

# QUATERNARY QUADRATIC FORMS WITH PRIME DISCRIMINANT

JEREMY ROUSE AND KATHERINE THOMPSON

ABSTRACT. Let  $Q$  be a positive-definite quaternary quadratic form with prime discriminant. We give an explicit lower bound on the number of representations of a positive integer  $n$  by  $Q$ . This problem is connected with deriving an upper bound on the Petersson norm  $\langle C, C \rangle$  of the cuspidal part of the theta series of  $Q$ . We derive an upper bound on  $\langle C, C \rangle$  that depends on the smallest positive integer not represented by the dual form  $Q^*$ . In addition, we give a non-trivial upper bound on the sum of the integers  $n$  excepted by  $Q$ .

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF RESULTS

The study of which integers are represented by a positive-definite quadratic form is an old one. After initial predominantly algebraic results from Euler, Lagrange and Legendre, in the 19th century beginning with Jacobi's formula for the number of representations of an integer by the sum of four squares, analytic techniques of increasing complexity have been applied. Towards the classification specifically of universal positive-definite quadratic forms (those which represent all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) were results from Ramanujan [17], Dickson, and eventually the Conway-Schneeberger 15-Theorem [2] and the Bhargava-Hanke 290-Theorem [3]. With almost universal forms (forms which are not universal and which fail to represent finitely-many  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ) or with forms which represent entire congruence classes are recent works respectively of Barowsky et. al [1] and Rouse [18]. Additionally, in the development of the theory of modular forms (and in particular bounds on cusp forms) are results by Tartakowsky [24], Ono-Soundararajan [14], and Schulze-Pillot [21].

To give specific context to the results in this paper, we highlight a few predecessors. First, recall that a quadratic form  $Q$  in  $r$  variables is anisotropic at a prime  $p$  if the only solution to  $Q(\vec{x}) = 0$  with  $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^r$  is  $\vec{x} = \vec{0}$ . If  $Q = \frac{1}{2}\vec{x}^T A \vec{x}$ , where  $A$  is an  $r \times r$  symmetric matrix with integer entries and even diagonal entries, we let  $D(Q) = \det(A)$  be the discriminant of  $Q$ . With that, we begin with the following result:

**Theorem** (Tartakowsky, 1929). *Let  $Q$  be a positive-definite quadratic form in 4 variables and fix an integer  $k \geq 0$ . Then there is a constant  $C(Q, k)$  such that if  $n$  is a positive integer with  $n \geq C(Q, k)$  and  $\text{ord}_p(n) \leq k$  for all anisotropic primes  $p$ , then  $n$  is represented by  $Q$ .*

A number of more recent projects including [5] and [20] have given bounds on the quantity  $C(Q, k)$  for forms in four or more variables. In [18], the first author proved the following result regarding forms with fundamental discriminant (which do not have any anisotropic primes):

**Theorem** (Rouse, 2014). *If  $D(Q)$  is a fundamental discriminant and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is a constant  $C_\epsilon$  so that all positive integers  $n \geq C_\epsilon D(Q)^{2+\epsilon}$  are represented by  $Q$ .*

The above result cannot be made effective because of the possibility of a Dirichlet  $L$ -function  $L(s, \chi)$  having a Siegel zero. The goal of the present paper is to prove a stronger result and make it completely effective in the case that  $D(Q) = p$  is a prime number. If  $Q = \frac{1}{2}\vec{x}^T A \vec{x}$  is such a form, the dual form  $Q^* = \frac{1}{2}\vec{x}^T pA^{-1}\vec{x}$  also has level  $p$ . Let  $\min Q^*$  denote the smallest positive integer represented by  $Q^*$ . Also, let  $M(n) = \max_{1 \leq m \leq n} \tau(m)$ . Note that  $M(n) = O(n^\epsilon)$  for all  $\epsilon > 0$ . More precisely, the bound  $M(n) \leq n^{\frac{1.538 \log(2)}{\log \log(n)}}$  for  $n \geq 3$  is proven in [13].

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $Q$  be a positive-definite quaternary quadratic form with prime discriminant  $p$ . Let  $n$  be a positive integer, and denote by  $\phi(n)$  Euler's totient, and  $\tau(n)$  the number of divisors of  $n$ . If  $p \geq 101$ , then*

$$r_Q(n) \geq \frac{24}{p^{3/2}}(p-1)\phi(n) - 23.85 \sqrt{p \log(p) \left( \frac{1}{\min Q^*} + \frac{3216.66M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}} \right)} \tau(n)n^{1/2}$$

where  $r_Q(n) := \#\{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^4 | Q(\vec{x}) = n\}$ .

**Remark.** *The inequality above shows that  $r_Q(n) > 0$  provided that  $n \gg \max \left\{ \frac{p^{2+\epsilon}}{\min Q^*}, p^{7/4+\epsilon} \right\}$ .*

The method of proof is to take  $\theta_Q(z) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} r_Q(n)q^n$ ,  $q = e^{2\pi iz}$  and decompose it as  $\theta_Q(z) = E(z) + C(z)$  into an Eisenstein series and a cusp form. The cusp form in turn may be decomposed as

$$C(z) = \sum_i c_i g_i(z)$$

where each  $g_i(z)$  is a newform. The Deligne bound on the Fourier coefficients of  $g_i(z)$  implies that the  $n$ th coefficient is bounded above by  $\tau(n) \sqrt{n}$ . It suffices then to estimate the coefficients  $c_i$ . We do this by using the orthogonality of the Petersson inner product and finding an upper bound on  $\langle C, C \rangle$ , and using a lower bound on  $\langle g_i, g_i \rangle$  from [18]. We obtain the following:

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose that  $Q$  is a positive-definite form  $Q$  in four-variables with prime discriminant  $p$ . Then*

$$\langle C, C \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\min Q^*} + \frac{3216.66M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}}.$$

When  $\min Q^*$  is small ( $\ll p^{1/4}$ ), our upper bound on  $\langle C, C \rangle$  matches the lower bound given by Waibel in [25].

**Theorem** (Waibel, 2020). *Suppose that  $Q$  is a positive-definite form in  $r$ -variables. Then*

$$\langle C, C \rangle \gg \frac{1}{[\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : \Gamma_0(N(Q))]} \left( \frac{N(Q)^{r/2}}{D(Q)} (\min Q^*)^{1-\frac{r}{2}} + O(N(Q)^\epsilon) \right).$$

The result above is stated using our normalization of the Petersson norm, which differs from that used by Waibel in [25]. In our case,  $r = 4$ ,  $N(Q) = D(Q) = p$ .

As a consequence of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we obtain a non-trivial bound on the sum of the integers not represented by  $Q$ .

**Corollary 3.** *Assume the notation above. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{n \\ r_Q(n)=0}} n \ll \max \left\{ \frac{p^{3+\epsilon}}{(\min Q^*)^2}, p^{5/2+\epsilon} \right\}.$$

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we introduce notation and review necessary background. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 2 and use that to prove Theorem 1. In Section 4, we prove Corollary 3. Last, in Section 5 we provide an example of an infinite family of forms of prime discriminant along with the complete classification of their excepted values.

## 2. BACKGROUND

Throughout, we use the word “form” to denote a positive-definite, integer-valued, quaternary quadratic form  $Q(\vec{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \vec{x}^T A \vec{x}$ . The **determinant**  $D(Q)$  of the form is the determinant of  $A$ . The **level**  $N = N(Q)$  of the form is the smallest integer such that  $NA^{-1}$  is an integral matrix with even diagonal entries. Let

$$r_Q(n) := \#\{\vec{x} \in \mathbb{Z}^4 | Q(\vec{x}) = n\}$$

denote the **representation number of  $n$  by  $Q$**  and define the **theta series of  $Q$** ,

$$\Theta_Q(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} r_Q(n) q^n \quad q = e^{2\pi iz}.$$

It is well-known that  $\Theta_Q \in \mathcal{M}_2(\Gamma_0(N(Q)), \chi_{D(Q)})$ , and decomposes as

$$\Theta_Q(z) = E(z) + C(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_E(n) q^n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_C(n) q^n.$$

where  $E(z)$  is the Eisenstein series contribution and where  $C(z)$  is the cusp form contribution.

Siegel expressed  $a_E(n)$  as a product of local densities.

**Theorem 4** (Siegel). *We have*

$$a_E(n) = \prod_{p \leq \infty} \beta_p(n)$$

where the product is over primes  $p$  and for finite  $p$ ,

$$\beta_q(n) = \lim_{v \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{\vec{x} \in (\mathbb{Z}/p^v\mathbb{Z})^4 \mid Q(\vec{x}) \equiv n \pmod{p^v}\}}{p^{3v}},$$

while

$$\beta_{\infty}(n) = \frac{4\pi^2 n}{\sqrt{\det(A)}}.$$

*Proof.* The formula for  $\beta_{\infty}$  is a special case of Hilfssatz 72 of [22]. Note that Siegel's normalization of  $A$  is different from ours, hence our correction with the factor of 4.  $\square$

In practice, for the finite places we rely on computational methods of Hanke, outlined in [7]. Let  $R_{p^v}(n) := \#\{\vec{x} \in (\mathbb{Z}/p^v\mathbb{Z})^4 \mid Q(\vec{x}) \equiv n \pmod{p^v}\}$  and set  $r_{p^v}(n) := \#R_{p^v}(n)$ . We say  $\vec{x} \in R_{p^v}(n)$

- is of **Zero type** if  $\vec{x} \equiv \vec{0} \pmod{p}$ , in which case we say  $\vec{x} \in R_{p^v}^{\text{Zero}}(n)$  with  $r_{p^v}^{\text{Zero}}(n) := \#R_{p^v}^{\text{Zero}}(n)$ ;
- is of **Good type** if  $p^{v_j} x_j \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  for some  $j \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ , in which case we say  $\vec{x} \in R_{p^v}^{\text{Good}}(n)$  with  $r_{p^v}^{\text{Good}}(n) := \#R_{p^v}^{\text{Good}}(n)$ ;
- and is of **Bad type** otherwise, in which case we say  $\vec{x} \in R_{p^v}^{\text{Bad}}(n)$  with  $r_{p^v}^{\text{Bad}}(n) := \#R_{p^v}^{\text{Bad}}(n)$ .

