{2-2 s}} \frac{\Gamma(k-2 s+1) \Gamma(2 s-3 / 2)}{\Gamma(k+2 s-2)} \mathrm{d} s
$$

[^2]for $3 / 4<\sigma<(k+1) / 2$, so the expression (2.7) is clear, with
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
I_{k}(x)=\frac{1}{2 \pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} \tilde{U}(s) \frac{4 \sqrt{\pi}}{i(-8 \pi i x)^{2-2 s}} \frac{\Gamma(k-2 s+1) \Gamma(2 s-3 / 2)}{\Gamma(k+2 s-2)} \mathrm{d} s \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

As in AHLQ, §3.2], by shifting the contour of integration to $\operatorname{Re}(s)=0$ say, and collecting the residues at $s=3 / 4$ and $1 / 4$, we obtain

$$
I_{k}(x)=\frac{\widetilde{U}(3 / 4)}{(1+i) \sqrt{x}}+O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{x} x}\right)
$$

which yields exactly the asymptotic in (2.6). From this, it is clear that

$$
\left|I_{k}(x)\right| \gg 1 / \sqrt{x}
$$

as long as $x \gg 1$ is large in terms of $k$ and $U$. Similar to the above, we find that

$$
x^{j} I_{k}^{(j)}(x)=\frac{\widetilde{U}(3 / 4)(2 j-1)!!}{(1+i)(-2)^{j} \sqrt{x}}+O_{j}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{x} x}\right),
$$

and hence

$$
x^{j} I_{k}^{(j)}(x)<_{j} 1 / \sqrt{x}
$$

for $x \gg 1$. Then the bounds for $1 / I_{k}(x)$ and its derivatives follow immediately. Q.E.D.
Moreover, we record here [AHLQ, Lemma 3.2].
Lemma 2.5. Suppose that $b^{2} X>1$. Then $I_{k}(a, b ; X)=O_{A}\left(X^{-A}\right)$ for any $A \geqslant 0$ if $|a-b| \sqrt{X}>X^{\varepsilon}$.

Finally, we refine the Bessel $\delta$-identity in AHLQ, Lemma 3.3] in the following form.
Lemma 2.6. Let $h>0$ be integer and $N, X>1$ be such that $X \gg h^{2} / N$ and $X^{1-\varepsilon}>N$. Let $r, n$ be integers in the dyadic interval $[N, 2 N]$. For any $A \geqslant 0$, we have

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\delta(r=n)=\frac{2 \pi r^{1 / 4}}{i^{k} h^{1 / 2} X^{3 / 4}} \cdot \frac{1}{h} \sum_{a(\bmod h)} e\left(\frac{a(n-r)}{h}\right) \cdot I_{k}\left(\frac{\sqrt{r}}{h}, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{h} ; X\right)  \tag{2.10}\\
V_{k}\left(\frac{\sqrt{r X}}{h}\right) \\
+O_{A}\left(X^{-A}\right)
\end{array}
$$

where $V_{k}(x)=1 / \sqrt{x} I_{k}(x)$ has bounds $x^{j} V_{k}^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j} 1$ for any $x \gg 1, \delta(r=n)$ is the Kronecker $\delta$ that detects $r=n$, and the implied constants above depend only on $k$, $U$, and possibly A or $j$.

Proof. Lemma[2.5]implies that $I_{k}(\sqrt{r} / h, \sqrt{n} / h ; X)$ is negligibly small unless $|r-n| \leqslant$ $X^{\varepsilon} h \sqrt{N / X}$, while the exponential sum in (2.10) gives us $r \equiv n(\bmod h)$. Consequently, the Kronecker $\delta(r=n)$ follows immediately from $X^{\varepsilon} h \sqrt{N / X}<h$ as assumed. Finally, the proof is completed in view of the expression of $I_{k}(a, a ; X)$ in (2.7) and the bounds for $1 / I_{k}(x)$ in 2.8 in Lemma2.3
Q.E.D.

Remark 2.7. A merit of the Bessel $\delta$-method is the flexibility of modulus $h$-it is chosen to be a (large) prime $h=p$ in $[\mathbf{A H L Q}]$ or a product of (large) primes $h=p q$ in $[\mathbf{F S}](q$ is the modulus of their $\chi$ ). In our case, we shall choose $h=p^{\beta} q$ for $\beta=2\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor$ and prime $q$ large ( $p^{\gamma}$ is the modulus of our $\chi$ ).

## 3. Application of Bessel $\delta$-identity and Voronoï summation

Let $S(N)=S_{f, \chi}(N)$ denote the exponential sum in Theorem1.2

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(N)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) e(f(n)) V\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Firstly, we write

$$
S(N)=\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \chi(r) e(f(r)) V\left(\frac{r}{N}\right) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) \delta(r=n)
$$

Let $q>\max \{p, M\}$ be prime. Let $\beta<\gamma$. As it will turn out to be our final choice, we set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta=2\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor \tag{3.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By applying the $\delta$-method identity (2.10) in Lemma 2.6 with $h=p^{\beta} q$ and reducing $a / h$ to its lowest term, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(N)=\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\beta}\left(S^{\star}\left(p^{\alpha} q, p^{\beta} q ; N, X\right)+S^{\star}\left(p^{\alpha}, p^{\beta} q ; N, X\right)\right)+O\left(X^{-A}\right) \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{align*}
S^{\star}(c, h ; N, X)=\frac{2 \pi i^{k} M^{1 / 2} N^{1 / 4}}{\eta_{g} h^{3 / 2} X^{3 / 4}} & \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \chi(r) e(f(r)) V_{\text {匕 }}\left(\frac{r}{N}\right) \sum_{a(\bmod c)}^{\star} e\left(-\frac{a r}{c}\right)  \tag{3.4}\\
\cdot & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) e\left(\frac{a n}{c}\right) I_{k}\left(\frac{\sqrt{r}}{h}, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{h} ; X\right),
\end{align*}
$$

where $V_{\natural}(x)=\eta_{g} \xi(-1) M^{-1 / 2} \cdot x^{1 / 4} V(x) V_{k}(\sqrt{N X x} / h)$ (recall that $\left.\xi(-1)=(-1)^{k}\right)$. As usual, the superscript $\star$ in the $a$-sum means $(a, c)=1$. It is clear from the bounds for $V(x)$ and $V_{k}(x)$ in Theorem 1.2 and Lemma 2.6 that the new $V_{\mathrm{\natural}}(x)$ has the same nature as $V(x)$; namely, $V_{\natural}(x)$ is supported in [1, 2], satisfying $\operatorname{Var}\left(V_{\natural}\right) \ll 1$ and $V_{\natural}^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j} \Delta^{j}$.

