### Hybrid Weyl-type bound for *p*-power twisted GL(2) *L*-functions

Zhengxiao Gao, Shu Luo, and Zhi Qi

ABSTRACT. Let g be a fixed holomorphic cusp form of arbitrary level and nebentypus. Let  $\chi$  be a primitive character of prime-power modulus  $q = p^{\gamma}$ . In this paper, we prove the following hybrid Weyl-type subconvexity bound

$$L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi) \ll_{g,p,\varepsilon} ((1 + |t|)q)^{1/3 + \varepsilon}$$

for any  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

#### 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 Re(s) = 1/2. The subconvexity problem is to improve (usually in a sub-family) the trivial convexity bound:

$$L(1/2+it,\pi) \ll_{\varepsilon} C(\pi,t)^{1/4+\varepsilon}$$

where  $C(\pi, t)$  is the so-called analytic conductor. See [IS] and [IK, §5].

Two classical results in the GL<sub>1</sub> 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*):

(1.1) 
$$\zeta(1/2+it) \ll_{\varepsilon} (1+|t|)^{1/6+\varepsilon},$$

and

(1.2) 
$$L(1/2+it,\chi) \ll_{t,\varepsilon} q^{3/16+\varepsilon}.$$

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  $L(1/2 + it, \chi)$  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:

(1.3) 
$$L(1/2 + it, \chi) \ll_{\varepsilon} ((1 + |t|)q)^{3/16 + \varepsilon}.$$

<sup>2010</sup> Mathematics Subject Classification. 11F66.

Key words and phrases. L-functions, subconvexity, Bessel delta method.

The third author was supported by National Key R&D Program of China No. 2022YFA1005300 and National Natural Science Foundation of China No. 12071420.

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  $GL_2 \times GL_1$  *L*-central values  $L(1/2, g \otimes \chi)$  over a  $GL_2$ -spectral family (*g* is either Maass or Eisenstein), among other results, the Weyl-type bound was proven in the *q*-aspect:

(1.4) 
$$L(1/2 + it, \chi) \ll_{t,\varepsilon} q^{1/6+\varepsilon}$$

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

(1.5) 
$$L(1/2 + it, \chi) \ll_{\varepsilon} ((1+|t|)q)^{1/6+\varepsilon}.$$

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  $\zeta(1/2 + it)$  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 sub-Weyl 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  $GL_2$  or  $GL_2 \times GL_1$  setting, the subconvexity problem has been investigated intensively since 1980's.

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

(1.6) 
$$L(1/2 + it, g) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} (1 + |t|)^{1/3+}$$

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 GL<sub>2</sub> 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] to extend (1.6) to the cases where g is Maass or holomorphic of arbitrary level and nebentypus. Furthermore, Blomer and Milićević [BM] 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 [BM] reads

(1.7) 
$$L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} (1 + |t|)^{5/2} p^{7/6} q^{1/3+\varepsilon}.$$

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  $GL_2 \times GL_1$  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**]):

(1.8) 
$$L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} (1 + |t|)^2 q^{5/11+1}$$

2

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. Bykovskii [**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  $(1 + |t|)^{1/2+\epsilon}q^{3/8+\epsilon}$  for holomorphic *g* of arbitrary level and trivial neben-typus. Blomer and Harcos [**BH**] pushed Bykovskii'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]:

(1.9) 
$$L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} ((1+|t|)q)^{19/40+\varepsilon},$$

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 GL<sub>2</sub> subconvexity problem is settled (in all aspects), H. Wu [**Wu**] 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:

(1.10) 
$$L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} (1 + |t|)^{1/(3-2\theta)+\varepsilon} q^{3/8+\theta/4+\varepsilon},$$

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 [**FS**] obtained the genuine Weyl–Burgess-type hybrid bound:

(1.11) 
$$L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} (1 + |t|)^{1/3 + \varepsilon} q^{3/8 + \varepsilon}$$

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 GL<sub>3</sub>. It turns out that his ideas are also successful in the GL<sub>2</sub> 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 + it, g) in [AKMS, AS, Agg, AHLQ],
- (3) the Weyl-type bound of Blomer and Milićević for L(1/2 + it, g ⊗ χ) with χ of *p*-power moduli in [MS],

and, as mentioned earlier, to improve

(4) the hybrid bound of Blomer and Harcos for  $L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi)$  in [Mun1, FS].

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

(1.12) 
$$L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi) \ll_{g,t,\varepsilon} p^{(\gamma - \lfloor \gamma/3 \rfloor)/2 + \varepsilon \gamma},$$

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) GL<sub>2</sub> *L*-functions in [**You**, **PY1**, **PY2**], but the self-dual assumption is not required here. Moreover, in similar spirits, other Weyl-type bounds for GL<sub>2</sub> (Rankin–Selberg) *L*-functions were obtained in [**JM**, **LLY**, **BJN**, **Nel**, **BFW**, **WX**].

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

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

for 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  $L(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi)$  with Weyl strength in both the *t*- and *q*-aspects.

THEOREM 1.1. Let  $g \in S_k^{\star}(M, \xi)$  and  $\chi(\text{mod } p^{\gamma})$  be as above. Suppose (p, 2M) = 1. Then

(1.13) 
$$L\left(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi\right) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} (1 + |t|)^{1/3+\varepsilon} p^{(\gamma - \lfloor \gamma/3 \rfloor)/2 + \varepsilon\gamma}$$

with the implied constant depending only on g and  $\varepsilon$ .

Theorem 1.1 will be deduced in §8 from the following estimate for twisted GL<sub>2</sub> 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  $N, T, \Delta \ge 1$ . Let  $V(x) \in C_c^{\infty}[1,2]$ . Assume that its total variation  $V(V) \ll 1$  and that  $V^{(j)}(x) \ll_j \Delta^j$  for  $j \ge 0$ . For  $\phi(x) \in C^{\infty}(1/2, 5/2)$  satisfying  $|\phi''(x)| \ge 1$  and  $\phi^{(j)}(x) \ll_j 1$  for  $j \ge 1$ , define

(1.14) 
$$f(x) = T\phi(x/N)$$

Define

(1.15) 
$$S_{f,\chi}(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_g(n)\chi(n)e(f(n))V\left(\frac{n}{N}\right).$$

Then

(1.16) 
$$S_{f,\chi}(N) \ll_{g,\phi,\varepsilon} (1 + \Delta/T) T^{1/3} p^{(\gamma - [\gamma/3])/2} N^{1/2 + \varepsilon} + \frac{(1 + \Delta/T)^{1/2} N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{1/6} p^{[\gamma/3]/2}},$$

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

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

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

(1.18) 
$$(T+\varDelta)p^{\gamma+1} < N^{3/2}$$

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

COROLLARY 1.3. Define

(1.19) 
$$S_{f,\chi}^{\sharp}(N) = \sum_{n \leq N} \lambda_g(n) \chi(n) e(f(n)).$$

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

(1.20) 
$$S_{f,\chi}^{\sharp}(N) \ll_{g,\phi,\varepsilon} T^{1/3} p^{(\gamma - [\gamma/3])/2} N^{1/2 + \varepsilon} + \frac{p^{(\gamma - [\gamma/3])/4} N^{3/4 + \varepsilon}}{T^{1/3}} + \frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{4/9} p^{[\gamma/3]/3}},$$

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

(1.21) 
$$S_{f,\chi}^{\sharp}(N) \ll_{g,\phi,\varepsilon} T^{1/3} p^{(\gamma - \lfloor \gamma/3 \rfloor)/2} N^{1/2+\varepsilon} + \frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{1/6} p^{\lfloor \gamma/3 \rfloor/2}}$$

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]<sup>1</sup> (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 **[FS]**, 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

(1.22) 
$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_g(n) \chi(n) W\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} Z^{5/2} p^{7/6+\gamma/3+\varepsilon\gamma} N^{1/2},$$

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

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

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:

(1.24) 
$$\sum_{n \leq N} \lambda_g(n) \chi(n) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} p^{1/3 + 2\gamma/21 + \varepsilon\gamma} N^{6/7}$$

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:

(1.25) 
$$\sum_{n \leq N} \lambda_g(n) \chi(n) \ll_{g,\varepsilon} p^{(\gamma - \lfloor \gamma/3 \rfloor)/4} N^{3/4+\varepsilon} + \frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{p^{\lfloor \gamma/3 \rfloor/3}}$$

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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>A similar result in the q-aspect  $(q = p^{\gamma})$  is also obtained in [GM] by applying the p-adic van der Corput method of Milićević [Mil].