If  $r_{p^v}(n) > 0$  for all primes  $p$  and for all  $v \in \mathbb{N}$ , we say that  $n$  is **locally represented**. If  $Q(\vec{x}) = 0$  has only the trivial solution over  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ , we say that  $p$  is an **anisotropic prime** for  $Q$ .

In the following theorems, we discuss reduction maps that allow for explicit calculation of local densities. Let the **multiplicity of a map**  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  at a **given**  $y \in Y$  be  $\#\{x \in X \mid f(x) = y\}$ . If all  $y \in Y$  have the same multiplicity  $M$ , we say that the map has multiplicity  $M$ .

**Theorem.** *We have*

$$r_{p^{k+\ell}}^{\text{Good}}(n) = p^{3\ell} r_{p^k}^{\text{Good}}(n)$$

for  $k \geq 1$  for  $p$  odd and for  $k \geq 3$  for  $p = 2$ .

*Proof.* See [7, Lemma 3.2].  $\square$

**Theorem.** *The map*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_Z : R_{p^k}^{\text{Zero}}(n) &\rightarrow R_{p^{k-2}}\left(\frac{n}{p^2}\right) \\ \vec{x} &\mapsto p^{-1}\vec{x} \pmod{p^{k-2}} \end{aligned}$$

is a surjective map with multiplicity  $p^4$ .

*Proof.* See [7, pg. 359]. □

**Theorem.** *Write  $Q$  in its local normalized form*

$$Q(\vec{x}) = \sum p^{v_j} Q_j(\vec{x}_j)$$

where  $\dim(Q_j) \leq 2$ . Let  $\mathbb{S}_0 = \{j | v_j = 0\}$ ,  $\mathbb{S}_1 = \{j | v_j = 1\}$  and  $\mathbb{S}_2 = \{j | v_j \geq 2\}$ .

- *Bad-Type-I solutions occur when  $\mathbb{S}_1 \neq \emptyset$  and  $\vec{x}_{\mathbb{S}_1} \not\equiv \vec{0}$ . The map*

$$\pi_{B'} : R_{p^k, Q}^{\text{Bad-I}}(n) \rightarrow R_{p^{k-1}, Q'}^{\text{Good}}\left(\frac{n}{p}\right)$$

which is defined for each index  $j$  by

$$\begin{aligned} x_j &\mapsto p^{-1}x_j & v'_j &= v_j + 1, & j &\in \mathbb{S}_0 \\ x_j &\mapsto x_j & v'_j &= v_j - 1, & j &\notin \mathbb{S}_0 \end{aligned}$$

is surjective with multiplicity  $p^{s_1+s_2}$ .

- *Bad-Type-II solutions can only occur when  $\mathbb{S}_2 \neq \emptyset$  and involves either  $\mathbb{S}_1 = \emptyset$  or  $\vec{x}_{\mathbb{S}_1} \equiv \vec{0}$ . The map*

$$\pi_{B''} : R_{p^k, Q}^{\text{Bad-II}}(n) \rightarrow R_{p^{k-2}, Q''}^{\vec{x}_{\mathbb{S}_2} \not\equiv \vec{0}}\left(\frac{n}{p^2}\right)$$

which is defined for each index  $j$  by

$$\begin{aligned} x_j &\mapsto p^{-1}x_j & v''_j &= v_j, & j &\in \mathbb{S}_0 \cup \mathbb{S}_1 \\ x_j &\mapsto x_j & v''_j &= v_j - 2, & j &\notin \mathbb{S}_2 \end{aligned}$$

is surjective with multiplicity  $p^{8-s_0-s_1}$ .

*Proof.* Again, see [7, pg. 360]. □

To estimate  $a_C(n)$ , we use techniques from [18], which we now review. Assume that  $D(Q)$  is a fundamental discriminant and decompose  $C(z) = \sum_{i=1}^s c_i g_i(z)$  as a linear combination of newforms. Here  $s = \dim S_2(\Gamma_0(N(Q)), \chi_{D_Q})$ . The Deligne bound gives

$$|a_C(n)| \leq \left( \sum_{i=1}^s |c_i| \right) \tau(n) \sqrt{n}$$

where  $\tau(n)$  denotes the number of positive divisors of  $n$ . To estimate  $\sum_{i=1}^s |c_i|$  we find an upper bound on  $\sum_{i=1}^s |c_i|^2$  and use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^s |c_i| \leq \sqrt{s} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^s |c_i|^2}.$$

The Petersson inner product of two cusp forms  $f, g \in S_2(\Gamma_0(N(Q)), \chi_{D(Q)})$  is given by

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \frac{3}{\pi[\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : \Gamma_0(N(Q))]} \iint_{\mathbb{H}/\Gamma_0(N(Q))} f(x+iy) \overline{g(x+iy)} dx dy.$$

Distinct newforms are orthogonal and this gives

$$\langle C, C \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^s |c_i|^2 \langle g_i, g_i \rangle.$$

**Proposition 5.** *If  $p$  is a prime and  $g_i \in S_2(\Gamma_0(p), \chi_p)$  is a newform, then*

$$\langle g_i, g_i \rangle \geq \frac{3p}{208\pi^4(p+1)\log(p)}.$$

*Proof.* Theorem 8 of [18] gives that the value at  $s = 1$  of the adjoint square  $L$ -function  $L(\mathrm{Ad}^2 g_i, s)$  is  $\frac{8\pi^4}{3}(1+1/p)\langle g_i, g_i \rangle$ . Proposition 11 of [18] shows that if  $g_i$  is a non-CM newform, then  $L(\mathrm{Ad}^2 g_i, 1) > \frac{1}{26\log(p)}$ . Finally, a CM newform in weight  $k \geq 2$  must arise from a Hecke character attached to an imaginary quadratic field  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{d})$  and takes the value

$$\xi((a)) = \left( \frac{a}{|a|} \right)^{k-1}$$

for all  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$  with  $a \equiv 1 \pmod{\mathfrak{m}}$ . Here  $\mathfrak{m}$  is the modulus of the Hecke character. Theorem 12.5 of [8] gives that the level of such a newform is  $d(\mathcal{O}_K)|N(\mathfrak{m})|$  where  $d(\mathcal{O}_K)$  is the discriminant of  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . If the level is a prime  $p$ , then  $d(\mathcal{O}_K) = p$  and  $|N(\mathfrak{m})| = 1$ , but this implies that  $\xi((1)) = 1$  and  $\xi((-1)) = -1$ . Since the ideals  $(1)$  and  $(-1)$  are equal this implies there are no prime level CM newforms of weight 2.  $\square$

**Remark.** *The above result is the key place in this paper where we use the assumption that the discriminant of  $Q$  is prime. Most of the rest of the paper extends to any form with fundamental discriminant.*

It suffices to find an upper bound on  $\langle C, C \rangle$ . For this task, we let  $Q^* = \frac{1}{2}\vec{x}^T N(Q) A_Q^{-1} \vec{x}$  be the dual form to  $Q$ . Let  $\theta_{Q^*} = E^* + C^*$  be the decomposition into an Eisenstein series and a cusp form. The Fricke involution  $W_N$  sends  $\theta_Q$  to  $\sqrt{N(Q)}\theta_{Q^*}$  and is an isometry for the Petersson inner product and therefore  $\langle C, C \rangle = N\langle C^*, C^* \rangle$ . Moreover, the form  $C^* = \sum a_{C^*}(n)q^n$  has the property that  $a_{C^*}(n) = 0$  if  $\chi_{D(Q)}(n) = 0$  or 1 and so  $C^* \in S_2^-(\Gamma_0(N(Q)), \chi_{D(Q)})$  (see Proposition 15 of [18]). Proposition 14 of [18] then gives that

$$\langle C^*, C^* \rangle = \frac{1}{[\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : \Gamma_0(N(Q))]} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(\mathrm{gcd}(n, N(Q)))} a_{C^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d \sqrt{\frac{n}{N(Q)}}\right),$$

where

$$\psi(x) = -\frac{6}{\pi} x K_1(4\pi x) + 24x^2 K_0(4\pi x),$$

where  $K_0$  and  $K_1$  are the usual  $K$ -Bessel functions. We use these formulas to estimate  $\langle C, C \rangle$ .

### 3. THE LARGEST EXCEPTED VALUE

In this section we explicitly find  $a_E(m)$  and give bounds on  $a_C(m)$  to prove Theorems 1 and 2.