For the moment, let

$$
h=p^{\beta} q ; \quad c=p^{\alpha} q, p^{\alpha} .
$$

Recall from (2.5) that

$$
I_{k}\left(\frac{\sqrt{r}}{h}, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{h} ; X\right)=\int_{0}^{\infty} U(x / X) e\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{r x}}{h}\right) J_{k-1}\left(\frac{4 \pi \sqrt{n x}}{h}\right) \mathrm{d} x
$$

Our assumptions $(p, M)=1$ and $q>M$ ensure that $(c, M)=1$. By applying the Voronoï summation in (2.3) in the reversed direction, we infer that

$$
\begin{align*}
S^{\star}(c, h ; N, X)=\frac{\xi(c) h^{1 / 2} N^{1 / 4}}{c X^{3 / 4}} & \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \chi(r) e(f(r)) V_{\natural}\left(\frac{r}{N}\right) \\
& \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\lambda_{g}(n)} S(r, n ; c) e\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{n r}}{\sqrt{M} c}\right) U\left(\frac{h^{2} n}{M X c^{2}}\right), \tag{3.5}
\end{align*}
$$

where $S(r, n ; c)$ is the Kloosterman sum

$$
S(r, n ; c)=\sum_{a(\bmod c)}^{\star} e\left(\frac{a r+\bar{a} n}{c}\right)
$$

Moreover, we introduce an average of (3.3) over primes $q$ in the dyadic segment $[Q, 2 Q](q \sim Q)$ for parameter $Q>\max \{p, M\}$; say there are $Q^{\star}=Q / \log Q$ many such primes. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(N)=\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\beta}\left(S_{\alpha \beta}^{0}(N, X, Q)+S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q)\right)+O\left(X^{-A}\right) \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\alpha \beta}^{\tau}(N, X, Q)=\frac{1}{Q^{\star}} \sum_{q \sim Q} S^{\star}\left(p^{\alpha} q^{\tau}, p^{\beta} q ; N, X\right) \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we consider here the conditions for the parameters in Lemma2.6. It will be convenient to introduce $H$ and $K$ in place of $Q$ and $X$ such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=p^{\beta} Q, \quad X=H^{2} K^{2} / N, \quad N^{\varepsilon}<K<T^{1-\varepsilon} \tag{3.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The first assumption $X \gg h^{2} / N$ (for $h=p^{\beta} q \sim H$ ) is justified by $K>N^{\varepsilon}$. The second assumption $X^{1-\varepsilon}>N$ amounts to

$$
\begin{equation*}
H>N^{1+\varepsilon} / K \tag{3.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 4. Application of Poisson summation

Let $S(n, c ; N)$ denote the $r$-sum in (3.5):

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(n, c ; N)=\sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \chi(r) S(r, n ; c) e(f(r)) e\left(\frac{2 \sqrt{n r}}{\sqrt{M} c}\right) V_{\text {ӊ }}\left(\frac{r}{N}\right) . \tag{4.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Recall that $\chi(r)$ is of modulus $p^{\gamma}$ and $f(r)=T \phi(r / N)$. For $c=p^{\alpha} q^{\tau}$, we apply the Poisson summation of modulus $\left[c, p^{\gamma}\right]=p^{\gamma} q^{\tau}$ to transform $S(n, c ; N)$ into

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(n, c ; N)=N \sum_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathfrak{c}_{\chi}\left(n, r, c,\left[c, p^{\gamma}\right]\right) \mathscr{I}\left(n, r, c,\left[c, p^{\gamma}\right] ; N\right) \tag{4.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n, r, c, d)=\frac{1}{d} \sum_{b(\bmod d)} \chi(b) S(b, n ; c) e\left(\frac{r b}{d}\right),  \tag{4.3}\\
\mathscr{I}(y, r, c, d ; N)=\int_{0}^{\infty} V_{\text {匕 }}(x) e\left(T \phi(x)+\frac{2 \sqrt{N x y}}{\sqrt{M} c}-\frac{r N x}{d}\right) \mathrm{d} x, \tag{4.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $h^{2} y / c^{2} \sim M X$.
4.1. Evaluation of the character sum $\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n, r, c, d)$. We start by simplifying the character $\operatorname{sum} \mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n, r, c, d)$ defined as in (4.3).

First, we consider the case $(c, d)=\left(p^{\alpha} q, p^{\gamma} q\right)$. To this end, we open the Kloosterman sum $S(b, n ; c)$ in 4.3), obtaining

$$
\frac{1}{p^{\gamma} q} \sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{\alpha} q\right)}^{\star} e\left(\frac{\bar{a} n}{p^{\alpha} q}\right) \sum_{b\left(\bmod p^{\gamma} q\right)} \chi(b) e\left(\frac{b\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right)}{p^{\gamma} q}\right) .
$$

Then we use reciprocity

$$
\frac{1}{p^{\gamma} q} \equiv \frac{\bar{q}}{p^{\gamma}}+\frac{\bar{p}^{\gamma}}{q}(\bmod 1),
$$

as $(p, q)=1$, to write the inner $b$-sum as

$$
\sum_{b_{1}\left(\bmod p^{\gamma}\right)} \chi\left(b_{1}\right) e\left(\frac{b_{1}\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \bar{q}}{p^{\gamma}}\right) \sum_{b_{2}(\bmod q)} e\left(\frac{b_{2}\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \bar{p}^{\gamma}}{q}\right) .
$$

Further, the $b_{1}$-sum equals $\bar{\chi}\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \chi(q) \cdot \tau(\chi)$, where $\tau(\chi)$ is the Gauss sum

$$
\tau(\chi)=\sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{\gamma}\right)} \chi(a) e\left(\frac{a}{p^{\gamma}}\right)
$$

while the $b_{2}$-sum yields the congruence $a \equiv-r \bar{p}^{\gamma-\alpha}(\bmod q)$. Thus we arrive at

$$
\frac{\chi(q) \tau(\chi)}{p^{\gamma}} \sum_{\substack{a\left(\bmod p^{\alpha} q\right) \\ a \equiv-r \bar{p}^{\gamma-\alpha}(\bmod q)}}^{{ }^{\star}} \bar{\chi}\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) e\left(\frac{\bar{a} n}{p^{\alpha} q}\right)
$$

Note that one must have $(r, q)=1$, as the sum is empty if otherwise. This sum may be simplified by reciprocity, and we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}\left(n, r, p^{\alpha} q, p^{\gamma} q\right)=\frac{\chi(q) \tau(\chi)}{p^{\gamma}} e\left(-\frac{p^{\gamma} \bar{p}^{2 \alpha} \bar{r} n}{q}\right) \sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)}^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) e\left(\frac{\overline{a q} n}{p^{\alpha}}\right) . \tag{4.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Similarly, for the degenerate case $(c, d)=\left(p^{\alpha}, p^{\gamma}\right)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}\left(n, r, p^{\alpha}, p^{\gamma}\right)=\frac{\tau(\chi)}{p^{\gamma}} \sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)}^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) e\left(\frac{\bar{a} n}{p^{\alpha}}\right) . \tag{4.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Trivially, as $|\tau(\chi)|=p^{\gamma / 2}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}\left(n, r, p^{\alpha}, p^{\gamma}\right)<p^{\alpha-\gamma / 2} \tag{4.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

4.2. Estimates for the integral $\mathscr{G}(y, r, c, d ; N)$. For the integral $\mathscr{G}(y, r, c, d ; N)$ defined in (4.4), we have the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. Let $\Delta \geqslant 1$. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=T+\Delta N^{\varepsilon} \tag{4.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose that $V_{\natural} \in C_{c}^{\infty}[1,2]$ has bounds $V_{\natural}^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j} \Delta^{j}$. Let $h^{2} y / c^{2} \sim M X$. Then for any $A \geqslant 0$ we have $\mathcal{G}(y, r, c, d ; N)=O_{A}\left(N^{-A}\right)$ whenever $|r| \gg S d / N$.

This lemma manifests that one can effectively truncate the sum at $|r|=S d / N$, at the cost of a negligible error.