**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  $y \in [Y, 2Y]$  (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

(2.1) 
$$\sum_{n \leq N} |\lambda_g(n)|^2 \ll_g N.$$

Moreover, the Ramanujan conjecture for holomorphic cusp forms is well-known ([**Del**, **DS**]):

(2.2) 
$$\lambda_g(n) \ll n^{\varepsilon}$$

**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  $S_k^*(M, \xi)$ . Let  $a, \bar{a}, c$  be integers such that  $c \ge 1$ , (a, c) = 1,  $a\bar{a} \equiv 1 \pmod{c}$  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 Atkin–Lehner pseudo-eigenvalue of g) such that

(2.3) 
$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_g(n) e\left(\frac{an}{c}\right) F(n) = \frac{\eta_g \xi(-c)}{c \sqrt{M}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\lambda_g(n)} e\left(-\frac{\overline{a}n}{c}\right) \check{F}\left(\frac{n}{c^2 M}\right),$$

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

(2.4) 
$$\check{F}(y) = 2\pi i^k \int_0^\infty F(x) J_{k-1} \left(4\pi \sqrt{xy}\right) \mathrm{d}x,$$

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  $q \leq Q$ , 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 (Mp, q) = 1 and in our application  $c = p^{\alpha}q$  or  $p^{\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \leq 2[\gamma/3]$ . 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  $\alpha \geq \operatorname{ord}_p(M)$  and to [**BMN**, 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 tests<sup>2</sup>) 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*  $i \ge 2$  *and*  $j \ge 0$ *, and* 

j

$$|f'(x)| \gg R.$$

*Then for any*  $A \ge 0$  *we have* 

$$\int_a^b e(f(x))w(x)\mathrm{d} x \ll_A (b-a)Z\left(\frac{Y}{R^2P^2} + \frac{1}{RP} + \frac{1}{RU}\right)^A.$$

**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

(2.5) 
$$I_k(a,b;X) = \int_0^\infty U(x/X) e(2a\sqrt{x}) J_{k-1}(4\pi b\sqrt{x}) dx.$$

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

(2.6) 
$$I_k(a,a;X) = \frac{(1+i)i^{k-1}\widetilde{U}(3/4)X}{4\pi(a^2X)^{1/4}} + O\left(\frac{X}{(a^2X)^{3/4}}\right).$$

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

(2.7) 
$$I_k(a,a;X) = \frac{i^k X}{2\pi} I_k(a\sqrt{X}),$$

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

(2.8) 
$$x^{j} \frac{\mathrm{d}^{j}}{\mathrm{d}x^{j}} \frac{1}{I_{k}(x)} \ll_{j} \sqrt{x},$$

for any  $x \ge 1$ .

**REMARK** 2.4. Alternatively, a cumbersome asymptotic formula of  $I_k(a, a; X)$  is obtained by contour shift in Proposition 1.1 of [**FS**].

PROOF. Recall from [AHLQ, §3.2] that

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Note that one only needs the weight functions to have bounded variation in the second derivative tests.

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

(2.9) 
$$I_k(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} \widetilde{U}(s) \frac{4\sqrt{\pi}}{i(-8\pi i x)^{2-2s}} \frac{\Gamma(k-2s+1)\Gamma(2s-3/2)}{\Gamma(k+2s-2)} \mathrm{d}s.$$

As in [AHLQ, §3.2], by shifting the contour of integration to 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

$$|I_k(x)| \gg 1/\sqrt{x}$$

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

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

and hence

$$x^j I_k^{(j)}(x) \ll_j 1/\sqrt{x},$$

for  $x \ge 1$ . 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  $I_k(a,b;X) = O_A(X^{-A})$  for any  $A \ge 0$  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, 2N]. For any  $A \ge 0$ , we have

(2.10) 
$$\delta(r=n) = \frac{2\pi r^{1/4}}{i^k h^{1/2} X^{3/4}} \cdot \frac{1}{h} \sum_{a \pmod{h}} e\left(\frac{a(n-r)}{h}\right) \cdot I_k\left(\frac{\sqrt{r}}{h}, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{h}; X\right) V_k\left(\frac{\sqrt{rX}}{h}\right) + O_A(X^{-A}),$$

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  $|r-n| \leq X^{\varepsilon}h\sqrt{N/X}$ , while the exponential sum in (2.10) gives us  $r \equiv n \pmod{h}$ . 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 Lemma 2.3. 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 [AHLQ] or a product of (large) primes h = pq in [FS] (qis the modulus of their  $\chi$ ). In our case, we shall choose  $h = p^{\beta}q$  for  $\beta = 2[\gamma/3]$  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 Theorem 1.2:

(3.1) 
$$S(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_g(n) \chi(n) e(f(n)) V\left(\frac{n}{N}\right)$$

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

$$\beta = 2[\gamma/3].$$

ß

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

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

with

$$S^{\star}(c,h;N,X) = \frac{2\pi i^k M^{1/2} N^{1/4}}{\eta_g h^{3/2} X^{3/4}} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \chi(r) e(f(r)) V_{\natural}\left(\frac{r}{N}\right) \sum_{a(\text{mod }c)} e\left(-\frac{ar}{c}\right)$$

$$\cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_g(n) e\left(\frac{an}{c}\right) I_k\left(\frac{\sqrt{r}}{h},\frac{\sqrt{n}}{h};X\right),$$
(3.4)

where  $V_{\natural}(x) = \eta_g \xi(-1) M^{-1/2} \cdot x^{1/4} V(x) V_k(\sqrt{NXx}/h)$  (recall that  $\xi(-1) = (-1)^k$ ). 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  $V_{\natural}(x)$  has the same nature as V(x); namely,  $V_{\natural}(x)$  is supported in [1, 2], satisfying  $Var(V_{\natural}) \ll 1$  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

$$I_k\left(\frac{\sqrt{r}}{h},\frac{\sqrt{n}}{h};X\right) = \int_0^\infty U\left(x/X\right)e\left(\frac{2\sqrt{rx}}{h}\right)J_{k-1}\left(\frac{4\pi\sqrt{nx}}{h}\right)dx.$$

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

$$S^{\star}(c,h;N,X) = \frac{\xi(c)h^{1/2}N^{1/4}}{cX^{3/4}} \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \chi(r)e(f(r))V_{\natural}\left(\frac{r}{N}\right)$$

$$\cdot \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \overline{\lambda_g(n)}S(r,n;c)e\left(\frac{2\sqrt{nr}}{\sqrt{Mc}}\right)U\left(\frac{h^2n}{MXc^2}\right),$$
(3.5)

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

$$S(r,n;c) = \sum_{a \pmod{c}}^{\star} e\left(\frac{ar+\overline{a}n}{c}\right).$$

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

(3.6) 
$$S(N) = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\beta} \left( S^{0}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q) + S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q) \right) + O(X^{-A}),$$

where

(3.7) 
$$S^{\tau}_{\alpha\beta}(N,X,Q) = \frac{1}{Q^{\star}} \sum_{q\sim Q} S^{\star}(p^{\alpha}q^{\tau},p^{\beta}q;N,X).$$

Finally, we consider here the conditions for the parameters in Lemma 2.6. It will be convenient to introduce H and K in place of Q and X such that

(3.8) 
$$H = p^{\beta}Q, \quad X = H^2 K^2 / N, \quad N^{\varepsilon} < K < T^{1-\varepsilon}.$$

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

$$(3.9) H > N^{1+\varepsilon}/K.$$

# 4. Application of Poisson summation

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

(4.1) 
$$S(n,c;N) = \sum_{r=1}^{\infty} \chi(r) S(r,n;c) e(f(r)) e\left(\frac{2\sqrt{nr}}{\sqrt{Mc}}\right) V_{\natural}\left(\frac{r}{N}\right)$$

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  $[c, p^{\gamma}] = p^{\gamma}q^{\tau}$  to transform S(n, c; N) into

(4.2) 
$$S(n,c;N) = N \sum_{r=-\infty}^{\infty} \mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n,r,c,[c,p^{\gamma}]) \mathcal{G}(n,r,c,[c,p^{\gamma}];N)$$

where

(4.3) 
$$\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n,r,c,d) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{b \pmod{d}} \chi(b) S(b,n;c) e\left(\frac{rb}{d}\right),$$

(4.4) 
$$\mathcal{G}(y,r,c,d;N) = \int_0^\infty V_{\mathfrak{g}}(x) e\left(T\phi(x) + \frac{2\sqrt{Nxy}}{\sqrt{Mc}} - \frac{rNx}{d}\right) \mathrm{d}x,$$

for  $h^2 y/c^2 \sim MX$ .