3.1. **The Eisenstein Series.** First, the Eisenstein subspace is 2 dimensional (see the details of the Proof of Theorem 5 of [6]) and is spanned by

$$G(z) = 1 + \frac{2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{d|n} d \chi_p(d) \right) q^n, \text{ and}$$

$$H(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \sum_{d|n} d \chi_p(n/d) \right) q^n.$$

Therefore, to express  $E(z)$  as a linear combination of  $G(z)$  and  $H(z)$ , it suffices to note that  $a_E(0) = 1$  due to  $Q$  being positive definite, and to find  $a_E(1)$ :

**Theorem 6.**  $a_E(1) = \frac{-2(p-1)}{L(-1, \chi_p)}.$

*Proof.* Siegel's local density formula (Theorem 4) gives

$$a_E(1) = \prod_{q \leq \infty} \beta_q(1)$$

$$= \beta_{\infty}(1) \beta_2(1) \beta_p(1) \left( \prod_{q \nmid 2p} \beta_q(1) \right).$$

We have  $\beta_{\infty}(1) = \frac{4\pi^2}{\sqrt{p}}$ . For  $\beta_2(1)$ , noting via the language of [7] that all solutions are of Good-type, one can see that  $\beta_2(1) = \frac{4 - \chi_p(2)}{4}$ . The local density at  $p$  can be computed using [26] which gives  $\beta_p(1) = 1 - \frac{1}{p}$ . Last, for the remaining infinitely many primes, taking a restricted look at Theorem 4 gives

$$\prod_{q \nmid 2p} \beta_q(1) = \prod_{q \nmid 2p} \left( 1 - \frac{\chi_p(q)}{q^2} \right)$$

$$= L(2, \chi_p)^{-1} \left( \frac{4}{4 - \chi_p(2)} \right).$$

Techniques outlined on page 104 of [9] show that

$$L(2, \chi_p) = -\frac{2\pi^2}{p\sqrt{p}} L(-1, \chi_p)$$

and hence

$$\prod_{q \nmid 2p} \beta_q(1) = -\frac{p\sqrt{p}}{2\pi^2 L(-1, \chi_p)} \left( \frac{4}{4 - \chi_p(2)} \right).$$

Putting everything together, we have

$$a_E(1) = \beta_{\infty}(1) \beta_2(1) \beta_p(1) \left( \prod_{q \nmid 2p} \beta_q(1) \right)$$

$$= \left( \frac{4\pi^2}{\sqrt{p}} \right) \left( \frac{4 - \chi_p(2)}{4} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) \left( -\frac{p\sqrt{p}}{2\pi^2 L(-1, \chi_p)} \left( \frac{4}{4 - \chi_p(2)} \right) \right)$$

$$= \frac{-2(p-1)}{L(-1, \chi_p)},$$

as originally claimed. □

As a result of Theorem 6, we now can write

$$E(z) = G(z) - \frac{2p}{L(-1, \chi_p)} H(z).$$

Moreover, the  $n$ th coefficient of the Eisenstein series is

$$a_E(n) = -\frac{2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \sum_{d|n} d(p\chi_p(n/d) - \chi_p(d)).$$

Replacing  $d$  with  $n/d$  simplifies this to

$$a_E(n) = -\frac{2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \sum_{d|n} \left(\frac{pn}{d} - d\right) \chi_p(d).$$

**Theorem 7.** For all  $n$ ,

$$a_E(n) \geq \frac{24}{p^{3/2}}(p-1)\phi(n).$$

*Proof.* Throughout we write  $n^* = n/p^{\text{ord}_p(n)}$ . We first note

$$\begin{aligned} a_E(n) &= -\frac{2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \sum_{d|n^*} \left(\frac{pn}{d} - d\right) \chi_p(d) \\ &= \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (pn - n^* \chi_p(n^*)) \sum_{d|n^*} \frac{\chi_p(d)}{d} \\ &\geq \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (pn - n^* \chi_p(n^*)) \sum_{d|n^*} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \\ &\geq \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (pn - n^*) \frac{\phi(n^*)}{n^*}. \end{aligned}$$

When  $\text{ord}_p(n) = 0$ ,

$$\frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (pn - n^*) \frac{\phi(n^*)}{n^*} = \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (p-1)\phi(n)$$

and if  $\text{ord}_p(n) = k \geq 1$  then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (pn - n^*) \frac{\phi(n^*)}{n^*} &\geq \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (p^{k+1}n^* - n^*) \frac{\phi(n^*)}{n^*} = \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (p^{k+1} - 1)\phi(n^*) \\ &\geq \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \frac{p^{k+1} - 1}{p^k - p^{k-1}} \phi(n) \\ &\geq \frac{-2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} (p-1)\phi(n). \end{aligned}$$

As  $L(-1, \chi_p) = -\frac{p^{3/2}}{2\pi^2} L(2, \chi_p)$  and  $|L(2, \chi_p)| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$ ,

$$-\frac{2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \geq \frac{4\pi^2}{p^{3/2}} \cdot \frac{6}{\pi^2} = \frac{24}{p^{3/2}}$$

and the claim holds.  $\square$

**3.2. The Cusp Series.** We begin with

$$C(z) = \sum_{i=1}^s c_i g_i$$

where  $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$ , the  $g_i(z)$  are newforms in  $S_2(\Gamma_0(p), \chi_p)$  and  $s = \dim S_2(\Gamma_0(p), \chi_p) = 2 \left\lfloor \frac{p-5}{24} \right\rfloor$ . Bounds of Deligne give

$$|a_C(n)| \leq C_Q \tau(n) \sqrt{n},$$

where  $C_Q = \sum_{i=1}^s |c_i|$ . In order to determine an upper bound on  $C_Q$  we first note that the Petersson norm of  $C$  is

$$\langle C, C \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^s |c_i|^2 \langle g_i, g_i \rangle.$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality gives

$$C_Q \leq \sqrt{\frac{As}{B}}$$

where  $\langle C, C \rangle \leq A$  and  $\langle g_i, g_i \rangle \geq B$  for all  $i$ . We will take  $s \leq \frac{p}{12}$ . Proposition 5 above gives  $B = \frac{3}{208\pi^4} \cdot \frac{p}{(p+1)\log(p)}$ . More taxing is effectively computing  $A$ , which we discuss in the following subsection.

**3.3. Computing  $A \geq \langle C, C \rangle$ .** Recall that

$$\langle C, C \rangle = \frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} a_{C^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi \left( d \sqrt{\frac{n}{p}} \right)$$

where  $\omega$  counts the number of distinct prime divisors and where

$$\psi(x) = -\frac{6}{\pi} x K_1(4\pi x) + 24x^2 K_0(4\pi x).$$

Note that  $\psi(x) \leq 24x^2 K_0(4\pi x)$  and (by equation (9) on page 1724 of [18]),  $K_0(x) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2x}} e^{-x}$ . Therefore  $\psi(x) \leq 6\sqrt{2}x^{3/2}e^{-4\pi x}$ . We begin by bounding the second sum in  $d$ :

**Lemma 8.** *The function  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx)$  is decreasing for  $x > 0$ . Also, for all  $x$ ,  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx) \leq \frac{3}{4\pi^2}$  and if  $x > 0.5$*

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx) \leq 9x^{3/2} e^{-4\pi x}.$$

*Proof.* Choosing  $\psi(0) = \frac{3}{2\pi^2}$  and  $\psi(-x) = \psi(x)$  if  $x < 0$  makes  $\psi$  into a continuous, even function. Let  $f(x) = \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx)$ . The Weierstrass  $M$ -test shows that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\psi'(nx)$  converges uniformly on compact subsets of  $(0, \infty)$  and thus  $f'(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\psi'(nx)$ . We have that

$$\psi'(x) = 72xK_1(4\pi x) \left( \frac{K_0(4\pi x)}{K_1(4\pi x)} - \frac{4}{3}\pi x \right).$$

So  $K_1(4\pi x) > 0$  for all  $x > 0$  and [23] shows that  $\frac{K_1(x)}{K_0(x)} > 1$  for  $x > 0$ . This implies that  $f'(x) < 0$  if  $x > \frac{3}{4\pi}$ .

The Poisson summation formula applied to  $x\psi'(x)$  gives

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\psi'(nx) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{-18n^2 x(n^2 - 6x^2)}{\pi^2(n^2 + 4x^2)^{7/2}}.$$

If  $x < 1/\sqrt{6}$ , every term on the right hand side is negative and therefore  $f'(x) < 0$ . Since  $1/\sqrt{6} > \frac{3}{4\pi}$  we have  $f'(x) < 0$  for all  $x$  and this proves that  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx)$  is decreasing.