Proof. For $h^{2} y / c^{2} \sim M X$, the derivative of the phase function in (4.4) is equal to

$$
-\frac{N r}{d}+T \phi^{\prime}(x)+\frac{\sqrt{N y}}{\sqrt{M x} c}=-\frac{N r}{d}+O\left(T+\frac{\sqrt{N X}}{H}\right) .
$$

By (3.8),

$$
\max \{T, \sqrt{N X} / H\}=\max \{T, K\}=T
$$

Therefore, the derivative is dominated by $-N r / d$ since $|N r / d| \gg S>T$, while the $i$-th derivative ( $i \geqslant 2$ ) is bounded by $O_{i}(T)$. Finally, we apply Lemma 2.2 with $Y=T, P=1$, $U=1 / \Delta$, and $R=S$, so that

$$
\frac{Y}{R^{2} P^{2}}+\frac{1}{R P}+\frac{1}{R U}=\frac{T}{\left(T+\Delta N^{\varepsilon}\right)^{2}}+\frac{1}{T+\Delta N^{\varepsilon}}+\frac{\Delta}{T+\Delta N^{\varepsilon}}=O\left(\frac{1}{N^{\varepsilon}}\right) .
$$

Lemma 4.2. Let $\operatorname{Var}\left(V_{\mathrm{\natural}}\right) \ll 1$. For $h^{2} y / c^{2} \sim M X$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{I}(y, r, c, d ; N) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \tag{4.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. For $y \sim M X, h \sim H$, and $X, N, H, K$ as in (3.8), define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{I}_{\mathrm{o}}(y, r, h ; N)=\int_{0}^{\infty} V_{\natural}(x) e\left(T \phi(x / N)+\frac{2 \sqrt{N x y}}{\sqrt{M} h}-\frac{r N x}{h}\right) \mathrm{d} x, \tag{4.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

which was originally defined in AHLQ (5.3) ${ }^{3}$. It is proven in AHLQ Lemma 5.1] that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{I}_{\mathrm{o}}(y, r, h ; N) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Evidently, the $\mathscr{I}_{0}$-integral is a special case of the $\mathcal{I}$-integrals. However, the change of variables

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{\mathrm{o}}=h^{2} y / c^{2}, \quad N_{\mathrm{o}}=N h^{2} / d^{2}, \quad h_{\mathrm{o}}=h^{2} / d, \quad\left(H_{\mathrm{o}}=H h / d\right) \tag{4.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

may also turn the $\mathcal{g}$-integral into a $\mathscr{g}_{\mathrm{o}}$-integral in the sense that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{I}(y, r, c, d ; N)=\mathscr{I}_{\mathrm{o}}\left(y_{\mathrm{o}}, r, h_{\mathrm{o}} ; N_{\mathrm{o}}\right) \tag{4.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Note that $N_{\mathrm{o}}>1$ or $N>p^{2 \gamma-2 \beta}$ is ensured here by (1.18) and (3.2). Hence (4.9) is a consequence of (4.11).
Q.E.D.

Admittedly, Lemma4.2 is an easy application of the second derivative test (see AHLQ, Lemma 5.1, A.2]). However, the true value of the observation above is for a direct deduction of Lemma 5.3 below from AHLQ, Lemma 5.5]. In this way, we may avoid a repetition as in [FS] of the three-page proof of [AHLQ, Lemma 5.5].
4.3. Estimates for $S_{\alpha \beta}^{0}(N, X, Q)$. From (4.2), 4.7), and Lemma 4.1 4.2, it follows that

$$
S\left(n, p^{\alpha} ; N\right) \ll N \sum_{|r|<S p^{\gamma} / N} \frac{p^{\alpha-\gamma / 2}}{\sqrt{T}}+N^{-A} \ll \frac{S p^{\gamma / 2+\alpha}}{\sqrt{T}}
$$

By (3.5), (4.1), and the Rankin-Selberg bound in (2.1) (and Cauchy), we infer that

$$
\begin{aligned}
S^{\star}\left(p^{\alpha}, p^{\beta} q ; N, X\right) & \ll \frac{\sqrt{p^{\beta} q} N^{1 / 4}}{p^{\alpha} X^{3 / 4}} \frac{S p^{\gamma / 2+\alpha}}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{n \sim M X / p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} q^{2}}\left|\lambda_{g}(n)\right| \\
& \ll g \frac{S(N X)^{1 / 4} p^{\gamma / 2-3 \beta / 2+2 \alpha}}{Q^{3 / 2} \sqrt{T}} \\
& =\frac{S \sqrt{K} p^{\gamma / 2-\beta+2 \alpha}}{Q \sqrt{T}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last equality follows from (3.8). Consequently,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\beta} S_{\alpha \beta}^{0}(N, X, Q) \ll \frac{S \sqrt{K} p^{\gamma / 2+\beta}}{Q \sqrt{T}} \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^3]4.4. Formulation for $S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q)$. To summarize, in view of (3.5), 3.7), 3.8), (4.1)-4.5), and Lemma 4.1, with simpler choice of notation, we formulate $S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q)$ in the following way.

Lemma 4.3. We have

$$
\begin{gather*}
S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q)=\frac{\xi\left(p^{\alpha}\right) \tau(\chi) N^{2}}{p^{\gamma+\beta+\alpha} Q^{\star}(Q K)^{3 / 2}} \sum_{n} \overline{\lambda_{g}(n)} U\left(\frac{p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} n}{M X}\right) \\
\cdot \sum_{q \sim Q} \frac{\xi \chi(q)}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{\substack{(r, q)=1 \\
|r|<S p^{\gamma} q / N}} \mathfrak{c}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n, r, q) \mathscr{I}_{\beta \gamma}\left(p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} n, r, q\right), \tag{4.15}
\end{gather*}
$$

up to a negligible error term, where

$$
\begin{gather*}
\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n, r, q)=e\left(-\frac{p^{\gamma} \bar{p}^{2 \alpha} \bar{r} n}{q}\right) \sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)}^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) e\left(\frac{\overline{a q} n}{p^{\alpha}}\right),  \tag{4.16}\\
g_{\beta \gamma}(y, r, q)=\int_{0}^{\infty} V_{\mathfrak{\natural}}(x) e\left(T \phi(x)+\frac{2 \sqrt{N x y}}{\sqrt{M} p^{\beta} q}-\frac{r N x}{p^{\gamma} q}\right) \mathrm{d} x, \tag{4.17}
\end{gather*}
$$

for $y \sim M X$.

## 5. Application of Cauchy inequality and Poisson summation

Next, we apply the Cauchy inequality to (4.15) and the Rankin-Selberg bound for the Fourier coefficients $\lambda_{g}(n)$ as in (2.1), getting

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q)<_{g} \frac{N^{3 / 2}}{p^{\gamma / 2+\beta} Q^{\star} \sqrt{Q K}} \cdot \sqrt{T_{\alpha \beta}^{2}(N, X, Q)}, \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $T_{\alpha \beta}^{2}(N, X, Q)$ is defined by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n} U\left(\frac{p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} n}{M X}\right)\left|\sum_{q \sim Q} \frac{\xi \chi(q)}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{\substack{(r, q)=1 \\|r|<S p^{\gamma} q / N}} \mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n, r, q) \mathscr{I}_{\beta \gamma}\left(p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} n, r, q\right)\right|^{2} . \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Opening the square and switching the order of summations, we obtain
where $T_{\alpha \beta}^{2}\left(n, r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2} ; N, X\right)$ is the $n$-sum given by
(5.4) $\sum_{n} \mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(n, r_{1}, q_{1}\right) \overline{\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(n, r_{2}, q_{2}\right)} \mathscr{I}_{\beta \gamma}\left(p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} n, r_{1}, q_{1}\right) \overline{\mathscr{Y}_{\beta \gamma}\left(p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} n, r_{2}, q_{2}\right)} U\left(\frac{p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha} n}{M X}\right)$.