**4.1. Evaluation of the character sum**  $\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n, r, c, d)$ . We start by simplifying the character sum  $\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n, r, c, d)$  defined as in (4.3).

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

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

Then we use reciprocity

$$\frac{1}{p^{\gamma}q} \equiv \frac{\overline{q}}{p^{\gamma}} + \frac{\overline{p}^{\gamma}}{q} \pmod{1},$$

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

$$\sum_{b_1 \pmod{p^{\gamma}}} \chi(b_1) e\left(\frac{b_1(r+ap^{\gamma-\alpha})\overline{q}}{p^{\gamma}}\right) \sum_{b_2 \pmod{q}} e\left(\frac{b_2(r+ap^{\gamma-\alpha})\overline{p}^{\gamma}}{q}\right)$$

Further, the  $b_1$ -sum equals  $\bar{\chi}(r + ap^{\gamma-\alpha})\chi(q) \cdot \tau(\chi)$ , where  $\tau(\chi)$  is the Gauss sum

$$\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{\chi}) = \sum_{a (\mathrm{mod}\, p^{\gamma})} \mathbf{\chi}(a) e\left(rac{a}{p^{\gamma}}
ight),$$

while the  $b_2$ -sum yields the congruence  $a \equiv -r\bar{p}^{\gamma-\alpha} \pmod{q}$ . Thus we arrive at

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

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

(4.5) 
$$\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n,r,p^{\alpha}q,p^{\gamma}q) = \frac{\chi(q)\tau(\chi)}{p^{\gamma}}e\left(-\frac{p^{\gamma}\overline{p}^{2\alpha}\overline{r}n}{q}\right)\sum_{a(\mathrm{mod}\,p^{\alpha})}^{\star}\overline{\chi}(r+ap^{\gamma-\alpha})e\left(\frac{\overline{aq}n}{p^{\alpha}}\right).$$

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

(4.6) 
$$\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n,r,p^{\alpha},p^{\gamma}) = \frac{\tau(\chi)}{p^{\gamma}} \sum_{a \pmod{p^{\alpha}}}^{\star} \overline{\chi}(r+ap^{\gamma-\alpha})e\left(\frac{\overline{a}n}{p^{\alpha}}\right).$$

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

(4.7) 
$$\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}(n,r,p^{\alpha},p^{\gamma}) < p^{\alpha-\gamma/2}.$$

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

LEMMA 4.1. Let  $\Delta \ge 1$ . Define

$$(4.8) S = T + \Delta N^{\varepsilon}.$$

Suppose that  $V_{\natural} \in C_c^{\infty}[1,2]$  has bounds  $V_{\natural}^{(j)}(x) \ll_j \Delta^j$ . Let  $h^2 y/c^2 \sim MX$ . Then for any  $A \ge 0$  we have  $\mathcal{G}(y,r,c,d;N) = O_A(N^{-A})$  whenever  $|r| \ge Sd/N$ .

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

**PROOF.** For  $h^2 y/c^2 \sim MX$ , the derivative of the phase function in (4.4) is equal to

$$-\frac{Nr}{d} + T\phi'(x) + \frac{\sqrt{Ny}}{\sqrt{Mxc}} = -\frac{Nr}{d} + O\left(T + \frac{\sqrt{NX}}{H}\right).$$

By (3.8),

$$\max\left\{T, \sqrt{NX}/H\right\} = \max\{T, K\} = T$$

Therefore, the derivative is dominated by -Nr/d since  $|Nr/d| \ge S > T$ , while the *i*-th derivative  $(i \ge 2)$  is bounded by  $O_i(T)$ . Finally, we apply Lemma 2.2 with Y = T, P = 1, U = 1/d, and R = S, so that

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

LEMMA 4.2. Let  $Var(V_{\flat}) \ll 1$ . For  $h^2 y/c^2 \sim MX$ , we have

(4.9) 
$$\mathcal{G}(y,r,c,d;N) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}.$$

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

(4.10) 
$$\mathcal{G}_{0}(y,r,h;N) = \int_{0}^{\infty} V_{\natural}(x) e\left(T\phi(x/N) + \frac{2\sqrt{Nxy}}{\sqrt{Mh}} - \frac{rNx}{h}\right) \mathrm{d}x$$

which was originally defined in [AHLQ, (5.3)]<sup>3</sup>. It is proven in [AHLQ, Lemma 5.1] that

(4.11) 
$$\mathcal{G}_0(y, r, h; N) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}$$

Evidently, the  $\mathcal{J}_o\text{-integral}$  is a special case of the  $\mathcal{J}\text{-integrals}.$  However, the change of variables

(4.12) 
$$y_{o} = h^{2} y/c^{2}, \quad N_{o} = Nh^{2}/d^{2}, \quad h_{o} = h^{2}/d, \quad (H_{o} = Hh/d),$$

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

(4.13) 
$$\mathcal{G}(y, r, c, d; N) = \mathcal{G}_{o}(y_{o}, r, h_{o}; N_{o}).$$

Note that  $N_0 > 1$  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, Lemma 4.2 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  $S^{0}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q)$ . From (4.2), (4.7), and Lemma 4.1, 4.2, it follows that

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

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

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

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

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

Q.E.D.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Note that  $p \sim P$  is used in [AHLQ] in place of our  $h \sim H$ .

**4.4. Formulation for**  $S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q)$ . 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  $S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q)$  in the following way.

LEMMA 4.3. We have

(4.15)  
$$S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q) = \frac{\xi(p^{\alpha})\tau(\chi)N^{2}}{p^{\gamma+\beta+\alpha}Q^{\star}(QK)^{3/2}} \sum_{n} \overline{\lambda_{g}(n)} U\left(\frac{p^{2\beta-2\alpha}n}{MX}\right)$$
$$\cdot \sum_{q\sim Q} \frac{\xi\chi(q)}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{\substack{(r,q)=1\\|r|\leqslant S p^{\gamma}q/N}} \mathfrak{C}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n, r, q) \mathcal{G}_{\beta\gamma}(p^{2\beta-2\alpha}n, r, q),$$

up to a negligible error term, where

(4.16) 
$$\mathfrak{C}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n,r,q) = e\left(-\frac{p^{\gamma}\overline{p}^{2\alpha}\overline{r}n}{q}\right)\sum_{a(\mathrm{mod}\,p^{\alpha})}^{\star}\overline{\chi}(r+ap^{\gamma-\alpha})e\left(\frac{\overline{aq}n}{p^{\alpha}}\right)$$

(4.17) 
$$\mathcal{G}_{\beta\gamma}(y,r,q) = \int_0^\infty V_{\natural}(x) e\left(T\phi(x) + \frac{2\sqrt{Nxy}}{\sqrt{M}p^\beta q} - \frac{rNx}{p^\gamma q}\right) \mathrm{d}x,$$

for  $y \sim MX$ .