Similarly, applying Poisson summation to  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx)$  we see

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx) = \frac{3}{4\pi^2} + \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{x} \hat{\psi}(d/x),$$

where  $\hat{\psi}$  is the Fourier transform of  $\psi$  and

$$\hat{\psi}(y) = -\frac{9y^2}{\pi^2(4+y^2)^{5/2}}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx) &= \frac{3}{4\pi^2} - \frac{9}{\pi^2} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{(d/x)^2}{(4+(d/x)^2)^{5/2}} \cdot \frac{1}{x} \\ &= \frac{3}{4\pi^2} - \frac{9}{\pi^2} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{d^2 x^2}{(4x^2 + d^2)^{5/2}} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{4\pi^2}. \end{aligned}$$

At the same time

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx) &\leq 6\sqrt{2} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} (dx)^{3/2} e^{-4\pi dx} \\ &\leq 6\sqrt{2} x^{3/2} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} d^2 e^{-4\pi dx} \\ &\leq \frac{6\sqrt{2} x^{3/2} (1 + e^{-4\pi x}) e^{-4\pi x}}{(1 - e^{-4\pi x})^3}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if  $x \geq 0.5$  we have

$$\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx) \leq 9x^{3/2} e^{-4\pi x}$$

as desired. □

For the sum in  $n$ , we use  $|a_{C^*}(n)| \leq r_{Q^*}(n) + a_{E^*}(n)$  which in turn will give the bound

$$|a_{C^*}(n)|^2 \leq r_{Q^*}(n)^2 + 2r_{Q^*}(n)a_{E^*}(n) + a_{E^*}(n)^2 \leq 2r_{Q^*}(n)^2 + 2a_{E^*}(n)^2.$$

We now bound the representation number and Eisenstein components separately. We begin with the Eisenstein contribution to  $\langle C, C \rangle$ :

**Lemma 9.**

$$\frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} \cdot 2a_{E^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right) \leq \frac{337.26 \log(p+2) + 206.64}{p}.$$

*Proof.* The proof of Proposition 15 of [18] shows that  $E^*(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_{E^*}(n)q^n$  has the property that  $a_{E^*}(n) = 0$  if  $n$  is a quadratic residue modulo  $p$ . Equation (14) of [6] gives a formula for the unique Eisenstein series with this property and implies that

$$a_{E^*}(n) = \frac{2}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \sum_{d|n} d(\chi_p(d) - \chi_p(n/d))$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} a_{E^*}(n) &\leq -\frac{4}{L(-1, \chi_p)} \sigma(n) \\ &\leq \frac{4\pi^4}{3p^{3/2}} \sigma(n). \end{aligned}$$

Robin's inequality [16] states that for  $n \geq 3$ ,  $\sigma(n) \leq e^\gamma n \log(\log(n)) + \frac{0.6483n}{\log(\log(n))}$ . This implies that  $\frac{\sigma(n)}{n\sqrt{\log(n+2)}}$  is decreasing if  $n > 1652$  and in particular,  $\sigma(n) \leq 1.44n\sqrt{\log(n+2)}$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Thus

$$\frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} \cdot 2a_{E^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right) \leq \frac{32\pi^8}{9p^3} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} \sigma(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right).$$

For the terms with  $n < p$  we use that  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx)$  is decreasing. Then the contribution for  $ap \leq n \leq bp$  is bounded by

$$(1.44)^2 \cdot \frac{32\pi^8}{9p^3} \sum_{n=ap}^{bp} n \log(n+2) \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right) \leq \frac{69958}{p^3} \cdot [bp \log(bp+2)] (b-a)p \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(d\sqrt{a}).$$

We apply this for  $(a, b) = (0, 0.01), (0.01, 0.1), (0.1, 0.2), \dots, (0.9, 1)$  and obtain a bound of

$$\frac{69958 \log(p+2)}{p} \cdot 0.00150889 \leq \frac{105.56 \log(p+2)}{p}.$$

Now, for  $n \geq p$ , we have  $2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} \leq 2$ . We also use the bound  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(d\sqrt{n/p}) \leq 9(n/p)^{3/4} e^{-4\pi\sqrt{n/p}}$ . This gives that the contribution for  $n \geq p$  is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(1.44)^2 64\pi^8}{p^3} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k^2 p}^{(k+1)^2 p} n \log(n+2) \cdot \left(\frac{n}{p}\right)^{3/4} e^{-4\pi k} \\ &\leq \frac{1259227}{p^{15/4}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (p(k+1)^2)^{7/4} \log((k+1)^2(p+2))(2k+1) p e^{-4\pi k} \\ &\leq \frac{1259227}{p} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1)^{7/2} (2k+1) \log((k+1)^2(p+2)) e^{-4\pi k} \\ &\leq \frac{1259227}{p} \left[ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 2 \log(k+1) (k+1)^{7/2} (2k+1) e^{-4\pi k} + \log(p+2) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1)^{7/2} (2k+1) e^{-4\pi k} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1259227}{p} [0.0001641 + 0.0001184 \log(p+2)] \leq \frac{206.64 + 231.7 \log(p+2)}{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the contribution for  $n < p$  and  $n \geq p$  gives the desired result.  $\square$

To estimate the other contribution to  $\langle C, C \rangle$ , namely

$$\frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} \cdot 2r_{Q^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right)$$

we will need to bound  $\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n)^2$ . We do this via the simple inequality

$$\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n)^2 \leq \left( \max_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) \right) \left( \sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) \right).$$

We will proceed to estimate the two factors on the right hand side. To do so we write  $Q$  as

$$Q = a_1(x_1 + m_{12}x_2 + m_{13}x_3 + m_{14}x_4)^2 + a_2(x_2 + m_{23}x_3 + m_{24}x_4)^2 + a_3(x_3 + m_{34}x_4)^2 + a_4x_4^2.$$

Here  $a_1$  is the minimum nonzero value of  $Q$ ,  $a_{i+1}/a_i \geq 3/4$ , and  $a_1a_2a_3a_4 = \det(A/2) = p/16$ . Also,  $|m_{ij}| \leq 1/2$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . (That we can write  $Q$  in such a form follows from Theorem 2.1.1 of [11].)

This corresponds to writing  $Q = \frac{1}{2}\vec{x}^T A \vec{x}$ , where  $\frac{1}{2}A = M^T D M$ , where  $D$  is diagonal with entries  $a_1, \dots, a_4$ . This gives  $\frac{1}{2}pA^{-1} = \frac{p}{4}M^{-1}D^{-1}(M^T)^{-1}$  and yields the formula

$$Q^* = a_1^*x_1^2 + a_2^*(x_2 + n_{21}x_1)^2 + a_3^*(x_3 + n_{31}x_1 + n_{32}x_2)^2 + a_4^*(x_4 + n_{41}x_1 + n_{42}x_2 + n_{43}x_3)^2,$$

where  $a_i^* = \frac{p}{4a_i}$ .

The following Lemma is an explicit quantitative version of the first part of GH from MO's answer here to a question on MathOverflow [15].

**Lemma 10.** *Define  $M(n) = \max_{1 \leq m \leq n} \tau(m)$ . Then for  $p \geq 17$*

$$r_{Q^*}(n) \leq 2 \left( 2 \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_1^*}} + 1 \right) \left( 2 \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_2^*}} + 1 \right) M(25.09np^{29/6}).$$

Note that  $M(n) = O(n^\epsilon)$ . More precisely,  $M(n) \leq n^{\frac{1.538 \log(2)}{\log \log(n)}}$  for  $n \geq 3$ . (See [13].)

*Proof.* From the formula

$$Q^* = a_1^*x_1^2 + a_2^*(x_2 + n_{21}x_1)^2 + a_3^*(x_3 + n_{31}x_1 + n_{32}x_2)^2 + a_4^*(x_4 + n_{41}x_1 + n_{42}x_2 + n_{43}x_3)^2,$$

we know that the number of choices for  $(x_1, x_2)$  so that  $Q^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = n$  is at most

$$\left( 2 \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_1^*}} + 1 \right) \left( 2 \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_2^*}} + 1 \right).$$

For each such pair  $(x_1, x_2)$ , we specialize  $Q^*$  at this value leaving a binary quadratic polynomial in the two variables  $x_3, x_4$ . More precisely, we wish to count integer solutions to

$$P(x_3, y_3) := ax_3^2 + bx_3x_4 + cx_4^2 + dx_3 + ex_4 + f = 0,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a_3^* + a_4^*n_{43}^2 & b &= 2a_4^*n_{43} & c &= a_4^* & d &= 2a_3^*n_{31}x_1 + 2a_3^*n_{32}x_2 + 2a_4^*n_{41}n_{43}x_1 + 2a_4^*n_{42}n_{43}x_2 \\ e &= 2a_4^*n_{43}(n_{41}x_1 + n_{42}x_2) & f &= Q^*(x_1, x_2, 0, 0) - n. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8 of [4] shows that if  $\Delta = b^2 - 4ac$ ,  $\xi = (be - 2cd)/\Delta$  and  $\eta = (bd - 2ae)/\Delta$ , then

$$P(x, y) = \frac{(2a(x + \xi) + b(y + \eta))^2 - \Delta(y + \eta)^2}{4a} + P(-\xi, -\eta).$$

Note that  $\Delta = b^2 - 4ac < 0$  since  $Q^*$  is positive-definite. It follows that the number of solutions to  $P(x, y) = 0$  is at most the number of solutions to  $X^2 - \Delta Y^2 = -4a\Delta^2 P(-\xi, -\eta)$ . The number of such solutions is at most the number of elements in the ring of integers of  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-\Delta})$  with norm  $m := -4a\Delta^2 P(-\xi, -\eta)$ . If  $K \neq \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})$  or  $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})$ , the number of elements of norm  $m$  is at most  $2\tau(m)$  because there are at most  $\tau(m)$  ideals with norm  $m$  and  $O_K$  has only two units.