We then apply the Poisson summation with modulus $p^{\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}$ to transform this $n$-sum into

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{M X}{p^{2 \beta-2 \alpha}} \sum_{n} \mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(n ; r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \mathcal{L}_{\beta \gamma}\left(\frac{M X n}{p^{2 \beta-\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}} ; r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2}\right) \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the character sum $\mathscr{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)=\mathscr{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(n ; r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2}\right)$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{r}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)=\frac{1}{p^{\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}} \sum_{b\left(\bmod p^{\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}\right)} \mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(b, r_{1}, q_{1}\right) \overline{\mathfrak{V}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(b, r_{2}, q_{2}\right)} e\left(\frac{n b}{p^{\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}}\right), \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the integral $\mathscr{L}_{\beta \gamma}(x)=\mathscr{L}_{\beta \gamma}\left(x ; r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2}\right)$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{\beta \gamma}(x)=\int_{0}^{\infty} U(y) \mathscr{I}_{\beta \gamma}\left(M X y, r_{1}, q_{1}\right) \overline{\mathscr{S}_{\beta \gamma}\left(M X y, r_{2}, q_{2}\right)} e(-x y) \mathrm{d} y . \tag{5.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

5.1. Analysis of the character sum $\mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)$. By inserting (4.16) into (5.6), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n) & =\frac{1}{p^{\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}} \sum_{a_{1}, a_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)}^{\star} \sum^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r_{1}+a_{1} p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \chi\left(r_{2}+a_{2} p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \\
& \cdot \sum_{b\left(\bmod p^{\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}\right)} e\left(\frac{p^{\gamma} \bar{p}^{2 \alpha} \bar{r}_{2} b}{q_{2}}-\frac{p^{\gamma} \bar{p}^{2 \alpha} \bar{r}_{1} b}{q_{1}}+\frac{\overline{a_{1} q_{1}} b}{p^{\alpha}}-\frac{\overline{a_{2} q_{2}} b}{p^{\alpha}}+\frac{n b}{p^{\alpha} q_{1} q_{2}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

By reciprocity, the exponential $b$-sum yields two congruence relations:

$$
\begin{gather*}
\bar{a}_{1} q_{2}-\bar{a}_{2} q_{1}+n \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right),  \tag{5.8}\\
p^{\gamma-\alpha}\left(\bar{r}_{2} q_{1}-\bar{r}_{1} q_{2}\right)+n \equiv 0\left(\bmod q_{1} q_{2}\right) . \tag{5.9}
\end{gather*}
$$

Therefore,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)=\sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)}^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r_{1}+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \chi\left(r_{2}+\overline{\bar{a} q_{2}+n} \cdot q_{1} p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right), \tag{5.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

if (5.9) holds, and $\mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)=0$ if otherwise.
Lemma 5.1. Let $\alpha \leqslant 2\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor$. Let $p$ be odd. Define $\mathfrak{E}_{\alpha}^{\alpha}(n)$ as in 5.10) with $\left(q_{1} q_{2}, p\right)=1$ (here $q_{1}$ and $q_{2}$ are not necessarily prime as far as the definition is concerned).
(1) If $n \not \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)$, then $\mathscr{E}_{\alpha}^{\alpha}(n)$ vanishes unless $r_{1} q_{1} \equiv r_{2} q_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\operatorname{ord}_{p}(n)}\right)$, in which case

$$
\mathscr{E}_{\alpha}^{\alpha}(n) \ll \begin{cases}p^{\lceil\alpha / 2\rceil+\operatorname{ord}_{p}(n)}, & \text { if } n \not \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{\lfloor\alpha / 2\rfloor}\right),  \tag{5.11}\\ p^{\lceil\alpha / 2\rceil+\operatorname{ord}_{p}(n) / 2}, & \text { if otherwise } .\end{cases}
$$

(2) If $n \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)$, then $\mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)$ vanishes unless $r_{1} q_{1} \equiv r_{2} q_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\alpha-1}\right)$, in which case

$$
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)= \begin{cases}\chi\left(\bar{r}_{1} r_{2}\right) \cdot p^{\alpha-1}(p-1), & \text { if } r_{1} q_{1} \equiv r_{2} q_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)  \tag{5.12}\\ -\chi\left(\bar{r}_{1} r_{2}\right) \cdot p^{\alpha-1}, & \text { if otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Proof. 4 First of all, since $\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(n ; r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2}\right)=\chi\left(q_{1} \bar{q}_{2}\right) \mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(n ; r_{1} \bar{q}_{2}, r_{2} \bar{q}_{1}, 1,1\right)$, we may assume $q_{1}=q_{2}=1$, that is,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n)=\sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{\alpha}\right)}^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r_{1}+a p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \chi\left(r_{2}+\overline{\bar{a}+n} p^{\gamma-\alpha}\right) \tag{5.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, if we let $\delta=\operatorname{ord}_{p}(n)$, then it can be assumed that $n=p^{\delta}$ if $\delta<\alpha$ (by $a \rightarrow \overline{n / p^{\delta}} \cdot a$ ) or $n=0$ if otherwise.

For simplicity, suppose that $\alpha=2 v$ is even with $0<v \leqslant \gamma / 3$; the odd case may be treated in the same way. Note that Lemma 5.1] is trivial for $\alpha=0$, 1 . In our later analysis, we shall always split $a\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right)$ into

$$
\begin{equation*}
a=a_{0}+a_{1} p^{v}, \quad a_{0}, a_{1}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right),\left(a_{0}, p\right)=1 \tag{5.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

The next lemma will be very helpful.

[^4]Lemma 5.2. Let $\mu<v \leqslant \gamma / 2$. Then for $(w, p)=1$ we have

$$
\begin{gather*}
\sum_{a_{1}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)} \chi\left(u+v w a_{1} p^{\gamma-v}\right)= \begin{cases}\chi(u) \cdot p^{v}, & \text { if } p^{v} \mid v \\
0, & \text { if otherwise }\end{cases}  \tag{5.15}\\
\sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)}^{\star} \chi\left(u+v w a_{0} p^{\gamma-v}\right)= \begin{cases}\chi(u) \cdot p^{v-1}(p-1), & \text { if } p^{v} \mid v \\
-\chi(u) \cdot p^{v-1}, & \text { if } p^{v-1} \| v \\
0, & \text { if otherwise }\end{cases} \tag{5.16}
\end{gather*}
$$

and for odd $p$ and $\left(w w^{\prime}, p\right)=1$ we have

$$
\left|\sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)}^{\star} \chi\left(u+v w a_{0} p^{\gamma-v}+w^{\prime} a_{0}^{2} p^{\gamma-v+\mu}\right)\right|= \begin{cases}p^{(v+\mu) / 2}, & \text { if } p^{\mu} \| v  \tag{5.17}\\ 0, & \text { if otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

To prove Lemma5.2, one may let $u=w=1$ and use the fact that $\psi(x)=\chi\left(1+x p^{\gamma-v}\right)$ is a primitive additive character modulo $p^{v}$. Note that (5.15) is just the orthogonal relation, while (5.16) is reduced to an evaluation of Ramanujan sums (see [IK, (3.3)]). For (5.17), we have the Gauss sum

$$
\sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)}^{\star} \psi\left(v a_{0}+w^{\prime} p^{\mu} a_{0}^{2}\right) .
$$

To evaluate this, we first reduce the modulus of $\psi$ by $\left(v, p^{\mu}\right)$, and then resort to [IK] Lemma $12.2,12.3$ ]. Their $h(y)$ is linear in our case, so it is easy to see (with $p$ odd) that the sum is non-zero if and only if $p^{\mu} \| v$, in which case the Gauss sum above has norm $p^{(v+\mu) / 2}$.