# 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

(5.1) 
$$S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N,X,Q) \ll_{g} \frac{N^{3/2}}{p^{\gamma/2+\beta}Q^{\star}\sqrt{QK}} \cdot \sqrt{T^{2}_{\alpha\beta}(N,X,Q)},$$

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

(5.2) 
$$\sum_{n} U\left(\frac{p^{2\beta-2\alpha}n}{MX}\right) \left| \sum_{q\sim Q} \frac{\xi\chi(q)}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{\substack{(r,q)=1\\|r|\ll S\,p^{\gamma}q/N}} \mathfrak{C}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n,r,q) \mathcal{G}_{\beta\gamma}(p^{2\beta-2\alpha}n,r,q) \right|^{2}.$$

Opening the square and switching the order of summations, we obtain

(5.3) 
$$T^{2}_{\alpha\beta}(N,X,Q) = \sum_{q_{1},q_{2}\sim Q} \frac{\xi\chi(q_{1}\bar{q}_{2})}{\sqrt{q_{1}q_{2}}} \sum_{\substack{(r_{i},q_{i})=1\\|r_{i}| \leqslant S p^{\gamma}q_{i}/N}} T^{2}_{\alpha\beta}(n,r_{1},r_{2},q_{1},q_{2};N,X),$$

where  $T^2_{\alpha\beta}(n, r_1, r_2, q_1, q_2; N, X)$  is the *n*-sum given by

(5.4) 
$$\sum_{n} \mathfrak{C}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n,r_1,q_1) \overline{\mathfrak{C}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n,r_2,q_2)} \mathcal{G}_{\beta\gamma}(p^{2\beta-2\alpha}n,r_1,q_1) \overline{\mathcal{G}_{\beta\gamma}(p^{2\beta-2\alpha}n,r_2,q_2)} U\left(\frac{p^{2\beta-2\alpha}n}{MX}\right).$$

We then apply the Poisson summation with modulus  $p^{\alpha}q_1q_2$  to transform this *n*-sum into

(5.5) 
$$\frac{MX}{p^{2\beta-2\alpha}} \sum_{n} \mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n; r_1, r_2, q_1, q_2) \mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma} \left( \frac{MXn}{p^{2\beta-\alpha}q_1q_2}; r_1, r_2, q_1, q_2 \right),$$

where the character sum  $\mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n) = \mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n; r_1, r_2, q_1, q_2)$  is given by

(5.6) 
$$\mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n) = \frac{1}{p^{\alpha}q_1q_2} \sum_{b \pmod{p^{\alpha}q_1q_2}} \mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(b,r_1,q_1) \overline{\mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(b,r_2,q_2)} e\left(\frac{nb}{p^{\alpha}q_1q_2}\right),$$

and the integral  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(x) = \mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(x; r_1, r_2, q_1, q_2)$  is given by

(5.7) 
$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(x) = \int_0^\infty U(y) \mathcal{G}_{\beta\gamma}(MXy, r_1, q_1) \overline{\mathcal{G}_{\beta\gamma}(MXy, r_2, q_2)} e(-xy) \mathrm{d}y.$$

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

$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n) = \frac{1}{p^{\alpha}q_{1}q_{2}} \sum_{a_{1},a_{2} \pmod{p^{\alpha}}}^{\star} \overline{\chi}(r_{1} + a_{1}p^{\gamma-\alpha})\chi(r_{2} + a_{2}p^{\gamma-\alpha})$$
$$\cdot \sum_{b \pmod{p^{\alpha}q_{1}q_{2}}} e\left(\frac{p^{\gamma}\overline{p^{2\alpha}}\overline{r_{2}b}}{q_{2}} - \frac{p^{\gamma}\overline{p^{2\alpha}}\overline{r_{1}b}}{q_{1}} + \frac{\overline{a_{1}q_{1}b}}{p^{\alpha}} - \frac{\overline{a_{2}q_{2}b}}{p^{\alpha}} + \frac{nb}{p^{\alpha}q_{1}q_{2}}\right).$$

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

(5.8) 
$$\bar{a}_1 q_2 - \bar{a}_2 q_1 + n \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\alpha}},$$

(5.9) 
$$p^{\gamma-\alpha}(\bar{r}_2q_1 - \bar{r}_1q_2) + n \equiv 0 \pmod{q_1q_2}.$$

Therefore,

(5.10) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n) = \sum_{a \pmod{p^{\alpha}}}^{\star} \overline{\chi}(r_1 + ap^{\gamma - \alpha})\chi(r_2 + \overline{a}q_2 + n \cdot q_1p^{\gamma - \alpha}),$$

if (5.9) holds, and  $\mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\gamma}(n) = 0$  if otherwise.

LEMMA 5.1. Let  $\alpha \leq 2[\gamma/3]$ . Let p be odd. Define  $\mathfrak{S}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n)$  as in (5.10) with  $(q_1q_2, p) = 1$  (here  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are not necessarily prime as far as the definition is concerned).

(1) If  $n \neq 0 \pmod{p^{\alpha}}$ , then  $\mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n)$  vanishes unless  $r_1q_1 \equiv r_2q_2 \pmod{p^{\operatorname{ord}_p(n)}}$ , in which case

(5.11) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n) \ll \begin{cases} p^{\lceil \alpha/2 \rceil + \operatorname{ord}_{p}(n)}, & \text{if } n \neq 0 \pmod{p^{\lfloor \alpha/2 \rfloor}}, \\ p^{\lceil \alpha/2 \rceil + \operatorname{ord}_{p}(n)/2}, & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2) If  $n \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\alpha}}$ , then  $\mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n)$  vanishes unless  $r_1q_1 \equiv r_2q_2 \pmod{p^{\alpha-1}}$ , in which case

(5.12) 
$$\mathfrak{C}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n) = \begin{cases} \chi(\overline{r}_1 r_2) \cdot p^{\alpha-1}(p-1), & \text{if } r_1 q_1 \equiv r_2 q_2 (\mod p^{\alpha}), \\ -\chi(\overline{r}_1 r_2) \cdot p^{\alpha-1}, & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

PROOF. <sup>4</sup> First of all, since  $\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n; r_1, r_2, q_1, q_2) = \chi(q_1 \bar{q}_2) \mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{\alpha}(n; r_1 \bar{q}_2, r_2 \bar{q}_1, 1, 1)$ , we may assume  $q_1 = q_2 = 1$ , that is,

(5.13) 
$$\mathfrak{E}^{\alpha}_{\chi}(n) = \sum_{a \pmod{p^{\alpha}}}^{\star} \overline{\chi}(r_1 + ap^{\gamma - \alpha})\chi(r_2 + \overline{\overline{a} + n}p^{\gamma - \alpha}).$$

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

For simplicity, suppose that  $\alpha = 2\nu$  is even with  $0 < \nu \leq \gamma/3$ ; 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  $a \pmod{p^{2\nu}}$  into

(5.14) 
$$a = a_0 + a_1 p^{\nu}, \quad a_0, a_1 \pmod{p^{\nu}}, \quad (a_0, p) = 1.$$

The next lemma will be very helpful.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Note that there is a careless mistake in Lemma 5.2 of [**MS**]: The  $\alpha q n + q'$  in their character sum should be  $\alpha q \overline{\alpha n + q'} = q \overline{n + \overline{\alpha} q'}$ . As such, a proof of Lemma 5.1 is needed here (it is actually more involved).

LEMMA 5.2. Let  $\mu < \nu \leq \gamma/2$ . Then for (w, p) = 1 we have

(5.15) 
$$\sum_{a_1 \pmod{p^{\nu}}} \chi(u + vwa_1 p^{\gamma - \nu}) = \begin{cases} \chi(u) \cdot p^{\nu}, & \text{if } p^{\nu} | v, \\ 0, & \text{if otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

(5.16) 
$$\sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \chi(u + vwa_0 p^{\nu-\nu}) = \begin{cases} \chi(u) \cdot p^{\nu-1}(p-1), & \text{if } p^{\nu}|v, \\ -\chi(u) \cdot p^{\nu-1}, & \text{if } p^{\nu-1} \|v, \\ 0, & \text{if otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and for odd p and (ww', p) = 1 we have

(5.17) 
$$\left|\sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \chi(u + vwa_0 p^{\nu-\nu} + w'a_0^2 p^{\nu-\nu+\mu})\right| = \begin{cases} p^{(\nu+\mu)/2}, & \text{if } p^{\mu} \| v, \\ 0, & \text{if otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

To prove Lemma 5.2, one may let u = w = 1 and use the fact that  $\psi(x) = \chi(1 + xp^{\gamma - \nu})$ is a primitive additive character modulo  $p^{\nu}$ . 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

$$\sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \psi(va_0 + w'p^{\mu}a_0^2).$$

To evaluate this, we first reduce the modulus of  $\psi$  by  $(v, p^{\mu})$ , 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  $p^{(\nu+\mu)/2}$ .