If  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-1})$  then  $-\Delta$  is an even square and it suffices to show that the number of solutions to  $X^2 + 4Y^2 = m$  is at most  $2\tau(m)$ . The fact that  $X^2 + 4Y^2$  is anisotropic at 2 reduces this to proving the result for  $m$  odd. The number of elements with norm  $m$  in  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  is at most  $4\tau(m)$ , but  $\mathbb{Z}[i]$  contains two sublattices with index 2 (namely,  $\langle 2, i \rangle$ ,  $\langle 1, 2i \rangle$ ) corresponding to the quadratic form  $X^2 + 4Y^2$ . These two sublattices intersect only in elements with even norm, and this shows that if  $m$  is odd,  $r_{X^2+4Y^2}(m) \leq \frac{1}{2}r_{X^2+Y^2}(m) \leq \frac{1}{2} \cdot (4\tau(m))$  giving the desired result. A similar argument applies if  $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-3})$ .

It suffices to bound

$$-4a\Delta^2 P(-\xi, -\eta) = 4a(4ac - b^2)((b^2 - 4ac)f + ae^2 - bde + cd^2).$$

We have  $a_3^* = \frac{p}{4a_3} \leq \frac{p}{4(9/16)} = \frac{4p}{9}$  and  $\frac{p}{16} = a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 \leq \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^6 a_4^4$  which give  $a_4 \geq \frac{3\sqrt{3}p^{1/4}}{16}$  and so  $a_4^* \leq \frac{4p^{3/4}}{3\sqrt{3}}$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} a &= a_3^* + a_4^* n_{43}^2 \leq \frac{4p}{9} + \frac{p^{3/4}}{3\sqrt{3}} \leq 0.54p & |b| &= 2a_4^* |n_{43}| \leq \frac{4p^{3/4}}{3\sqrt{3}} & c &= a_4^* \leq \frac{4p^{3/4}}{3\sqrt{3}} \\ |b^2 - 4ac| &= |-4a_3^* a_4^*| \leq \frac{64p^{7/4}}{27\sqrt{3}} \end{aligned}$$

To bound  $d$  and  $e$  we use that  $\frac{1}{a_1^*} = \frac{4a_1}{p}$  and  $\frac{1}{a_2^*} = \frac{4a_2}{p}$  together with the bounds  $a_1 \leq \frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}}p^{1/4}$ ,  $a_2 \leq \frac{2^{2/3}}{3}p^{1/3}$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} |d| &= 2a_3^* |n_{31} x_1| + 2a_3^* |n_{32} x_2| + 2a_4^* |n_{41} n_{43} x_1| + 2a_4^* |n_{42} n_{43} x_2| \leq \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_1^*}} \left( \frac{2p}{3} + \frac{7p^{3/4}}{6\sqrt{3}} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_2^*}} \left( \frac{2p}{3} + \frac{p^{3/4}}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \cdot \frac{4p^{-3/8}}{3^{3/4}} \left( \frac{2p}{3} + \frac{7p^{3/4}}{6\sqrt{3}} \right) + \sqrt{n} \cdot \frac{2^{4/3} p^{-1/3}}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot \left( \frac{2p}{3} + \frac{p^{3/4}}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \leq 2.941n^{1/2} p^{2/3} \\ |e| &= 2a_4^* |n_{43} (n_{41} x_1 + n_{42} x_2)| \left( \frac{2p}{3} + \frac{p^{3/4}}{\sqrt{3}} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \cdot \frac{4p^{3/4}}{3\sqrt{3}} \cdot (1/2) \left( \frac{7}{8} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_1^*}} + \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{\frac{n}{a_2^*}} \right) \leq 0.946n^{1/2} p^{5/12}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,  $-n \leq f \leq 0$ . Putting everything together we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &4a(4ac - b^2)((b^2 - 4ac)f + ae^2 - bde + cd^2) \\ &\leq 4(0.54p) \cdot \frac{64p^{7/4}}{27\sqrt{3}} \left( \frac{64p^{7/4}}{27\sqrt{3}} n + 0.484np^{11/6} + 2.142np^{11/6} + 6.659np^{25/12} \right) \\ &\leq 25.09np^{29/6}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for each  $x_1, x_2$ , the number of solutions to  $Q^*(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) = n$  is  $\leq 2M(25.09np^{29/6})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 11.** For  $p \geq 17$ , we have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) \leq 64x^2 p^{-3/2} + 75.52x^{3/2} p^{-1} + 30.49xp^{-1/2} + 8.11x^{1/2} + 1.$$

*Proof.* We begin with expanding a rather simple bound and perhaps inelegantly moving term by term:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) &\leq \prod_{i=1}^4 \left( 4 \sqrt{\frac{xa_i}{p}} + 1 \right) \\ &\leq 256 \sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4} x^2 p^{-2} + 64(\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3} + \sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_4} + \sqrt{a_1 a_3 a_4} + \sqrt{a_2 a_3 a_4}) x^{3/2} p^{-3/2} \\ &\quad + 16(\sqrt{a_1 a_2} + \sqrt{a_1 a_3} + \sqrt{a_1 a_4} + \sqrt{a_2 a_3} + \sqrt{a_2 a_4} + \sqrt{a_3 a_4}) x p^{-1} \\ &\quad + 4(\sqrt{a_1} + \sqrt{a_2} + \sqrt{a_3} + \sqrt{a_4}) \sqrt{x} p^{-1/2} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 = \frac{p}{16}$  immediately bounds the first term by  $64x^2 p^{-3/2}$ , which in turn leads to  $\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3} \leq \frac{1}{3^{3/4}} p^{3/8}$ . As the minimum of  $a_3$  is  $\frac{9}{16}$  we have  $\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_4} \leq \frac{1}{3} p^{1/2}$ . Similarly, with a minimum of  $a_2$  of  $\frac{3}{4}$  we have  $\sqrt{a_1 a_3 a_4} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} p^{1/2}$ . Last, considering the minimum of  $a_1$  is 1, we see  $\sqrt{a_2 a_3 a_4} \leq \frac{1}{4} p^{1/2}$ .

For the remaining six terms: using  $a_i \geq \frac{3}{4} a_{i-1}$  gives  $a_1 \leq \frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}} p^{1/4}$ ,  $a_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} p^{1/4}$  which bounds  $\sqrt{a_1 a_2}$ .

For  $\sqrt{a_1 a_3}$  we note that  $a_2 \geq \frac{3}{4}a_1$ ,  $a_4 \geq \frac{3}{4}a_3$  and therefore  $\frac{p}{16} \geq \frac{9}{16}(a_1 a_3)^2$ . For  $\sqrt{a_2 a_3}$  we note that the maximum value of  $a_2 a_3$  occurs when  $a_1 = 1$ ,  $a_2 = \frac{2^{2/3}}{3}p^{1/3}$ ,  $a_3 = 2^{-4/3}p^{1/3}$  and  $a_4 = 3 \cdot 2^{-10/3}p^{1/3}$ . This yields  $\sqrt{a_2 a_3} \leq \frac{1}{2^{1/3}3^{1/2}}p^{1/3}$ . We have  $a_1 a_4 = \frac{p}{16a_2 a_3}$  and  $a_2 a_3$  is minimized when  $a_2 = 3/4$  and  $a_3 = 9/16$ . This gives  $\sqrt{a_1 a_4} \leq \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}p^{1/2}$ . Similarly,  $\sqrt{a_2 a_4} \leq \frac{\sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{16a_1 a_3}} \leq \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{p}$  and  $\sqrt{a_3 a_4} \leq \frac{\sqrt{p}}{\sqrt{16a_1 a_2}} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\sqrt{p}$ . Finally note that  $\sqrt{a_4} \leq \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}p^{1/2}$ . These substitutions give:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) &\leq 256 \sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4} x^2 p^{-2} + 64(\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3} + \sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_4} + \sqrt{a_1 a_3 a_4} + \sqrt{a_2 a_3 a_4}) x^{3/2} p^{-3/2} \\ &\quad + 16(\sqrt{a_1 a_2} + \sqrt{a_1 a_3} + \sqrt{a_1 a_4} + \sqrt{a_2 a_3} + \sqrt{a_2 a_4} + \sqrt{a_3 a_4}) x p^{-1} \\ &\quad + 4(\sqrt{a_1} + \sqrt{a_2} + \sqrt{a_3} + \sqrt{a_4}) \sqrt{x} p^{-1/2} + 1 \\ &\leq 64x^2 p^{-3/2} + 64 \left( \frac{1}{3^{3/4}} p^{3/8} + \frac{1}{3} p^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} p^{1/2} + \frac{1}{4} p^{1/2} \right) x^{3/2} p^{-3/2} \\ &\quad + 16 \left( \frac{2}{3} p^{1/4} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} p^{1/4} + \frac{1}{2^{1/3}3^{1/2}} p^{1/3} + \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} p^{1/2} + \frac{1}{3} p^{1/2} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}} p^{1/2} \right) x p^{-1} \\ &\quad + 4 \left( \frac{2}{3^{3/4}} p^{1/8} + \frac{2^{1/3}}{\sqrt{3}} p^{1/6} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} p^{1/4} + \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}} p^{1/2} \right) x p^{-1/2} + 1 \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

**Corollary 12.** For  $1 \leq x \leq p$  we have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) \leq 179.12 \sqrt{x}$$

and for  $x \geq p$  we have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) \leq 178.37 x^2 p^{-3/2}.$$

**Lemma 13.** Let  $p \geq 101$ . Then

$$\frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} \cdot 2r_{Q^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi \left( d \sqrt{\frac{n}{p}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\min Q^*} + 3216.6524 \frac{M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}}.$$

*Proof.* For this proof, we proceed by cases on the size of  $n$  relative to  $p$ . In many intervals we use the bound  $\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n)^2 \leq r_{Q^*}(x) (\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n))$ ; this then will use Lemmas 10 and 11.