Proof of Lemma 5.1 (2): Case $n \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right)$. In this case, it is clear that $\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}(n)=$ $\mathfrak{E}_{\alpha}^{2 v}(0)($ see (5.13) $)$ is equal to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right)}^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r_{1}+a p^{\gamma-2 v}\right) \chi\left(r_{2}+a p^{\gamma-2 v}\right) . \tag{5.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

By inserting $a=a_{0}+a_{1} p^{v}$ (as in (5.14)), and using the congruence relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{r_{1}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}+a_{1} p^{\gamma-v}} \equiv\left(\overline{r_{1}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}}\right)^{2}\left(r_{1}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}-a_{1} p^{\gamma-v}\right)\left(\bmod p^{\gamma}\right) \tag{5.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}(0)=\sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)}^{\star} \sum_{a_{1}\left(\bmod p^{\nu}\right)} \chi\left(u_{0}\left(a_{0}\right)+v \cdot w\left(a_{0}\right) a_{1} p^{\gamma-v}\right), \tag{5.20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
u_{0}\left(a_{0}\right)=\left(\overline{r_{1}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}}\right)\left(r_{2}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}\right), \quad v=r_{1}-r_{2}, \quad w\left(a_{0}\right)=\left(\overline{r_{1}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}}\right)^{2} .
$$

Note that $\gamma \leqslant 2 \gamma-3 v$ (or $v \leqslant \gamma / 3$ ) is indeed needed here (and used implicitly hereafter). An application of 5.15) in Lemma 5.2 implies that $\mathscr{C}_{\chi}^{2 v}(0)$ can be non-vanishing only if $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)$, in which case we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{2 v}(0)=p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)}^{\star} \chi\left(u_{0}\left(a_{0}\right)\right) . \tag{5.21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further, it follows from $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)$ that

$$
\begin{aligned}
u_{0}\left(a_{0}\right) & \equiv \bar{r}_{1}\left(1-\bar{r}_{1} a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}+\bar{r}_{1}^{2} a_{0}^{2} p^{2 \gamma-4 v}\right)\left(r_{2}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}\right) \\
& \equiv \bar{r}_{1} r_{2}+\bar{r}_{1}^{2}\left(r_{1}-r_{2}\right) a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}\left(\bmod p^{\gamma}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

and hence we arrive at

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}(0)=p^{v} \cdot \sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{\nu}\right)}^{\star} \chi\left(u+v^{\prime} w a_{0} p^{\gamma-v}\right), \tag{5.22}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
u=\bar{r}_{1} r_{2}, \quad v^{\prime}=\left(r_{1}-r_{2}\right) / p^{v}, \quad w=\bar{r}_{1}^{2}
$$

Thus (5.12) is a direct consequence of (5.16) in Lemma 5.2 Note that $\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{2 v}(0)$ is non-zero if and only if $\left(r_{1}-r_{2}\right) / p^{\nu} \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{\nu-1}\right)$ or in other words $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{2 v-1}\right)$.

Proof of Lemma 5.1(1). For $n \not \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right)$, we need to treat the cases $(n, p)=1$ or $p$ separately. Recall that the $\mathscr{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}(n)$ under consideration is given by (5.13).

Case $(n, p)=1$. Assume $n=1$. It follows from the change of variables $a+1 \rightarrow a$, $r_{1}-p^{\gamma-2 v} \rightarrow r_{1}$, and $r_{2}+p^{\gamma-2 v} \rightarrow r_{2}$ that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}(1)=\sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right)}^{\star \star} \bar{\chi}\left(r_{1}+a p^{\gamma-2 v}\right) \chi\left(r_{2}-\bar{a} p^{\gamma-2 v}\right), \tag{5.23}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the $\star \star$ in the $a$-sum indicates $(a(a-1), p)=1$. Now let $a=a_{0}+a_{1} p^{v}$ as in (5.14). The congruence in (5.19) together with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\overline{a_{0}+a_{1} p^{v}} \equiv \bar{a}_{0}-\bar{a}_{0}^{2} a_{1} p^{v}\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right) \tag{5.24}
\end{equation*}
$$

yields the expression

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}(1)=\sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)}^{\star \star} \sum_{a_{1}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)} \chi\left(u\left(a_{0}\right)+v\left(a_{0}\right) w\left(a_{0}\right) a_{1} p^{\gamma-v}\right), \tag{5.25}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
u\left(a_{0}\right)=\left(\overline{r_{1}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}}\right)\left(r_{2}-\bar{a}_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}\right), \quad v\left(a_{0}\right)=r_{1} \bar{a}_{0}^{2}-r_{2} .
$$

It follows from (5.15) in Lemma5.2 that the character sum is equal to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}(1)=p^{v} \cdot \sum_{\substack{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right) \\ a_{0}^{2} \equiv r_{1} \bar{r}_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\nu}\right)}}^{\star \star \star} \chi\left(u\left(a_{0}\right)\right), \tag{5.26}
\end{equation*}
$$

and trivially bounded by $2 p^{v}$ as the quadratic equation $a_{0}^{2} \equiv r_{1} \bar{r}_{2}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)$ has at most 2 solutions for $p$ odd.

Case $(n, p)=p$. Assume $n=p^{\delta}$ with $0<\delta<2 v$. We need to consider

$$
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}\left(p^{\delta}\right)=\sum_{a\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right)}^{\star} \bar{\chi}\left(r_{1}+a p^{\gamma-2 v}\right) \chi\left(r_{2}+\overline{\bar{a}+p^{\delta}} \cdot p^{\gamma-2 v}\right)
$$

By

$$
\overline{\bar{a}+p^{\delta}}=a \cdot \overline{1+a p^{\delta}} \equiv a-a^{2} p^{\delta}+a^{3} p^{2 \delta}-\ldots\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right),
$$

and $a=a_{0}+a_{1} p^{v}($ see (5.14) $)$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
\overline{\bar{a}+p^{\delta}} & \equiv a_{0}+a_{1} p^{v}-\left(a_{0}^{2}+2 a_{0} a_{1} p^{v}\right) p^{\delta}+\left(a_{0}^{3}+3 a_{0}^{2} a_{1} p^{v}\right) p^{2 \delta}-\ldots \\
& \equiv \overline{\bar{a}_{0}+p^{\delta}}+\left(\overline{1+a_{0} p^{\delta}}\right)^{2} a_{1} p^{v}\left(\bmod p^{2 v}\right) \tag{5.27}
\end{align*}
$$

Similar to the cases above, by (5.19) and 5.27, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}\left(p^{\delta}\right)=\sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{\nu}\right)}^{\star} \sum_{a_{1}\left(\bmod p^{\nu}\right)} \chi\left(u_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right)+v_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right) w\left(a_{0}\right) a_{1} p^{\gamma-v}\right), \tag{5.28}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
u_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right)=\overline{\left(r_{1}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}\right)}\left(r_{2}+\overline{\bar{a}_{0}+p^{\delta}} p^{\gamma-2 v}\right), \quad v_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right)=r_{1}\left(\overline{1+a_{0} p^{\delta}}\right)^{2}-r_{2}
$$

Next we apply (5.15) in Lemma5.2 in two different cases. Our goal is to prove that the character sum $⿷_{\chi}^{2 v}\left(p^{\delta}\right)$ is non-zero only if $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\delta}\right)$, and bounded by $p^{\nu+\delta / 2}$ for $\delta \geqslant v$ or by $p^{v+\delta}$ for $\delta<v$.