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

(5.18) 
$$\sum_{a(\text{mod }p^{2\nu})}^{\star} \overline{\chi}(r_1 + ap^{\gamma - 2\nu})\chi(r_2 + ap^{\gamma - 2\nu}).$$

By inserting  $a = a_0 + a_1 p^{\nu}$  (as in (5.14)), and using the congruence relation

(5.19) 
$$\overline{r_1 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu} + a_1 p^{\gamma - \nu}} \equiv (\overline{r_1 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu}})^2 (r_1 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu} - a_1 p^{\gamma - \nu}) \pmod{p^{\gamma}},$$
  
we obtain

we obtai

(5.20) 
$$\mathfrak{G}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(0) = \sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \sum_{a_1 \pmod{p^{\nu}}} \chi(u_0(a_0) + v \cdot w(a_0)a_1p^{\nu-\nu}),$$

where

$$u_0(a_0) = (\overline{r_1 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu}})(r_2 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu}), \quad v = r_1 - r_2, \quad w(a_0) = (\overline{r_1 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu}})^2.$$

Note that  $\gamma \leq 2\gamma - 3\nu$  (or  $\nu \leq \gamma/3$ ) is indeed needed here (and used implicitly hereafter). An application of (5.15) in Lemma 5.2 implies that  $\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(0)$  can be non-vanishing only if  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p^{\nu}}$ , in which case we have

(5.21) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(0) = p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \chi(u_0(a_0)).$$

Further, it follows from  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p^{\nu}}$  that

$$u_0(a_0) \equiv \overline{r}_1(1 - \overline{r}_1 a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu} + \overline{r}_1^2 a_0^2 p^{2\gamma - 4\nu})(r_2 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu})$$
  
$$\equiv \overline{r}_1 r_2 + \overline{r}_1^2 (r_1 - r_2) a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu} \pmod{p^{\gamma}},$$

and hence we arrive at

(5.22) 
$$\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(0) = p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \chi(u + v' w a_0 p^{\nu-\nu}),$$

with

$$u = \overline{r}_1 r_2, \qquad v' = (r_1 - r_2)/p^{\nu}, \qquad w = \overline{r}_1^2.$$

Thus (5.12) is a direct consequence of (5.16) in Lemma 5.2. Note that  $\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(0)$  is non-zero if and only if  $(r_1 - r_2)/p^{\nu} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\nu-1}}$  or in other words  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p^{2\nu-1}}$ .

*Proof of Lemma* 5.1 (1). For  $n \neq 0 \pmod{p^{2\nu}}$ , we need to treat the cases (n, p) = 1 or p separately. Recall that the  $\mathfrak{C}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(n)$  under consideration is given by (5.13).

*Case* (n, p) = 1. Assume n = 1. It follows from the change of variables  $a + 1 \rightarrow a$ ,  $r_1 - p^{\gamma - 2\nu} \rightarrow r_1$ , and  $r_2 + p^{\gamma - 2\nu} \rightarrow r_2$  that

(5.23) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(1) = \sum_{a(\text{mod } p^{2\nu})}^{\star\star} \overline{\chi}(r_1 + ap^{\gamma - 2\nu})\chi(r_2 - \overline{a}p^{\gamma - 2\nu}),$$

where the **\*\*** in the *a*-sum indicates (a(a-1), p) = 1. Now let  $a = a_0 + a_1 p^{\nu}$  as in (5.14). The congruence in (5.19) together with

(5.24) 
$$\overline{a_0 + a_1 p^{\nu}} \equiv \overline{a}_0 - \overline{a}_0^2 a_1 p^{\nu} \pmod{p^{2\nu}},$$

yields the expression

(5.25) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(1) = \sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}} \sum_{a_1 \pmod{p^{\nu}}} \chi(u(a_0) + v(a_0)w(a_0)a_1p^{\gamma-\nu}),$$

with

$$u(a_0) = (\overline{r_1 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu}})(r_2 - \overline{a}_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu}), \qquad v(a_0) = r_1 \overline{a}_0^2 - r_2.$$

It follows from (5.15) in Lemma 5.2 that the character sum is equal to

(5.26) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(1) = p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{\substack{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}} \\ a_0^2 \equiv r_1 \bar{r}_2 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}}^{\star \star} \chi(u(a_0)),$$

and trivially bounded by  $2p^{\nu}$  as the quadratic equation  $a_0^2 \equiv r_1 \overline{r}_2 \pmod{p^{\nu}}$  has at most 2 solutions for *p* odd.

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

$$\mathfrak{E}^{2\nu}_{\chi}(p^{\delta}) = \sum_{a(\mathrm{mod}\,p^{2\nu})}^{\star} \overline{\chi}(r_1 + ap^{\gamma-2\nu})\chi(r_2 + \overline{\overline{a} + p^{\delta}} \cdot p^{\gamma-2\nu}).$$

By

$$\overline{\overline{a} + p^{\delta}} = a \cdot \overline{1 + ap^{\delta}} \equiv a - a^2 p^{\delta} + a^3 p^{2\delta} - \dots (\operatorname{mod} p^{2\nu}),$$

and  $a = a_0 + a_1 p^{\nu}$  (see (5.14)), we have

(5.27) 
$$\overline{\overline{a} + p^{\delta}} \equiv a_0 + a_1 p^{\nu} - (a_0^2 + 2a_0 a_1 p^{\nu}) p^{\delta} + (a_0^3 + 3a_0^2 a_1 p^{\nu}) p^{2\delta} - \dots$$
$$\equiv \overline{\overline{a_0} + p^{\delta}} + (\overline{1 + a_0 p^{\delta}})^2 a_1 p^{\nu} \pmod{p^{2\nu}}.$$

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

(5.28) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(p^{\delta}) = \sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}} \sum_{a_1 \pmod{p^{\nu}}} \chi(u_{\delta}(a_0) + v_{\delta}(a_0)w(a_0)a_1p^{\nu-\nu}),$$

with

$$u_{\delta}(a_0) = \overline{(r_1 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu})}(r_2 + \overline{a_0} + p^{\delta} p^{\gamma - 2\nu}), \qquad v_{\delta}(a_0) = r_1 (\overline{1 + a_0 p^{\delta}})^2 - r_2$$

Next we apply (5.15) in Lemma 5.2 in two different cases. Our goal is to prove that the character sum  $\mathfrak{E}^{2\nu}_{\chi}(p^{\delta})$  is non-zero only if  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p^{\delta}}$ , and bounded by  $p^{\nu+\delta/2}$  for  $\delta \ge \nu$  or by  $p^{\nu+\delta}$  for  $\delta < \nu$ .

For  $\delta \ge v$ , since  $v_{\delta}(a_0)$  is reduced to  $v = r_1 - r_2$  modulo  $p^v$ , by (5.15) we have

(5.29) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(p^{\delta}) = p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \chi(u_{\delta}(a_0))$$

under the condition  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p^{\nu}}$ . Now

$$\begin{split} u_{\delta}(a_0) &\equiv \bar{r}_1^2 (r_1 - a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu} + \bar{r}_1 a_0^2 p^{2\gamma - 4\nu}) (r_2 + a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu} + a_0^2 p^{\gamma - 2\nu + \delta}) \\ &\equiv \bar{r}_1 r_2 + \bar{r}_1^2 (r_1 - r_2) a_0 p^{\gamma - 2\nu} + \bar{r}_1 a_0^2 p^{\gamma - 2\nu + \delta} \, (\text{mod } p^{\gamma}). \end{split}$$

Then we arrive at

(5.30) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(p^{\delta}) = p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}}^{\star} \chi(u + v'wa_0p^{\gamma-\nu} + w'a_0^2p^{\gamma-2\gamma+\delta}),$$

with

$$u = \overline{r}_1 r_2,$$
  $v' = (r_1 - r_2)/p^{\nu},$   $w = \overline{r}_1^2,$   $w' = \overline{r}_1.$ 

Thus (5.17) in Lemma 5.2 implies that this sum is zero unless  $(r_1 - r_2)/p^{\nu} \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\delta-\nu}}$  (in other words  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p^{\delta}}$ ) and bounded by  $p^{\nu+\delta/2}$ .