- $1 \leq n \leq \frac{3}{4}p^{1/2}$ :

First, observe that if  $r_{Q^*}(n) = 0$  for  $1 \leq n \leq \frac{3}{4}p^{1/2}$ , then the contribution from this segment is zero. Assume therefore that  $\min Q^* \leq \frac{3}{4}p^{1/2}$ .

If  $\vec{x} = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \\ x_4 \end{bmatrix} \neq \vec{0}$  and  $i$  is the smallest positive integer so that  $x_i \neq 0$ , then  $Q^*(\vec{x}) \geq a_i^* x_i^2 \geq a_i^*$ . Hence

$$\min Q^* \geq \min\{a_1^*, a_2^*, a_3^*, a_4^*\}.$$

We have that  $a_1^* \geq (3/4)a_2^* \geq (9/16)a_3^* \geq (27/64)a_4^*$ . This implies that

$$\frac{p^3}{16} = a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* a_4^* \leq \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^6 (a_1^*)^4$$

and so  $a_1^* \geq \frac{9}{4^{8/3}} p^{3/4} > \frac{3}{4} p^{1/2}$ .

We have  $a_1^* = \frac{p}{4a_1} \leq p/4$  and so  $p^3/16 = a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* a_4^*$  gives

$$\frac{p^2}{4} = \frac{p^3}{16(p/4)} \leq \frac{p^3}{16a_1^*} = a_2^* a_3^* a_4^* \leq \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^3 (a_2^*)^3$$

This gives  $a_2^* \geq \frac{3p^{2/3}}{4^{4/3}} > \frac{3}{4}p^{1/2}$ .

Similarly,  $a_2^* = \frac{p}{4a_2} \leq p/3$  and so

$$\frac{3}{4p} = \frac{p^3}{16(p^2/12)} \leq \frac{p^3}{16a_1^* a_2^*} = a_3^* a_4^* \leq \frac{4}{3}(a_3^*)^2$$

gives  $a_3^* \geq \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{p}$ . Since  $\min Q^* < \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{p}$ , it follows that  $a_4^* < \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{p}$  and if  $Q^*(\vec{x}) < \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{p}$ , then  $x_1 = x_2 = x_3 = 0$ . So if  $r_{Q^*}(n) \neq 0$ , then  $n = a_4^* i^2$  and  $r_{Q^*}(n) = 2$ . It follows that the contribution from this range is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{n=1}^{\frac{3}{4}p^{1/2}} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} 2r_{Q^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right) &\leq \frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{i=1}^{\left\lfloor \sqrt{\frac{3\sqrt{p}}{4a_4^*}} \right\rfloor} \frac{2 \cdot 2^2}{a_4^* i^2} \cdot \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \\ &\leq 8 \cdot \frac{3}{4\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_4^* i^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{a_4^*} \cdot \frac{6}{\pi^2} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2} = \frac{1}{a_4^*} = \frac{1}{\min Q^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Next we use Lemma 10 to give a bound on  $r_{Q^*}(n)$ .

We start by giving bounds on  $a_1^*$ ,  $a_2^*$  and  $a_1^* a_2^*$  in terms of  $a_4^*$ . We have that  $\frac{p^3}{16a_4^*} = a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* \leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^3 (a_1^*)^3$  and so  $a_1^* \geq \frac{4}{3 \cdot 2^{4/3}} p(a_4^*)^{-1/3}$ . We have

$$\frac{p^3}{16(p/4)a_4^*} \leq \frac{p^3}{16a_1^* a_4^*} = a_2^* a_3^* \leq \frac{3}{4}(a_2^*)^2.$$

This gives  $a_2^* \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} p(a_4^*)^{-1/2}$ . We next derive an upper bound on  $a_3^*$ . We have

$$\frac{3^3}{4^3} (a_3^*)^3 a_4^* \leq a_1^* a_2^* a_3^* a_4^* = \frac{p^3}{16}$$

and so  $a_3^* \leq \frac{2^{4/3}}{3} p(a_4^*)^{-1/3}$ . This gives

$$a_1^* a_2^* \geq \frac{p^3}{16a_3^* a_4^*} \geq \frac{3p^2}{2^{16/3} (a_4^*)^{2/3}}.$$

Plugging this in gives

$$(1) \quad r_{Q^*}(n) \leq \left( 29.328 \frac{n}{p} (a_4^*)^{1/3} + 10.764 \sqrt{\frac{n}{p}} (a_4^*)^{1/4} + 2 \right) M(25.09np^{29/6}).$$

- $\frac{3}{4}p^{1/2} \leq n \leq p/100$ : In this, and remaining regions, we use that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{n=\alpha}^{\beta} \frac{2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} 2r_{Q^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right) \\ & \leq 2 \left( \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{p}}\right) \right) \cdot \left[ \int_{\alpha}^{\beta} \frac{1}{t^2} \sum_{\alpha \leq n \leq t} 2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} r_{Q^*}(n)^2 dt + \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_{\alpha \leq n \leq \beta} 2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} r_{Q^*}(n)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

We use that  $\gcd(n, p) = 1$  if  $n < p$  and we apply the above result using equation (1) to bound  $r_{Q^*}(n)$  and  $\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) \leq 179.12 \sqrt{x}$ . For  $\alpha = \frac{3}{4} \sqrt{p}$  and  $\beta = \frac{1}{100}p$ , we get an upper bound of

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left[ 239.52 (a_4^*)^{1/3} + 146.52 (a_4^*)^{1/4} \ln(p) + 125.74 p^{1/4} \right] M(25.09 p^{35/6}).$$

- $p/100 \leq n \leq p-1$ : We use the same formulas as above and take  $(\alpha, \beta) = (2^k p/100, 2^{k+1} p/100)$  for  $0 \leq k \leq 5$ , as well as  $(\alpha, \beta) = (64p/100, p)$ . In total we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \left[ 596.82 (a_4^*)^{1/3} + 955.35 (a_4^*)^{1/4} + 949.86 \right].$$

- $n \geq p$ : Using that  $a_4^* \geq 2$ , we have that  $r_{Q^*}(n) \leq 41.1 \left(\frac{n}{p}\right) (a_4^*)^{1/3} M(25.09 n p^{29/6})$  for  $n \geq p$ . We have

$$\frac{p}{p+1} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n=k^2 p}^{(k+1)^2 p} \frac{2 \cdot 2^{\omega(\gcd(n,p))} r_{Q^*}(n)^2}{n} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi\left(d\sqrt{\frac{n}{p}}\right).$$

We use  $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \psi(dx) \leq 9x^{3/2} e^{-4\pi x}$  and get the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 36k^{3/2} e^{-4\pi k} \sum_{n=k^2 p}^{(k+1)^2 p} \frac{r_{Q^*}(n)^2}{n} \\ & = 36 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{3/2} e^{-4\pi k} \left[ \int_{k^2 p}^{(k+1)^2 p} \frac{1}{t^2} \left( \sum_{n \leq t} r_{Q^*}(n) \right) \left( \max_{n \leq t} r_{Q^*}(n) \right) dt \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{(k+1)^2 p} \left( \sum_{n \leq (k+1)^2 p} r_{Q^*}(n) \right) \left( \max_{n \leq (k+1)^2 p} r_{Q^*}(n) \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using that  $\sum_{n \leq x} r_{Q^*}(n) \leq 178.37 x^2 p^{-3/2}$  gives the bound  $3665.51 \frac{(a_4^*)^{1/3}}{\sqrt{p}} (4k^3 + 6k^2 + 4k + 1) M(25.09(k+1)^2 p^{35/6})$  on the integral. The second term is bounded by  $7331.1(k+1)^4 \frac{(a_4^*)^{1/3}}{\sqrt{p}} M(25.09(k+1)^2 p^{35/6})$ , for a total of

$$\frac{(a_4^*)^{1/3}}{\sqrt{p}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{3/2} (131958.36(4k^3 + 6k^2 + 4k + 1) + 263919.6(k+1)^4) M(25.09(k+1)^2 p^{35/6}) e^{-4\pi k}.$$

If  $n \geq 2$ , there is an even integer  $r$  with  $1 \leq r \leq n$  for which  $\tau(r)$  is a maximum. (If the  $r$  was odd, we could replace an odd prime factor of  $r$  with 2 resulting in a lower number with the same number of divisors.) This implies that for  $n \geq 1$ ,  $M(2n) = \max_{r \leq n} \tau(2r) \leq \max_{r \leq n} \tau(2)\tau(r) = \tau(2)M(n) = 2M(n)$ . A straightforward induction then shows that  $M(kn) \leq 2kM(n)$ . Applying this bound in the above formula gives yields  $\frac{(a_4^*)^{1/3}}{\sqrt{p}} M(25.09 p^{35/6})$  times a convergent series in  $k$ , whose sum is  $\leq 82.525$  and so we get the contribution  $\frac{82.525 (a_4^*)^{1/3} M(25.09 p^{35/6})}{\sqrt{p}}$  to the inner product from the portion with  $n \geq p$ .