For $\delta \geqslant v$, since $v_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right)$ is reduced to $v=r_{1}-r_{2}$ modulo $p^{v}$, by (5.15) we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}\left(p^{\delta}\right)=p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{\nu}\right)}^{\star} \chi\left(u_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right)\right) \tag{5.29}
\end{equation*}
$$

under the condition $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)$. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
u_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right) & \equiv \bar{r}_{1}^{2}\left(r_{1}-a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}+\bar{r}_{1} a_{0}^{2} p^{2 \gamma-4 v}\right)\left(r_{2}+a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}+a_{0}^{2} p^{\gamma-2 v+\delta}\right) \\
& \equiv \bar{r}_{1} r_{2}+\bar{r}_{1}^{2}\left(r_{1}-r_{2}\right) a_{0} p^{\gamma-2 v}+\bar{r}_{1} a_{0}^{2} p^{\gamma-2 v+\delta}\left(\bmod p^{\gamma}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then we arrive at

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}\left(p^{\delta}\right)=p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)}^{\star} \chi\left(u+v^{\prime} w a_{0} p^{\gamma-v}+w^{\prime} a_{0}^{2} p^{\gamma-2 \gamma+\delta}\right), \tag{5.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
u=\bar{r}_{1} r_{2}, \quad v^{\prime}=\left(r_{1}-r_{2}\right) / p^{v}, \quad w=\bar{r}_{1}^{2}, \quad w^{\prime}=\bar{r}_{1} .
$$

Thus (5.17) in Lemma 5.2 implies that this sum is zero unless $\left(r_{1}-r_{2}\right) / p^{v} \equiv 0\left(\bmod p^{\delta-v}\right)$ (in other words $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\delta}\right)$ ) and bounded by $p^{v+\delta / 2}$.

For $\delta<v$, one has $\left(1+a_{0} p^{\delta}\right)^{2} r_{2} \equiv r_{1}\left(\bmod p^{v}\right)$, and this yields $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\delta}\right)$ together with $2 a_{0}+a_{0}^{2} p^{\delta} \equiv\left(r_{1} \bar{r}_{2}-1\right) / p^{\delta}\left(\bmod p^{\nu-\delta}\right)$. Consequently, (5.15) yields the sum

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2 v}\left(p^{\delta}\right)=p^{\nu} . \sum_{\substack{a_{0}\left(\bmod p^{\nu}\right) \\ 2 a_{0}+a_{0}^{2} p^{\delta} \equiv\left(r_{1} \bar{r}_{2}-1\right) / p^{\delta}\left(\bmod p^{v-\delta}\right)}}^{\star} \chi\left(u_{\delta}\left(a_{0}\right)\right) . \tag{5.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

By Hensel's lemma, the sum has at most $p^{\delta}$ many terms, so it is bounded by $p^{v+\delta}$. Q.E.D.
5.2. Bounds for the integral $\mathcal{L}_{\beta \gamma}(x)$. Recall that the integral $\mathscr{L}_{\beta \gamma}(x)$ is defined by (4.17) and (5.7).

Lemma 5.3. Let $S, T, K, Q>1, N>p^{2 \gamma-2 \beta}$ be parameters with $N^{\varepsilon}<K \ll T \ll S$ and $p^{\beta} Q>N^{1+\varepsilon} / K$. Let $q_{i} \sim Q$ and $\left|r_{i}\right| \ll S p^{\gamma} Q / N(i=1,2)$. Let Var $\left(V_{\natural}\right) \ll 1$. Suppose that $\phi^{(j)}(v) \ll 1$ for $j=2,3$ and that $\left|\phi^{\prime \prime}(v)\right| \gg 1$ for all $v \in(1 / 2,5 / 2)$.
(1) We have $\mathscr{L}_{\beta \gamma}(x)=O\left(N^{-A}\right)$ if $|x| \geqslant K$.
(2) Assume that $K^{2} / T>N^{\varepsilon}$. For $K^{2} / T \ll|x|<K$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{\beta \gamma}(x) \ll \frac{1}{T \sqrt{|x|}} . \tag{5.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $|x| \ll K^{2} / T$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{\beta \gamma}(x) \ll \frac{1}{T} . \tag{5.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

(3) Let $q_{1}=q_{2}=q$. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{\beta \gamma}(0) \ll \min \left\{\frac{1}{T}, \frac{S p^{\gamma} Q N^{\varepsilon}}{T K N\left|r_{1}-r_{2}\right|}\right\} . \tag{5.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. This lemma is a generalization of [AHLQ, Lemma 5.5]—if we let $p^{\beta}=p^{\gamma}=$ 1 and $S=T$, then we arrive at their Lemma $5.5^{5}$. It is easy to see that their proof for (3) is still valid if several $T$ were replaced by $S$ provided that $S \gg T$. By the simple observation in the proof of Lemma 4.2, this lemma is actually a consequence of (the $S$-version of) AHLQ Lemma 5.5] by the change of variables $N_{\mathrm{o}}=N / p^{2 \gamma-2 \beta}, q_{\mathrm{o} i}=p^{2 \beta-\gamma} q_{i}$, and $Q_{\mathrm{o}}=p^{2 \beta-\gamma} Q($ see 4.12) $)$.
Q.E.D.

Remark 5.4. By checking the proof of Lemma 5.5 in AHLQ], it seems that the condition $p^{\beta} Q>N^{1+\varepsilon} / K$ arising from the Bessel $\delta$-method (see $\sqrt{3.9}$ ) is redundant-we keep it here only for the sake of safety.
5.3. Estimates for $S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q)$. Now we are ready to estimate $S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q)$. In view of (5.1)-(5.5), (5.9), and Lemma5.3 (1), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q) \ll g \sqrt{S_{\mathrm{diag}}^{2}(N, X, Q)}+\sqrt{S_{\mathrm{off}}^{2}(N, X, Q)}+N^{-A} \tag{5.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

with

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{\text {diag }}^{2}(N, X, Q)=\frac{N^{3} X}{p^{\gamma+4 \beta-2 \alpha} Q^{\star 2} Q^{2} K} \sum_{q \sim Q} \sum_{\substack{\left(r_{1} r_{2}, q\right)=1 \\
\left|r_{i}\right| \ll p^{\gamma} q / N \\
r_{1} \equiv r_{2}(\bmod q)}} \sum_{\chi} \mathfrak{F}_{\chi}^{\alpha}\left(0 ; r_{1}, r_{2}, q, q\right) \mathcal{L}_{\beta \gamma}\left(0 ; r_{1}, r_{2}, q, q\right),  \tag{5.36}\\
& S_{\text {off }}^{2}(N, X, Q)=\frac{N^{3} X}{p^{\gamma+4 \beta-2 \alpha} Q^{\star 2} Q^{2} K} \sum_{q_{1}, q_{2} \sim Q} \sum_{\substack{\left|r_{i}\right| \ll S p^{\gamma} q_{i} / N}} \sum_{\substack{ \\
(5.37)}}^{\sum_{\substack{0<|n| \ll N / p^{\alpha} K}}} \begin{array}{l}
n \equiv p^{\gamma-\alpha}\left(\bar{r}_{1} q_{2}-\bar{r}_{2} q_{1}\right)\left(\bmod q_{1} q_{2}\right)
\end{array}
\end{align*}
$$

in correspondence to the cases where $n=0$ and $n \neq 0$, respectively. Note that for $n=0$, the congruence relation in (5.9) reads $\bar{r}_{2} q_{1} \equiv \bar{r}_{1} q_{2}\left(\bmod q_{1} q_{2}\right)$, and it forces $q_{1}=q_{2}(=q)$ and $r_{1} \equiv r_{2}(\bmod q)$. Moreover, $X=p^{2 \beta} Q^{2} K^{2} / N($ as in (3.8) $)$ is used here for the range of the $n$-sum.