For  $\delta < \nu$ , one has  $(1 + a_0 p^{\delta})^2 r_2 \equiv r_1 \pmod{p^{\nu}}$ , and this yields  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p^{\delta}}$ together with  $2a_0 + a_0^2 p^{\delta} \equiv (r_1 \overline{r}_2 - 1)/p^{\delta} \pmod{p^{\nu-\delta}}$ . Consequently, (5.15) yields the sum

(5.31) 
$$\mathfrak{E}_{\chi}^{2\nu}(p^{\delta}) = p^{\nu} \cdot \sum_{\substack{a_0 \pmod{p^{\nu}}\\2a_0 + a_0^2 p^{\delta} \equiv (r_1 \overline{r}_2 - 1)/p^{\delta} \pmod{p^{\nu - \delta}}} \chi(u_{\delta}(a_0)).$$

By Hensel's lemma, the sum has at most  $p^{\delta}$  many terms, so it is bounded by  $p^{\nu+\delta}$ . Q.E.D.

**5.2.** Bounds for the integral  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(x)$ . Recall that the integral  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(x)$  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  $|r_i| \ll S p^{\gamma}Q/N$  (i = 1, 2). Let  $Var(V_{\natural}) \ll 1$ . Suppose that  $\phi^{(j)}(v) \ll 1$  for j = 2, 3 and that  $|\phi''(v)| \gg 1$  for all  $v \in (1/2, 5/2)$ .

(1) We have  $\mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(x) = O(N^{-A})$  if  $|x| \ge K$ .

(2) Assume that  $K^2/T > N^{\varepsilon}$ . For  $K^2/T \ll |x| < K$ , we have

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

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

(5.33) 
$$\qquad \qquad \mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(x) \ll \frac{1}{T}.$$

(3) Let  $q_1 = q_2 = q$ . Then

(5.34) 
$$\mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}(0) \ll \min\left\{\frac{1}{T}, \frac{S p^{\gamma} Q N^{\varepsilon}}{T K N |r_1 - r_2|}\right\}.$$

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<sup>5</sup>. 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  $N_0 = N/p^{2\gamma-2\beta}$ ,  $q_{0i} = p^{2\beta-\gamma}q_i$ , and  $Q_0 = p^{2\beta-\gamma}Q$  (see (4.12)). Q.E.D.

**REMARK** 5.4. By checking the proof of Lemma 5.5 in [AHLQ], it seems that the condition  $p^{\beta}Q > N^{1+\epsilon}/K$  arising from the Bessel  $\delta$ -method (see (3.9)) is redundant—we keep it here only for the sake of safety.

**5.3. Estimates for**  $S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q)$ . Now we are ready to estimate  $S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q)$ . In view of (5.1)–(5.5), (5.9), and Lemma 5.3 (1), we have

(5.35) 
$$S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N, X, Q) \ll_{g} \sqrt{S^{2}_{\text{diag}}(N, X, Q)} + \sqrt{S^{2}_{\text{off}}(N, X, Q)} + N^{-A}$$

with

(5.36)

$$S_{\text{diag}}^{2}(N, X, Q) = \frac{N^{3}X}{p^{\gamma+4\beta-2\alpha}Q^{\star2}Q^{2}K} \sum_{q\sim Q} \sum_{\substack{(r_{1}r_{2},q)=1\\|r_{l}| \leqslant Sp^{\gamma}q/N\\r_{1} \equiv r_{2}(\text{mod} q)}} \mathfrak{S}_{\text{off}}^{\alpha}(N, X, Q) = \frac{N^{3}X}{p^{\gamma+4\beta-2\alpha}Q^{\star2}Q^{2}K} \sum_{q_{1},q_{2}\sim Q} \sum_{\substack{(r_{i},q_{i})=1\\|r_{l}| \leqslant Sp^{\gamma}q_{l}/N}} \sum_{\substack{0<|n|\leqslant N/p^{\alpha}K\\n \equiv p^{\gamma-\alpha}(\bar{r}_{1}q_{2}-\bar{r}_{2}q_{1})(\text{mod} q_{1}q_{2})}} \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}^{\alpha}(n; r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2}) \mathcal{L}_{\beta\gamma}\left(\frac{MXn}{p^{2\beta-\alpha}q_{1}q_{2}}; r_{1}, r_{2}, q_{1}, q_{2}\right),$$

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  $\bar{r}_2 q_1 \equiv \bar{r}_1 q_2 \pmod{q_1 q_2}$ , and it forces  $q_1 = q_2 (= q)$  and  $r_1 \equiv r_2 \pmod{q}$ . 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

$$\frac{N^{3}X}{p^{\gamma+4\beta-2\alpha}Q^{\star2}Q^{2}K}\sum_{q\sim Q}\left(\sum_{\substack{(r,q)=1\\|r|\leqslant Sp^{\gamma}q/N}}\frac{p^{\alpha}}{T}+\sum_{\delta=0,1}\sum_{\substack{r_{1}\neq r_{2}\\(r_{1}r_{2},q)=1\\|r_{l}|\leqslant Sp^{\gamma}q/N\\r_{1}\equiv r_{2}(\operatorname{mod}p^{\alpha-\delta}q)}}\frac{Sp^{\gamma+\alpha-\delta}QN^{\varepsilon}}{TKN|r_{1}-r_{2}|}\right)$$

and hence

(5.38)  
$$S_{\text{diag}}^{2}(N, X, Q) \ll \frac{N^{3}X}{p^{\gamma+4\beta-2\alpha}Q^{\star}Q^{2}K} \left(\frac{Sp^{\gamma}Q}{N}\frac{p^{\alpha}}{T} + \frac{Sp^{\gamma}Q}{N}\frac{Sp^{\gamma}N^{\varepsilon}}{TKN}\right) \\ \ll \left(KNp^{3\alpha-2\beta} + Sp^{\gamma-2\beta+2\alpha}N^{\varepsilon}\right)\frac{S}{T}\log Q.$$

<sup>5</sup>Note that  $p_i \sim P$  in [AHLQ] corresponds to our  $p^{\beta}q_i \sim p^{\beta}Q$ .

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

$$(5.39) Q > N^{1+\varepsilon}/K,$$

so that we would necessarily have  $q_1 \neq q_2$ . Otherwise, if  $q_1 = q_2 = q$ , the congruence condition  $n \equiv p^{\gamma-\alpha}(\bar{r}_1q - \bar{r}_2q) \pmod{q^2}$  would imply q|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  $n \equiv p^{\gamma-\alpha}(\bar{r}_1q_2 - \bar{r}_2q_1) \pmod{q_1q_2}$  splits into  $r_1 \equiv \bar{n}p^{\gamma-\alpha}q_2 \pmod{q_1}$  and  $r_2 \equiv -\bar{n}p^{\gamma-\alpha}q_1 \pmod{q_2}$ . By Lemma 5.1 (1) and 5.3 (2), we infer that  $S_{\text{off}}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q)$  is bounded by

$$\frac{N^{3}X}{p^{\gamma+4\beta-2\alpha}Q^{\star2}Q^{2}K}\sum_{q_{1},q_{2}\sim Q}\left(\sum_{\substack{(n,p)=1\\|n|\ll N/p^{\alpha}T}}\sum_{\substack{|r_{i}|\ll S p^{\gamma}q_{i}/N\\r_{2}\equiv -\bar{n}p^{\gamma-\alpha}q_{2}(\operatorname{mod} q_{1})\\r_{2}\equiv -\bar{n}p^{\gamma-\alpha}q_{1}(\operatorname{mod} q_{2})}\right) + \sum_{\substack{(n,p)=1\\N/p^{\alpha}T\ll|n|\ll N/p^{\alpha}K}}\sum_{\substack{r_{1}\equiv \bar{n}p^{\gamma-\alpha}q_{2}(\operatorname{mod} q_{1})\\r_{2}\equiv -\bar{n}p^{\gamma-\alpha}q_{2}(\operatorname{mod} q_{1})}\\r_{2}\equiv -\bar{n}p^{\gamma-\alpha}q_{1}(\operatorname{mod} q_{2})} \frac{p^{\lceil \alpha/2\rceil}p^{\beta-\alpha/2}\sqrt{q_{1}q_{2}}}{T\sqrt{X|n|}}\right)$$