Using the bound  $a_4^* \leq \frac{4p^{3/4}}{3\sqrt{3}}$  we obtain the bound

$$\frac{1}{\min Q^*} + \frac{M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}} \left( 918.87 \sqrt[3]{\frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}}} + 353.53 \sqrt[4]{\frac{4}{3\sqrt{3}}} \cdot \frac{\log(p)}{p^{1/16}} + 125.74 + \frac{949.86}{p^{1/4}} \right).$$

The maximum value of  $\frac{\log(x)}{x^{1/16}}$  occurs when  $x = e^{16}$ . Using the bound  $\frac{\log(p)}{p^{1/16}} \leq \frac{16}{e}$  gives the desired result.  $\square$

Finally, we combine Lemma 9 and Lemma 13 to prove Theorem 2.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* We simplify the formula for the sum of the right hand side of Lemma 9 and Lemma 13 by allowing both terms to include  $M(25.09p^{35/6})$ . If  $p = 101$ ,  $25.09 \cdot p^{35/6} \approx 12341710124278$ . We use a tabulated list of record high values of  $\tau(n)$  (see OEIS sequence A002182) to determine that the integer with the greatest number of divisors less than  $25 \cdot 101^{35/6}$  is 9316358251200 and so  $M(25.09 \cdot 101^{35/6}) = 10752$ .

Next, we note that

$$\frac{337.26 \log(p+2)}{p} \leq 0.00457 \frac{10752}{p^{1/4}} \leq 0.00457 \frac{M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}}$$

for  $p \geq 101$ . This can be seen using the fact that  $\log(x+2)/x^{3/4}$  is decreasing for  $x > e^{4/3} - 2$ . Finally,

$$\frac{206.67}{p} \leq 0.00061 \frac{10752}{p^{1/4}} \leq 0.00061 \frac{M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}}$$

for  $p \geq 101$ . Therefore

$$\langle C, C \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\min Q^*} + (3216.6524 + 0.00457 + 0.00061) \frac{M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}} \leq \frac{1}{\min Q^*} + 3216.66 \frac{M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}}$$

as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We have  $r_Q(n) = a_E(n) + a_C(n)$ . A lower bound on  $a_E(n)$  was given in Theorem 7. Using the bound  $C_Q \leq \sqrt{\frac{As}{B}}$ , where  $A$  is the bound given in Theorem 2 and  $B = \frac{3}{208\pi^4} \cdot \frac{p}{(p+1)\log(p)}$  we obtain

$$C_Q \leq \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{12} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \cdot \frac{208\pi^4}{3}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\min Q^*} + 3216.66 \frac{M(25.09p^{35/6})}{p^{1/4}}}.$$

We use that for  $p \geq 101$ ,

$$\left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{12} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right) \cdot \frac{208\pi^4}{3}} \right) \leq 23.85.$$

$\square$

#### 4. SUM OF EXCEPTIONS

In this section, we prove Corollary 3. We proceed by using Theorem 2 and relating  $\langle C, C \rangle$  to an integral of the form

$$\int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} |C(x+iy)|^2 dx dy.$$

**Lemma 14.** *Let  $\sigma > 0$  and let  $F(\sigma)$  be the largest number of points in the region  $\{x+iy : -1/2 \leq x \leq 1/2, y \geq \sigma\}$  that can be in a single  $\Gamma_0(p)$  orbit. Then,  $F(\sigma) \leq 1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2p\sigma}$ .*



*Proof.* Choose a  $\Gamma_0(p)$ -orbit and let  $w = \alpha + i\beta$  be a point with  $|\alpha| \leq 1/2$ ,  $\beta \geq \sigma$  that has lowest imaginary part (subject to  $\beta \geq \sigma$ ) in this orbit. We will count the number of matrices  $M = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$  (up to negation) in  $\Gamma_0(p)$  with  $\text{Im}(M(w)) \geq \text{Im}(w)$  and  $|\text{Re}(M(w))| \leq 1/2$ .

We have

$$\text{Im}(M(w)) = \frac{\text{Im}(w)}{|cw + d|^2}.$$

So in order for  $\text{Im}(M(w)) \geq w$ , we need  $|cw + d|^2 \leq 1$ . If  $c = 0$ , then in order for  $M$  to be in  $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z})$  we must have  $d = \pm 1$  and so up to negation we have  $d = 1$ . This gives us one choice of  $(c, d)$ .

Assume then that  $c > 0$ . We have  $|cw + d|^2 = (\alpha + d)^2 + (c\beta)^2 \leq 1$  and also  $\gcd(c, d) = 1$ . Since  $-1/2 \leq \alpha \leq 1/2$ , there is at most one choice of  $d$  so that  $(\alpha + d)^2 \leq 1$  (either  $d = 1$  or  $d = -1$ ). In any case,  $|\alpha + d| \geq 1/2$  and so  $(\alpha + d)^2 \geq 1/4$ . Thus,  $(c\beta)^2 \leq 3/4$  and so  $c \leq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2\beta}$ . Recalling that  $c$  must be a multiple of  $p$ , the total number of choices of  $(c, d)$  with  $c > 0$  is at most  $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2p\beta}$ .

Finally, for each choice of  $(c, d)$ , if  $M_1 = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$  and  $M_2 = \begin{bmatrix} a' & b' \\ c & d \end{bmatrix}$  are two different matrices in  $\Gamma_0(p)$  with the same choice of  $(c, d)$ , then  $M_1 M_2^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} * & * \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . If  $-1/2 \leq \text{Re}(M_2(w)) \leq 1/2$ , then  $\text{Re}(M_1(w)) = \text{Re}(M_1 M_2^{-1} M_2(w))$  is not between  $-1/2$  and  $1/2$ . Thus, for each  $(c, d)$  pair, there is at most one choice of  $a, b$  that makes  $-1/2 \leq \text{Re}(M(w)) \leq 1/2$ . This proves the claim.  $\square$

It follows from the claim that

$$\frac{1}{p+1} \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} |C(x+iy)|^2 dx dy \leq \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2p\sigma}\right) \langle C, C \rangle$$

since the region  $\sigma \leq y \leq \infty$  is contained in at most  $F(\sigma) \leq 1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2p\sigma}$  different fundamental domains for  $\Gamma_0(p)$ .

A straightforward calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p+1} \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} |C(x+iy)|^2 dx dy &= \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \sum_{m,n} a_C(m) a_C(n) e^{-2\pi(m+n)y} e^{2\pi i(m-n)x} dx dy \\ &= \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_C(n)^2 e^{-4\pi n y} dy \\ &= \frac{1}{4\pi} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_C(n)^2}{n} e^{-4\pi n \sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

If  $n$  is an integer so that  $r_Q(n) = 0$ , then  $a_C(n) = -a_E(n)$ . We have that  $a_E(n) \geq \frac{24(p-1)}{p^{3/2}} \phi(n) \gg \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \frac{n}{\log \log(n)}$  if  $n > 2$ .

Let  $m$  be the largest positive integer  $n$  so that  $r_Q(n) = 0$  and  $\sigma = 1/m$ . Theorem 1 shows that  $m \ll \max\{\frac{p^{2+\epsilon}}{\min Q^*}, p^{7/4+\epsilon}\}$ .

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{r_Q(n)=0} n &\ll 3 + (\log \log m)^2 \sum_{r_Q(n)=0} \frac{pn}{(\log \log(n))^2} \\
&\ll 3 + p(\log \log m)^2 \sum_{r_Q(n)=0} \frac{a_E(n)^2}{n} \\
&\ll 3 + p(\log \log m)^2 \sum_{r_Q(n)=0} \frac{a_C(n)^2}{n} \\
&\ll 3 + p(\log \log m)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_C(n)^2}{n} e^{-4\pi n\sigma} \\
&\ll 3 + (\log \log m)^2 (p+1)pF(1/m)\langle C, C \rangle \\
&\ll p^{2+\epsilon} \left( 1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}m}{2p} \right) \left( \frac{1}{\min Q^*} + p^{-1/4+\epsilon} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

If  $\min Q^* \leq p^{1/4-\epsilon}$ , we get that

$$\sum_{r_Q(n)=0} n \ll p^{1+\epsilon} \frac{m}{\min Q^*} \ll \frac{p^{3+\epsilon}}{(\min Q^*)^2}.$$

If  $\min Q^* > p^{1/4-\epsilon}$ , we get

$$\sum_{r_Q(n)=0} n \ll p^{1+\epsilon} m p^{-1/4+\epsilon} \ll p^{5/2+\epsilon}.$$

In all cases, we obtain

$$\sum_{r_Q(n)=0} n \ll \max \left\{ \frac{p^{3+\epsilon}}{(\min Q^*)^2}, p^{5/2+\epsilon} \right\}.$$

as desired.

## 5. FAMILY OF FORMS WITH EXPLICIT EXCEPTIONS

We end this paper with an example of a family of prime discriminant forms, and the classification of the excepted values.

**Theorem 15.** *Let  $p \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$  be prime. Consider the quadratic form*

$$Q_p(\vec{x}) = x^2 + xy + xz + xw + y^2 + yz + yw + z^2 + zw + \frac{p+3}{8}w^2.$$

*This quaternary form is almost universal; more specifically, it represents all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  except those  $n < \frac{p}{8}$  of the form  $n = 4^k(16\ell + 14)$  for integers  $k$  and  $\ell$ .*

We begin with a pair of lemmas regarding the integers represented by a particular ternary subform of  $Q_p$  and by a specific ternary form. We begin by discussing the integers represented by the subform  $Q_p((x, y, z, 0))$ .