For $S_{\text {diag }}^{2}(N, X, Q)$, we split the sum over $r_{1}$ and $r_{2}$ according as $r_{1}=r_{2}$ or not, and apply Lemmas 5.1 (2) and 5.3(3). Consequently, $S_{\text {diag }}^{2}(N, X, Q)$ is bounded by

$$
\frac{N^{3} X}{p^{\gamma+4 \beta-2 \alpha} Q^{\star 2} Q^{2} K} \sum_{q \sim Q}\left(\sum_{\substack{(r, q)=1 \\|r|<S p^{\gamma} q / N}} \frac{p^{\alpha}}{T}+\sum_{\delta=0,1} \sum_{\substack{r_{1} \neq r_{2} \\\left(r_{1} r_{2}, q\right)=1 \\\left|r_{i}\right| \ll p^{\gamma} q / N \\ r_{1} \equiv r_{2}\left(\bmod p^{\alpha-\delta} q\right)}} \frac{S p^{\gamma+\alpha-\delta} Q N^{\varepsilon}}{T K N\left|r_{1}-r_{2}\right|}\right)
$$

and hence

$$
\begin{align*}
S_{\text {diag }}^{2}(N, X, Q) & \ll \frac{N^{3} X}{p^{\gamma+4 \beta-2 \alpha} Q^{\star} Q^{2} K}\left(\frac{S p^{\gamma} Q}{N} \frac{p^{\alpha}}{T}+\frac{S p^{\gamma} Q}{N} \frac{S p^{\gamma} N^{\varepsilon}}{T K N}\right)  \tag{5.38}\\
& \ll\left(K N p^{3 \alpha-2 \beta}+S p^{\gamma-2 \beta+2 \alpha} N^{\varepsilon}\right) \frac{S}{T} \log Q
\end{align*}
$$

[^5]To deal with $S_{\text {off }}^{2}(N, X, Q)$, we need to strengthen the condition $Q>N^{1+\varepsilon} / p^{\beta} K$ (see (3.9) into

$$
\begin{equation*}
Q>N^{1+\varepsilon} / K \tag{5.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that we would necessarily have $q_{1} \neq q_{2}$. Otherwise, if $q_{1}=q_{2}=q$, the congruence condition $n \equiv p^{\gamma-\alpha}\left(\bar{r}_{1} q-\bar{r}_{2} q\right)\left(\bmod q^{2}\right)$ would imply $q \mid n$, but this is impossible, in view of the length $N / p^{\alpha} K$ of the $n$-sum.

For ease of exposition, we shall only treat the partial sum $S_{\text {off }}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q)$ with the coprime condition $(n, p)=1$. For general $n$, one just needs to use Lemma 5.1 at full strength.

Next, we interchange the sum over $n$ and the sums over $r_{1}, r_{2}$. Note that for fixed $n$, the congruence $n \equiv p^{\gamma-\alpha}\left(\bar{r}_{1} q_{2}-\bar{r}_{2} q_{1}\right)\left(\bmod q_{1} q_{2}\right)$ splits into $r_{1} \equiv \bar{n} p^{\gamma-\alpha} q_{2}\left(\bmod q_{1}\right)$ and $r_{2} \equiv-\bar{n} p^{\gamma-\alpha} q_{1}\left(\bmod q_{2}\right)$. By Lemma 5.1 (1) and 5.3 (2), we infer that $S_{\text {off }}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q)$ is bounded by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{N^{3} X}{p^{\gamma+4 \beta-2 \alpha} Q^{\star 2} Q^{2} K} \sum_{q_{1}, q_{2} \sim Q} \sum_{\substack{(n, p)=1 \\
|n|<N / p^{\alpha} T}} \sum_{\substack{\left|r_{i}\right|<S \\
r_{1} \equiv \bar{n} n^{\gamma-\alpha} q_{2} q_{i} / N \\
r_{2} \equiv-\bar{n} p^{\gamma-\alpha} q_{1}\left(\bmod q_{1}\right)}} \sum_{\substack{\text { (mod } \left.q_{2}\right)}} \frac{p^{\lceil\alpha / 2\rceil}}{T} \\
&\left.+\sum_{\substack{(n, p)=1 \\
N / p^{\alpha} T \ll|n|<N / p^{\alpha} K}} \sum_{\substack{\left|r_{i}\right|<S S \\
r_{1} \equiv \bar{n} p^{\gamma-\alpha} p_{2} q_{i}\left(\bmod q_{1}\right) \\
r_{2} \equiv-\bar{n} p^{\gamma-\alpha} q_{1}\left(\bmod q_{2}\right)}} \sum_{\substack{ }} \frac{p^{[\alpha / 2]} p^{\beta-\alpha / 2} \sqrt{q_{1} q_{2}}}{T \sqrt{X|n|}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We record here the condition in Lemma55.3(2):

$$
\begin{equation*}
K>\sqrt{T} N^{\varepsilon} . \tag{5.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

When $N \leqslant S p^{\gamma}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
S_{\mathrm{off}}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q) & \ll \frac{N^{3} X}{p^{\gamma+4 \beta-2 \alpha} Q^{2} K} \cdot p^{\lceil\alpha / 2\rceil}\left(\frac{N}{p^{\alpha} T^{2}}+\frac{p^{\beta-\alpha / 2} Q}{T \sqrt{X}} \sqrt{\frac{N}{p^{\alpha} K}}\right)\left(\frac{S p^{\gamma}}{N}\right)^{2}  \tag{5.41}\\
& =p^{\gamma+\lceil 3 \alpha / 2\rceil-2 \beta}\left(K N+\frac{N T}{\sqrt{K}}\right)\left(\frac{S}{T}\right)^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

When $N>S p^{\gamma}$, the $\left(S p^{\gamma} / N\right)^{2}$ in (5.41) needs to be replaced by 1. In other words, we lose $\left(N / S p^{\gamma}\right)^{2}$. However, the loss may be reduced to $N / S p^{\gamma}$ if we rearrange the sums in the following order:

$$
\sum_{q_{1} \sim Q} \sum_{\substack{\left(r_{1}, q_{1}\right)=1}}\left(\sum_{\substack{(n, p)=1 \\\left|r_{1}\right|<S p^{\gamma} q_{1} / N}} \sum_{\substack{(n, p)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\left(n \mid \ll N / p^{\alpha} T\right.}} \sum_{\substack{\left(n, p^{\alpha} \sim Q \\|\ll| n \mid \ll N / p^{\alpha} K\right.}} \sum_{\substack{q_{2} \mid \ll p^{\gamma} p^{\gamma} / N \\ q_{2} \equiv r_{1} n \bar{p}^{\gamma-\alpha}\left(\bmod q_{1}\right)}} .\right.
$$

Thus for $N>S p^{\gamma}$, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
S_{\mathrm{off}}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q) & \ll \frac{N^{3} X}{p^{\gamma+4 \beta-2 \alpha} Q^{\star} Q^{2} K} \frac{S p^{\gamma} Q}{N} \cdot p^{[\alpha / 2\rceil}\left(\frac{N}{p^{\alpha} T^{2}}+\frac{p^{\beta-\alpha / 2} Q}{T \sqrt{X}} \sqrt{\frac{N}{p^{\alpha} K}}\right)  \tag{5.42}\\
& \ll \frac{N}{p^{2 \beta-[3 \alpha / 2]} T}\left(K N+\frac{N T}{\sqrt{K}}\right) \frac{S}{T} \log Q .
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (5.41) and (5.42), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\mathrm{off}}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q) \ll p^{\gamma+[3 \alpha / 2]-2 \beta}\left(K N+\frac{N T}{\sqrt{K}}\right)\left(1+\frac{N}{S p^{\gamma}}\right)\left(\frac{S}{T}\right)^{2} \log Q \tag{5.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we conclude from (5.35), (5.38) and (5.43) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\alpha=0}^{\beta} S_{\alpha \beta}^{1}(N, X, Q) \ll\left(\sqrt{T p^{\gamma}}+p^{\gamma / 2-\beta / 4}\left(\sqrt{K N}+\frac{\sqrt{N T}}{K^{1 / 4}}\right)\left(1+\sqrt{\frac{N}{S p^{\gamma}}}\right)\right) \frac{S}{T} N^{\varepsilon} \tag{5.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 6. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Recall that $\beta=2\lfloor\gamma / 3\rfloor$ and $S=T+\Delta N^{\varepsilon}$ as in (3.2) and (4.8), so the bound in (1.16) that we need to prove is translated int(6)