We record here the condition in Lemma 5.3 (2):

(5.40) 
$$K > \sqrt{T} N^{\varepsilon}$$

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

(5.41)  
$$S_{\text{off}}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q) \ll \frac{N^{3}X}{p^{\gamma+4\beta-2\alpha}Q^{2}K} \cdot p^{\lceil \alpha/2 \rceil} \left(\frac{N}{p^{\alpha}T^{2}} + \frac{p^{\beta-\alpha/2}Q}{T\sqrt{X}}\sqrt{\frac{N}{p^{\alpha}K}}\right) \left(\frac{Sp^{\gamma}}{N}\right)^{2}$$
$$= p^{\gamma+\lceil 3\alpha/2 \rceil-2\beta} \left(KN + \frac{NT}{\sqrt{K}}\right) \left(\frac{S}{T}\right)^{2}.$$

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

$$\sum_{q_1 \sim Q} \sum_{\substack{(r_1, q_1) = 1 \\ |r_1| \leqslant S p^{\gamma} q_1/N}} \left( \sum_{\substack{(n, p) = 1 \\ |n| \leqslant N/p^{\alpha}T}} + \sum_{\substack{(n, p) = 1 \\ N/p^{\alpha}T \leqslant |n| \leqslant N/p^{\alpha}K} } \right) \sum_{\substack{q_2 \sim Q \\ q_2 \equiv r_1 n \overline{p}^{\gamma - \alpha} (\text{mod } q_1)} \sum_{\substack{|r_2| \leqslant S p^{\gamma} q_2/N \\ r_2 \equiv -\overline{n} p^{\gamma - \alpha} q_1 (\text{mod } q_2)}}$$

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

(5.42)  
$$S_{\text{off}}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q) \ll \frac{N^3 X}{p^{\gamma + 4\beta - 2\alpha} Q^{\star} Q^2 K} \frac{S p^{\gamma} Q}{N} \cdot p^{\lceil \alpha/2 \rceil} \left( \frac{N}{p^{\alpha} T^2} + \frac{p^{\beta - \alpha/2} Q}{T \sqrt{X}} \sqrt{\frac{N}{p^{\alpha} K}} \right)$$
$$\ll \frac{N}{p^{2\beta - \lceil 3\alpha/2 \rceil} T} \left( KN + \frac{NT}{\sqrt{K}} \right) \frac{S}{T} \log Q.$$

Combining (5.41) and (5.42), we have

(5.43) 
$$S_{\text{off}}^{\star 2}(N, X, Q) \ll p^{\gamma + \lceil 3\alpha/2 \rceil - 2\beta} \left( KN + \frac{NT}{\sqrt{K}} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{N}{S p^{\gamma}} \right) \left( \frac{S}{T} \right)^2 \log Q.$$

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

$$(5.44) \quad \sum_{\alpha=0}^{\beta} S^{1}_{\alpha\beta}(N,X,Q) \ll \left(\sqrt{Tp^{\gamma}} + p^{\gamma/2-\beta/4} \left(\sqrt{KN} + \frac{\sqrt{NT}}{K^{1/4}}\right) \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{N}{Sp^{\gamma}}}\right)\right) \frac{S}{T} N^{\varepsilon}.$$

# 6. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Recall that  $\beta = 2[\gamma/3]$  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 into<sup>6</sup>:

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

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

(6.2) 
$$T^{1/3}p^{\gamma/3} < N^{1/2},$$

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

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

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

(6.3) 
$$S(N) \ll \frac{ST^{1/3}p^{\gamma/2+\beta}}{N} + \frac{Sp^{\gamma/2}N^{\varepsilon}}{T^{1/2}} + \frac{Sp^{\gamma/2-\beta/4}N^{1/2+\varepsilon}}{T^{2/3}} + \frac{S^{1/2}N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{2/3}p^{\beta/4}}.$$

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,

$$S^{\flat}(N) = \sum_{N \leqslant n \leqslant 2N} \lambda_g(n) \chi(n) e\left(f(n)\right).$$

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  $S^{\flat}(N)$  with S(N). By Deligne's bound (2.2), we infer that

$$S^{\flat}(N) = S(N) + O\left(N^{1+\varepsilon}/\varDelta\right).$$

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

(7.1) 
$$S^{\flat}(N) \ll T^{1/3} p^{\gamma/3} N^{1/2+\varepsilon} + \frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{1/6} p^{\gamma/6}} + \frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{\Delta}$$

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Note that the  $N^{\varepsilon}$  is removed from  $S = T + \Delta N^{\varepsilon}$  in (1.16) due to our  $\varepsilon$ -convention.

for  $\Delta \leq T$ , and

(7.2) 
$$S^{\flat}(N) \ll \frac{\varDelta p^{\gamma/3} N^{1/2+\varepsilon}}{T^{2/3}} + \frac{\varDelta^{1/2} N^{1+\varepsilon}}{T^{2/3} p^{\gamma/6}} + \frac{N^{1+\varepsilon}}{\varDelta}$$

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  $N \ge T^{4/9} p^{10\gamma/9}$ , we choose  $\varDelta = T^{4/9} p^{\gamma/9}$  so that (7.2) yields

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

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

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

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

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

Consequently, we obtain (1.20) by combining these bounds.

For  $T^5 \ge p^{\gamma}$ , 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]):

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

where  $|\epsilon(1/2 + it, g \otimes \chi)| = 1$ , 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  $j, A \ge 0$ . By applying a dyadic partition of unity to the sums above, it follows that for some  $N \le (tp^{\gamma})^{1+\epsilon}$  we have

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

where

$$S(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_g(n) \chi(n) n^{-it} V\left(\frac{n}{N}\right),$$

and  $V(x) \in C_c^{\infty}[1,2]$  with  $V^{(j)}(x) \ll_j 1$ . Thus Theorem 1.1 follows directly from Theorem 1.2 on choosing  $\phi(x) = -\log x/2\pi$ , T = t, and  $\Delta = 1$ .