**Lemma 16.** *The ternary quadratic form  $x^2 + xy + xz + y^2 + yz + z^2$  is regular and of class number one. It represents all positive integers except those of the form  $4^k(16\ell + 14)$ .*

*Proof.* That the form is regular and of class number one is readily found in [10]. In particular, this means that  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  is represented by the form if and only if  $n$  is locally represented by the form. Clearly, over  $\mathbb{R}$  all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  are represented. Over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  for  $p \neq 2$ , Hensel's Lemma states it is sufficient to check  $(\text{mod } p)$  to guarantee representation. As this form is nondegenerate and of dimension at least 2, that makes it universal

over a finite field, and specifically  $\pmod{p}$ . The only prime left to consider is  $p = 2$ . Using Siegel's theory of local densities, one must check whether any quotients of an integer by a square factor are represented  $\pmod{2^5}$ . A simple Sage computation shows that  $n \equiv 14, 30 \pmod{32}$  are not locally-represented, which implies that  $n = 4^k(16\ell + 14)$  are not represented. Moreover, for all other  $n$ , there are Good-type solutions (using the language of [7]) which means  $n$  is represented over  $\mathbb{Q}_2$ .  $\square$

We also will reference the following result:

**Lemma 17.** *The ternary form  $X^2 + 2Y^2 + 6Z^2$  is regular, and represents every positive integer  $N \equiv 9 \pmod{24}$ . Additionally, there is a representation of the form  $X = 4z + 1$ ,  $Y = 3y + z + 1$ , and  $Z = 2x + y + z + 1$  for some integers  $x, y, z$ .*

*Proof.* That the form is regular again can be found in [10]. Clearly, over  $\mathbb{R}$  all  $n \equiv 9 \pmod{24}$  are represented. For  $p \neq 2, 3$ , over  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  Hensel's Lemma again states it is sufficient to check  $\pmod{p}$ , and again in those cases the form is ternary and nondegenerate so it is actually universal. For  $p = 3$ , note that  $(1, 2, 0)$  is a solution with at least one nonzero partial derivative, so it can be lifted to a solution in  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ . For  $p = 2$ , all partial derivatives vanish, and so it suffices to look  $\pmod{32}$  to ensure a 2-adic solution. Running Sage [19], we see that there are solutions. By local-global principles, then,  $X^2 + 2Y^2 + 6Z^2$  represents all positive integers  $\equiv 9 \pmod{24}$ .

Now set  $N = 24m + 9$  for some nonnegative integer  $m$ . For  $24m + 9 = X^2 + 2Y^2 + 6Z^2$ ,  $X$  must be odd. Without loss of generality by swapping  $X$  and  $-X$  as necessary,  $X = 4z + 1$  for  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Considering now the equation  $\pmod{3}$ , one has  $X \equiv \pm Y \pmod{3}$ . Again, without loss of generality suppose  $X \equiv Y \pmod{3}$ . Writing  $X - Y = 3k$  for some integer  $k$  and solving for  $Y$  yields  $Y = 3(k + z) + z + 1$ . Last, consider the equation  $\pmod{8}$ . Then  $Y$  and  $Z$  must have the same parity. Therefore  $Z - Y = 2\ell$  for  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Substituting again, this means  $Z = 2(\ell + k + z) + (k + z) + z + 1$ . And noting the parentheses, letting  $y = k + z$  and  $x = \ell + k + z$ , the claim holds.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 15:* By Lemma 16, we need only consider representation of integers  $n = 4^k(16\ell + 14)$  by the form  $Q_p$ . We begin by diagonalizing the form over  $\mathbb{Q}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Q_p(\vec{x}) &= x^2 + xy + xz + xw + y^2 + yz + yw + z^2 + zw + \frac{p+3}{8}w^2 \\ &= \left(x + \frac{1}{2}(y + z + w)\right)^2 + \frac{3}{4}\left(y + \frac{1}{3}(z + w)\right)^2 + \frac{2}{3}\left(z + \frac{1}{4}w\right)^2 + \frac{p}{8}w^2. \end{aligned}$$

If  $Q_p$  represents  $n$ , then  $\frac{p}{8}w^2 \leq n$ , or  $|w| \leq 2\left(\sqrt{\frac{2n}{p}}\right)$ . When  $\sqrt{\frac{2n}{p}} < \frac{1}{2}$ , or equivalently when  $n < \frac{p}{8}$ , this forces  $w = 0$  and Lemma 16 shows such  $n$  cannot be represented by the subsequent ternary subform.

Next suppose  $n = 4^k(16\ell + 14)$  with  $n \geq \frac{p}{8}$ . Set  $m = n - \frac{p+3}{8}$ . By Lemma 17 there exist integers  $x, y, z$  with

$$24m + 9 = (4z + 1)^2 + 2(3y + z + 1)^2 + 6(2x + y + z + 1)^2.$$

Expanding and simplifying, this gives

$$\begin{aligned} n &= x^2 + xy + xz + y^2 + yz + z^2 + z + y + z + \frac{p+3}{8} \\ &= Q_p((x, y, z, 1)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $Q_p$  represents  $n$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] Barowski, M., Damron, W., Mejia, A., Saia, F., Schock, N., and Thompson, K., *Classically integral quadratic forms excepting at most two values*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 146 (2018), 3661-3677.
- [2] Bhargava, M., *On the Conway-Schneeberger fifteen theorem*, Quadratic forms and their applications (Dublin, 1999), Contemp. Math., vol. 272, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence RI, 2000, pp. 27-37
- [3] Bhargava, M., and Hanke, J., *Universal quadratic forms and the 290-Theorem*, Preprint.
- [4] Blomer, V., and Pohl, A., *The sup-norm problem on the Siegel modular space of rank two*, Amer. Jour. Math., Vol. 138, No. 4, August 2016, pp.999-1027.
- [5] Browning, T.D., Dietmann, R., *On the representation of integers by quadratic forms*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, Volume 96, Issue 2, March 2008, pp 289-416.
- [6] Brunier, J.H., and Bundschuh, M., *On Borcherds products associated with lattices of prime discriminant*, Ramanujan Journal 7 (2003), 49-61.
- [7] Hanke, J., *Local densities and explicit bounds for representability by a quadratic form*, Duke Math. J. 124 (2004), no. 2, 351-388.
- [8] Iwaniec, H., *Topics in Classical Automorphic Forms*, Graduate studies in mathematics, American Mathematical Society, 1997.
- [9] Iwasawa, K., *Lectures on p-adic L-Functions*, Princeton University Press, 1972.
- [10] Jagy, W.C., Kaplansky, I., and Schiemann, A. *There are 913 regular ternary forms*, Mathematika, 44 (1997), 332-341.
- [11] Kitaoka, Y., *Arithmetic of quadratic forms*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 106, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.
- [12] Legendre, A.-M. *Essai sur la theorie des nombres*, Paris, An VI (1797-1798)
- [13] Nicolas, J.L., and Robin, G., *Majorations explicites pour le nombre de diviseurs de N*, Canad. Math. Bull. Vol 26 (4), 1983, pg. 485-492.
- [14] Ono, K., and Soundararajan, K., *Ramanujan's ternary quadratic form*, Invent. Math. 130 (1997), no. 3, 415-454.
- [15] <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/256576/which-quaternary-quadratic-form-represents-n-the-greatest-number-of-times>
- [16] Robin, G. *Grandes valeurs de la fonction somme des diviseurs et hypothese de Riemann*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 63 (1984), no. 2, 187-213.
- [17] Ramanujan, S., *On the expression of a number in the form  $ax^2 + by^2 + cz^2 + dw^2$* , Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 19 (1916), 11-21.
- [18] Rouse, J., *Quadratic forms representing all odd positive integers*, American Journal of Mathematics, **136** (2014), no. 6, 1693-1745.
- [19] SageMath, the Sage Mathematics Software System (Version 6.10), The Sage Developers, 2015, <http://www.sagemath.org>.
- [20] Schulze-Pillot, R., *On explicit versions of Tartakovski's theorem*, Arch. Math. (Basel) 77 (2001), no. 2, 129-137. MR 1842088 (2002i:11036)
- [21] Schulze-Pillot, R., and Yenirce, A., *Petersson products of bases of spaces of cusp forms and estimates of Fourier coefficients*, International Journal of Number Theory, Vol. 14, No. 08, 2018, 2277-2290.
- [22] Siegel, C.L., *Über Die Analytische Theorie Der Quadratischen Formen III*, Annals of Mathematics, **38** (1937), 212-291.
- [23] Soni, R.P., *On an inequality for modified Bessel functions*, J. Math and Phys., **44** (1965), 406-407.
- [24] Tartakowsky, W., *Die Gesamtheit der Zahlen, die durch eine positive quadratische Form  $f(x_1, \dots, x_s)(s4)$  darstellbar sind*, Izv. Akad. Nauk. SSSR 7 (1929), 111-122, 165-195.
- [25] Waibel, F., *Uniform bounds for norms of theta series and arithmetic applications*, arXiv:2012.04311
- [26] Yang, T., *An explicit formula for local densities of quadratic forms*, J. Number Theory, 72 (1998), No. 2, 309-356.

J.ROUSE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WAKE FOREST UNIVERSITY, WINSTON-SALEM, NC., 27109

*E-mail address*, J. Rouse: [rouseja@wfu.edu](mailto:rouseja@wfu.edu)

K. THOMPSON, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD., 21402

*E-mail address*, K. Thompson: [kthomps@usna.edu](mailto:kthomps@usna.edu)