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(N) \ll \frac{S p^{\gamma / 2-\beta / 4} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}}{T^{2 / 3}}+\frac{S^{1 / 2} N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{2 / 3} p^{\beta / 4}} \tag{6.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, we may impose the condition (see (1.18))

$$
\begin{equation*}
T^{1 / 3} p^{\gamma / 3}<N^{1 / 2} \tag{6.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

because if otherwise (6.1) is worse than the trivial bound $S(N) \ll N$.
It follows from (3.6), (4.14) and (5.44) that

$$
S(N) \ll \frac{S \sqrt{K} p^{\gamma / 2+\beta}}{Q \sqrt{T}}+\frac{S p^{\gamma / 2} N^{\varepsilon}}{\sqrt{T}}+\frac{S p^{\gamma / 2-\beta / 4} N^{\varepsilon}}{T}\left(\sqrt{K N}+\frac{\sqrt{N T}}{\sqrt[4]{K}}\right)\left(1+\sqrt{\frac{N}{S p^{\gamma}}}\right)
$$

On choosing $K=T^{2 / 3}$ and $Q=N^{1+\varepsilon} / \sqrt{T}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(N) \ll \frac{S T^{1 / 3} p^{\gamma / 2+\beta}}{N}+\frac{S p^{\gamma / 2} N^{\varepsilon}}{T^{1 / 2}}+\frac{S p^{\gamma / 2-\beta / 4} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}}{T^{2 / 3}}+\frac{S^{1 / 2} N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{2 / 3} p^{\beta / 4}} \tag{6.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

The required conditions in (3.8), (5.39), and (5.40) are well justified for our choice of $K$ and $Q$. Finally, the condition (6.2) implies that the first two terms are dominated by the third term in 6.3), so we arrive at the desired bound (6.1).

## 7. Proof of Corollary 1.3

It suffices to prove the same estimates in (1.20) and (1.21) for the sum over dyadic segments,

$$
S^{b}(N)=\sum_{N \leqslant n \leqslant 2 N} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) e(f(n)) .
$$

To this end, choose the $V(x) \in C_{c}^{\infty}[1,2]$ in Theorem 1.2 so that $V(x) \equiv 1$ on $[1+1 / \Delta, 2-$ $1 / \Delta]$ and compare $S^{b}(N)$ with $S(N)$. By Deligne's bound (2.2), we infer that

$$
S^{b}(N)=S(N)+O\left(N^{1+\varepsilon} / \Delta\right)
$$

In order to have cleaner exponents, we consider the case $\gamma \equiv 0(\bmod 3)$. It follows from (1.16) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{b}(N) \ll T^{1 / 3} p^{\gamma / 3} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}+\frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{1 / 6} p^{\gamma / 6}}+\frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{\Delta} \tag{7.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

[^6]for $\Delta \leqslant T$, and
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{b}(N) \ll \frac{\Delta p^{\gamma / 3} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon}}{T^{2 / 3}}+\frac{\Delta^{1 / 2} N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{2 / 3} p^{\gamma / 6}}+\frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{\Delta} \tag{7.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

for $\Delta>T$. Note that in the former case, the best choice is clearly $\Delta=T$, while in the latter case, the optimal choice of $\Delta$ is the one that balances the last and the first two terms.

For $T^{5}<p^{\gamma}$,
(1) if $N \geqslant T^{4 / 9} p^{10 \gamma / 9}$, we choose $\Delta=T^{4 / 9} p^{\gamma / 9}$ so that (7.2) yields

$$
S^{b}(N) \ll \frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{4 / 9} p^{\gamma / 9}}
$$

(2) if $T^{8 / 3} p^{2 \gamma / 3} \leqslant N<T^{4 / 9} p^{10 \gamma / 9}$, we choose $\Delta=T^{1 / 3} N^{1 / 4} / p^{\gamma / 6}$ so that (7.2) yields

$$
S^{b}(N) \ll \frac{p^{\gamma / 6} N^{3 / 4+\varepsilon}}{T^{1 / 3}}
$$

(3) if $N<T^{8 / 3} p^{2 \gamma / 3}$, we choose $\Delta=T$ and (7.1) yields

$$
S^{\mathrm{b}}(N) \ll T^{1 / 3} p^{\gamma / 3} N^{1 / 2+\varepsilon} .
$$

Consequently, we obtain 1.20 by combining these bounds.
For $T^{5} \geqslant p^{\gamma}$, we choose $\Delta=T$ and (1.21) follows directly from (7.1).

## 8. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Theorem 1.1 is a standard consequence of Theorem 1.2. Let $t>1$ say. We have the following approximate functional equation (see [IK] Theorem 5.3, Proposition 5.4]):

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)= & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n)}{n^{1 / 2+i t}} V_{t}\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{M} p^{\gamma}}\right) \\
& +\epsilon(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi) \cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\overline{\lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n)}}{n^{1 / 2-i t}} V_{-t}\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{M} p^{\gamma}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $|\epsilon(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)|=1$, and $V_{ \pm t}(x)$ is a smooth function with $x^{j} V_{ \pm t}^{(j)}(x) \ll_{j, A}$ $(1+x / t)^{-A}$ for any $j, A \geqslant 0$. By applying a dyadic partition of unity to the sums above, it follows that for some $N \leqslant\left(t p^{\gamma}\right)^{1+\varepsilon}$ we have

$$
L(1 / 2+i t, g \otimes \chi)<_{\varepsilon, A} \frac{|S(N)|}{\sqrt{N}} N^{\varepsilon}+N^{-A},
$$

where

$$
S(N)=\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_{g}(n) \chi(n) n^{-i t} V\left(\frac{n}{N}\right),
$$

and $V(x) \in C_{c}^{\infty}[1,2]$ with $V^{(j)}(x)<_{j} 1$. Thus Theorem 1.1 follows directly from Theorem 1.2 on choosing $\phi(x)=-\log x / 2 \pi, T=t$, and $\Delta=1$.
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[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ A similar result in the $q$-aspect $\left(q=p^{\gamma}\right)$ is also obtained in $\mathbf{G M}$ by applying the $p$-adic van der Corput method of Milićević Mil.

[^2]:    ${ }^{2}$ Note that one only needs the weight functions to have bounded variation in the second derivative tests.

[^3]:    ${ }^{3}$ Note that $p \sim P$ is used in AHLQ in place of our $h \sim H$.

[^4]:    ${ }^{4}$ Note that there is a careless mistake in Lemma 5.2 of $\left[\overline{\mathbf{M S}]: ~ T h e ~} \alpha q \overline{n+q^{\prime}}\right.$ in their character sum should be $\alpha q \overline{\alpha n+q^{\prime}}=q \overline{n+\bar{\alpha} q^{\prime}}$. As such, a proof of Lemma 5.1 is needed here (it is actually more involved).

[^5]:    ${ }^{5}$ Note that $p_{i} \sim P$ in AHLQ corresponds to our $p^{\beta} q_{i} \sim p^{\beta} Q$.

[^6]:    ${ }^{6}$ Note that the $N^{\varepsilon}$ is removed from $S=T+\Delta N^{\varepsilon}$ in 1.16 due to our $\varepsilon$-convention.