#### Z. GAO, S. LUO, AND Z. QI

#### References

- [Agg] K. Aggarwal. Weyl bound for GL(2) in t-aspect via a simple delta method. J. Number Theory, 208:72– 100, 2020.
- [AHLQ] K. Aggarwal, R. Holowinsky, Y. Lin, and Z. Qi. A Bessel delta method and exponential sums for GL(2). Q. J. Math., 71(3):1143–1168, 2020.
- [AHLS] K. Aggarwal, R. Holowinsky, Y. Lin, and Q. Sun. The Burgess bound via a trivial delta method. *Ramanujan J.*, 53(1):49–74, 2020.
- [AKMS] R. Acharya, S. Kumar, G. Maiti, and S. K. Singh. Subconvexity bound for GL(2) L-functions: t-aspect. Acta Arith., 194(2):111–133, 2020.
- [AS] K. Aggarwal and S. K. Singh. Subconvexity bound for GL(2) *L*-functions: *t*-aspect. *Mathematika*, 67(1):71–99, 2021.
- [Ass] E. Assing. Adelic Voronoï summation and subconvexity for *GL*(2) *L*-functions in the depth aspect. *Int. J. Number Theory*, 17(7):1537–1568, 2021.
- [BFW] O.Balkanova, D.Frolenkov, and H. Wu. On Weyl's subconvex bound for cube-free Hecke characters: totally real case. arXiv:2108.12283, to appear in J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 2021.
- [BH] V. Blomer and G. Harcos. Hybrid bounds for twisted L-functions. J. Reine Angew. Math., 621:53–79, 2008. Addendum, *ibid.*, 694:241–244, 2014.
- [BJN] V. Blomer, S. Jana, and P. D. Nelson. The Weyl bound for triple product *L*-functions. *Duke Math. J.*, 172(6):1173–1234, 2023.
- [BM] V. Blomer and D. Milićević. p-adic analytic twists and strong subconvexity. Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4), 48(3):561–605, 2015.
- [BMN] A. R. Booker, M. B. Milinovich, and N. Ng. Subconvexity for modular form *L*-functions in the *t* aspect. *Adv. Math.*, 341:299–335, 2019.
- [Bou] J. Bourgain. Decoupling, exponential sums and the Riemann zeta function. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 30(1):205–224, 2017.
- [Bur1] D. A. Burgess. On character sums and L-series. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3), 12:193–206, 1962.
- [Bur2] D. A. Burgess. On character sums and L-series. II. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3), 13:524–536, 1963.
- [Byk] V. A. Bykovskiĭ. A trace formula for the scalar product of Hecke series and its applications. Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI), 226(Anal. Teor. Chisel i Teor. Funktsiĭ. 13):14–36, 235–236, 1996.
- [CI] J. B. Conrey and H. Iwaniec. The cubic moment of central values of automorphic L-functions. Ann. of Math. (2), 151(3):1175–1216, 2000.
- [Del] P. Deligne. La conjecture de Weil. I. Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math., (43):273–307, 1974.
- [DF11] W. Duke, J. Friedlander, and H. Iwaniec. Bounds for automorphic L-functions. Invent. Math., 112(1):1– 8, 1993.
- [DFI2] W. Duke, J. B. Friedlander, and H. Iwaniec. Bounds for automorphic L-functions. II. Invent. Math., 115(2):219–239, 1994.
- [DS] P. Deligne and J.-P. Serre. Formes modulaires de poids 1. Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4), 7:507–530 (1975), 1974.
- [FS] Y. Fan and Q. Sun. A Bessel  $\delta$ -method and hybrid bounds for GL<sub>2</sub>. Q. J. Math., 73(2):617–656, 2022.
- [GK] S. W. Graham and G. Kolesnik. van der Corput's method of exponential sums, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, Vol. 126. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [GM] A. Ghosh and K. Mallesham. Sub-Weyl strength bounds for twisted GL(2) short character sums. *arXiv*:2209.09479, 2022.
- [Goo] A. Good. The square mean of Dirichlet series associated with cusp forms. *Mathematika*, 29(2):278–295 (1983), 1982.
- [HB1] D. R. Heath-Brown. Hybrid bounds for Dirichlet L-functions. Invent. Math., 47(2):149–170, 1978.
- [HB2] D. R. Heath-Brown. Hybrid bounds for Dirichlet *L*-functions. II. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.* (2), 31(122):157–167, 1980.
- [HH] J. Hoffstein and T. A. Hulse. Multiple Dirichlet series and shifted convolutions. J. Number Theory, 161:457–533, 2016. With an appendix by A. Reznikov.
- [HMQ] R. Holowinsky, R. Munshi, and Z. Qi. Beyond the Weyl barrier for GL(2) exponential sums. Adv. Math., 426:Paper No. 109099, 43, 2023.

- [Hux] M. N. Huxley. Area, Lattice Points, and Exponential Sums, London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series, Vol. 13. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, 1996. Oxford Science Publications.
- [IK] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski. Analytic Number Theory, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, Vol. 53. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [IS] H. Iwaniec and P. Sarnak. Perspectives on the analytic theory of *L*-functions. Special Volume, Part II, pages 705–741. 2000. GAFA 2000 (Tel Aviv, 1999).
- [JM] M. Jutila and Y. Motohashi. Uniform bound for Hecke L-functions. Acta Math., 195:61–115, 2005.
- [Jut1] M. Jutila. Lectures on a Method in the Theory of Exponential Sums, Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Lectures on Mathematics and Physics, Vol. 80. Published for the Tata Institute of Fundamental Research, Bombay; by Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987.
- [Jut2] M. Jutila. Transformations of exponential sums. Proceedings of the Amalfi Conference on Analytic Number Theory (Maiori, 1989), pages 263–270. Univ. Salerno, Salerno, 1992.
- [Jut3] M. Jutila. The additive divisor problem and its analogs for Fourier coefficients of cusp forms. I. Math. Z, 223(3):435–461, 1996.
- [Jut4] M. Jutila. The additive divisor problem and its analogs for Fourier coefficients of cusp forms. II. Math. Z., 225(4):625–637, 1997.
- [Jut5] M. Jutila. Mean values of Dirichlet series via Laplace transforms. Analytic number theory (Kyoto, 1996), London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., Vol. 247, pages 169–207. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1997.
- [KMV] E. Kowalski, P. Michel, and J. VanderKam. Rankin–Selberg L-functions in the level aspect. Duke Math. J., 114(1):123–191, 2002.
- [Kua] C. I. Kuan. Hybrid bounds on twisted *L*-functions associated with modular forms. J. Number Theory, 189:380–416, 2018.
- [Lan] E. Landau. Über die ζ-Funktion und die L-Funktionen. Math. Z., 20(1):105–125, 1924.
- [Lit] J. E. Littlewood. Researches in the theory of the Riemann ζ-function. Proc. London Math. Soc., 20(2):Records xxii–xxviii, 1922.
- [LLY] Y.-K. Lau, J. Liu, and Y. Ye. A new bound  $k^{2/3+\epsilon}$  for Rankin-Selberg *L*-functions for Hecke congruence subgroups. *IMRP Int. Math. Res. Pap.*, pages Art. ID 35090, 78, 2006.
- [Meu] T. Meurman. On the order of the Maass L-function on the critical line. Number theory, Vol. 1 (Budapest, 1987), Colloq. Math. Soc. János Bolyai, Vol. 51, pages 325–354. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1990.
- [Mil] D. Milićević. Sub-Weyl subconvexity for Dirichlet *L*-functions to prime power moduli. *Compos. Math.*, 152(4):825–875, 2016.
- [MS] R. Munshi and S. K. Singh. Weyl bound for *p*-power twist of GL(2) *L*-functions. Algebra Number Theory, 13(6):1395–1413, 2019.
- [Mun1] R. Munshi. The circle method and bounds for L-functions—I. Math. Ann., 358(1-2):389-401, 2014.
- [Mun2] R. Munshi. The circle method and bounds for L-functions—II: Subconvexity for twists of GL(3) L-functions. Amer. J. Math., 137(3):791–812, 2015.
- [Mun3] R. Munshi. The circle method and bounds for L-functions—III: t-aspect subconvexity for GL(3) L-functions. J. Amer. Math. Soc., 28(4):913–938, 2015.
- [Mun4] R. Munshi. The circle method and bounds for L-functions—IV: Subconvexity for twists of GL(3) L-functions. Ann. of Math. (2), 182(2):617–672, 2015.
- [Mun5] R. Munshi. A note on Burgess bound. Geometry, algebra, number theory, and their information technology applications, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., Vol. 251, pages 273–289. Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [MV] P. Michel and A. Venkatesh. The subconvexity problem for GL<sub>2</sub>. Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci., (111):171–271, 2010.
- [Nel] P. D. Nelson. Eisenstein series and the cubic moment for PGL(2). arXiv:1911.06310, 2019.
- [PY1] I. Petrow and M. P. Young. The Weyl bound for Dirichlet L-functions of cube-free conductor. Ann. of Math. (2), 192(2):437–486, 2020.
- [PY2] I. Petrow and M. P. Young. The fourth moment of Dirichlet L-functions along a coset and the Weyl bound. arXiv:1908.10346, to appear in Duke Math. J., 2019.
- [Tit] E. C. Titchmarsh. *The theory of the Riemann zeta-function*. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, second edition, 1986. Edited and with a preface by D. R. Heath-Brown.
- [Wey1] H. Weyl. Über die Gleichverteilung von Zahlen mod. Eins. Math. Ann., 77(3):313–352, 1916.
- [Wey2] H. Weyl. Zur Abschätzung von  $\zeta(1 + ti)$ . Math. Z., 10:88–101, 1921.
- [Wu] H. Wu. Burgess-like subconvex bounds for  $GL_2 \times GL_1$ . Geom. Funct. Anal., 24(3):968–1036, 2014.

#### Z. GAO, S. LUO, AND Z. QI

- [WX] H. Wu and P. Xi. A uniform Weyl bound for *L*-functions of Hilbert modular forms. *arXiv:2302.14652*, 2023.
- [You] M. P. Young. Weyl-type hybrid subconvexity bounds for twisted L-functions and Heegner points on shrinking sets. J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), 19(5):1545–1576, 2017.

School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China *Email address*: zxgao@zju.edu.cn

School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan, 250100, China *Email address*: shu.luo@mail.sdu.edu.cn

School of Mathematical Sciences, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou, 310027, China *Email address*: zhi.qi@zju.edu.cn

24